

A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter assesses the potential of the proposed Cornell NYC Tech project to impact historic and cultural resources, which include both archaeological and architectural resources. The project site (Block 1373, Lots 1 [partial] and 20) is located on the southern portion of Roosevelt Island (the Island), south of the Ed Koch Queensboro Bridge (see **Figure 7-1a**). The project site contains the Coler-Goldwater Specialty Hospital and Nursing Facility (Goldwater Hospital), which has been determined by the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation (OPRHP) to be eligible for listing on the State and National Registers of Historic Places (S/NR-eligible). It also contains a sanitary pump station (the South Pump Station) located in a fenced area on the southeast corner of the project site. A rezoning area is also analyzed in this chapter that includes the project site; a one-way circulation roadway encircling the project site (the loop road); and a concrete seawall, which forms the barrier along the East River to the east and west of the project site.

The historic and cultural resources analysis has been prepared in accordance with City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR), the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), and under Section 14.09 of the New York State Historic Preservation Act of 1980 (SHPA). These laws and regulations require that city and state agencies, respectively, consider the impacts of their actions on historic properties. This technical analysis follows the guidance of the *CEQR Technical Manual* (June 2012 Edition).

B. METHODOLOGY

ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Archaeological resources are the physical remnants, usually buried, of past human activities on a site. They can include archaeological resources associated with Native American populations that used or occupied a site and can include stone tools or refuse from tool-making activities, remnants of habitation or camp sites, etc. These resources are also referred to as “precontact,” since they were deposited before Native Americans’ contact with European settlers. Archaeological resources can also include remains from activities that occurred during the historic period, which began with the European colonization of the New York area in the 17th century. Historic period archaeological resources can include objects associated with historic battle sites, landfill deposits, structural foundations, and domestic shaft features such as cisterns, wells, and privies.

While many sites may have contained archaeological resources at one time, where later development occurred archaeological resources may have been disturbed or destroyed by grading, excavation, building construction, and infrastructure installation and street improvements. However, some resources do survive in urban environments despite extensive development. Deposits can be protected when covered with pavement (i.e., a parking lot) or with

a building with a shallow foundation and no basement. In both scenarios, archaeological deposits can be sealed beneath the ground surface, protected from further disturbance.

The study area for archaeological resources is the area that would be disturbed by in-ground project construction. For the purposes of the proposed project, the archaeological resources study area includes the project site and the adjacent roadway. In a February 10, 2012 Environmental Review letter, the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) determined that the archaeological study area has the potential for the recovery of archaeological resources associated with the precontact and 19th-century occupation of Roosevelt Island. LPC recommended that a Phase 1A Archaeological Documentary Study of the archaeological study area be completed to clarify LPC's initial findings and to determine if additional analysis (i.e., Phase 1B archaeological testing) is warranted (see **Appendix 7**, "Historic and Cultural Resources"). Therefore, a Phase 1A Archaeological Documentary Study of the archaeological study area was prepared by AKRF in March 2012 to evaluate the archaeological study area's potential to contain archaeological resources. Documentary research was undertaken, including the review of property conveyance records, city directories, land tract reports, tax assessments, historic maps and atlases, and other historical and existing subsurface information. The conclusions and recommendations of the Phase 1A findings are included in the analysis below in "Existing Conditions." As summarized below, the Phase 1A study determined that the archaeological study area is not sensitive for archaeological resources dating to either the precontact or historic periods. In a comment letter dated March 26, 2012, LPC concurred with the conclusions and recommendations of the Phase 1A study. As indicated in its June 19, 2012 findings letter, OPRHP has no further archaeological concerns for the project site (see Appendix 7, "Historic and Cultural Resources"). Therefore, no additional archaeological analysis of the archaeological study area is warranted and this analysis focuses on standing structures only.

ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES

Architectural resources are defined as National Historic Landmarks (NHLs); properties or districts listed on or determined eligible for listing on the State or National Registers of Historic Places (S/NR); New York City Landmarks (NYCLs) and Historic Districts (NYCHDs), and properties that have been found by LPC to appear eligible for designation, considered for designation ("heard") by LPC at a public hearing, or calendared for consideration at such a hearing (these are "pending" NYCLs).

As stated in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, significant adverse impacts can occur if a project would affect those characteristics that make a property eligible for listing in the S/NR or for New York City Landmark designation.

In general, potential impacts on architectural resources can include both direct physical impacts and indirect impacts. Direct impacts include demolition of a resource and alterations to a resource that cause it to become a different visual entity. Direct impacts could also include damage from vibration (e.g., from construction blasting or pile driving), or from falling objects, subsidence, collapse, or construction machinery associated with adjacent construction, which is defined as any construction activity that would occur within 90 feet of an architectural resource, as established in the New York City Department of Buildings (DOB)'s *Technical Policy and Procedure Notice #10/88* (TPPN #10/88). DOB's TPPN #10/88 defines an architectural resource as a property that is an NYCL, included in an NYCHD, or listed on the S/NR.

Indirect impacts are contextual or visual impacts that could result from project construction or operation. As described in the *CEQR Technical Manual*, indirect impacts could result from

blocking significant public views of a resource; isolating a resource from its setting or relationship to the streetscape; altering the setting of a resource; introducing incompatible visual, audible, or atmospheric elements to a resource's setting; or introducing shadows over a historic landscape or an architectural resource with sun-sensitive features that contribute to that resource's significance, such as a church with notable stained glass windows.

ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES STUDY AREA

To account for potential physical and contextual impacts, the architectural resources study area for the proposed project encompasses the project site and the rezoning area and the area within approximately 400 feet of the rezoning area. The analysis also considers longer contextual views available beyond the 400-foot study area, including views from Manhattan and Queens, as appropriate (see **Figures 7-1a** and **7-1b**).

CRITERIA AND REGULATIONS

Once the study area was determined, an inventory of officially recognized architectural resources in the study area was compiled ("Architectural Resources").

Criteria for inclusion on the National Register are listed in the Code of Federal Regulations, Title 36, Part 63. LPC and OPRHP have adopted these criteria for use in identifying architectural resources for CEQR and SEQRA review. Following these criteria, districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects are eligible for the National Register if they possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association, and:

- A. Are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of history;
- B. Are associated with significant people;
- C. Embody distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction; represent the work of a master, possess high artistic value, or represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- D. May yield archaeological information important in prehistory or history.

Properties that are less than 50 years of age are ordinarily not eligible, unless they have achieved exceptional significance. Determinations of eligibility are made by OPRHP.

LPC designates historically significant properties or areas in New York City as NYCLs and/or NYCHDs, following the criteria provided in New York Administrative Code, Title 25, Chapter 3. Buildings, properties, or objects are eligible for landmark status when they are at least 30 years old. Landmarks have a special character or special historical or aesthetic interest or value as part of the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of the city, state, or nation. There are four types of landmarks: individual landmarks, interior landmarks, scenic landmarks, and historic districts.

In addition to identifying officially recognized architectural resources in the study area (NHLs, S/NR-listed and S/NR-eligible properties, NYCLs, NYCHDs, and properties determined eligible for or pending landmark designation), a survey was conducted to identify any previously undesignated properties in the study area that were then evaluated for their potential S/NR or NYCL eligibility ("potential architectural resources") in compliance with the *CEQR Technical Manual* and SEQRA guidelines.

Once the architectural resources in the study area were identified, the proposed project was assessed for both direct physical impacts and indirect contextual impacts on architectural resources.

C. BACKGROUND HISTORY¹

Precontact archaeological sites in New York City are generally found in close proximity to high ground (but not exceeding 12 to 15 percent slopes), fresh water courses, well-drained soils, and previously identified precontact archaeological sites. The original topographic setting of Roosevelt Island does not indicate that it would have been a preferred place for a permanent or semi-permanent Native American habitation site. No Native American sites have been identified on Roosevelt Island, although Native American settlements have been identified on the shores of Queens and Manhattan opposite the Island. It is therefore likely that the local Native American populations used the Island for the exploitation of resources and it is possible that short-term campsites were once located along the Island's shores.

After the settlement of the area by European colonists in the 17th century, Roosevelt Island was used for agricultural purposes. The Island was owned by a number of well-known Dutch and English settlers, including Wouter van Twiler, the Director General of New Netherland who first purchased the Island from the Native Americans, and Captain John Manning, the Englishman responsible for surrendering New York City to the Dutch for a brief period in 1673. Beginning with Manning's daughter and son-in-law, members of the Blackwell family would inhabit the Island for more than a century, giving it the long-lasting name "Blackwell's Island." The family's residence, the Blackwell House (S/NR, NYCL), is located on the northern half of Roosevelt Island to the north of the project site. The name Blackwell's Island was used until circa 1921, when the Island was renamed "Welfare Island." The Island was renamed again in 1973, becoming "Roosevelt Island."

Historic maps dating to the 18th and early 19th centuries do not depict any structures or other developments on the southern end of Roosevelt Island. The City of New York purchased Blackwell's Island in 1828 for the purposes of constructing a new penitentiary to relieve the overcrowded city prisons in Manhattan. The Penitentiary opened in 1829 and was the first structure to be depicted at the southern end of Roosevelt Island on early 19th century maps of New York City. The prison complex was expanded throughout the 19th century as more and more space was needed to house the city's convicts. Other structures associated with the Penitentiary, including a washhouse, workhouses, a bathhouse, and the warden's residence, were present within the study area.

The prisoners held on Blackwell's Island were made to do physical labor as part of their punishment. A large quarry was located within the Penitentiary grounds to the north of the study area. Many of the Island's prisoners served their time quarrying rock which was then used to construct other buildings on the Island and in other parts of the city. Teams of incarcerated laborers were also tasked with the grading the prison grounds. While some of the prison buildings were supplied with running water and connected to sewer lines that emptied into the East River, the Penitentiary lacked modern toilet facilities and cells were supplied with only buckets for the purposes of waste management.

¹ This section is summarized from the Phase 1A Documentary Study, "CornellNYC Tech Roosevelt Island Campus." AKRF, Inc. March 2012.

As a result of the overcrowding and poor living conditions in the prison, by the early 20th century, the city decided that it was necessary to replace the antiquated and unsanitary Penitentiary with a larger, more modern facility that could accommodate the rising number of prisoners. With the construction of the new prison on Riker's Island in the late 1920s, the Penitentiary on Roosevelt Island was closed and in 1936, crews of Works Progress Administration (WPA)¹ workers demolished the complex. Photographs of the site after the demolition of the prison indicate that the ground surface of the former Penitentiary complex was relatively flat and did not possess the small hills and elevated areas seen on the project site today. The project site therefore appears to have been heavily modified by the construction and subsequent demolition of the prison complex as well as by the extensive grading of the site by teams of convicts during the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

After the demolition of the Penitentiary, the existing Goldwater Hospital was constructed on the project site between 1937 and 1939. The hospital was designed in such a manner as to provide patients with access to fresh air and sunlight. Grassy lawns originally separated the buildings making up the hospital complex, although these were converted into paved parking areas in the late 20th century. The southern end of the hospital grounds were largely undeveloped until 1971, when Building J was constructed. More detailed information on Goldwater Hospital is provided below in "Existing Conditions."

In addition to the Penitentiary, other structures were built on the southern portion of Roosevelt Island in the 19th century. The Smallpox Hospital (S/NR, NYCL) was designed by architect James Renwick, Jr., and constructed in 1856 near the southern end of the Island. The Smallpox Hospital was abandoned in the 1950s; the hospital's ruins are currently being stabilized and will be a feature within South Point Park. By the late 19th century, the southern portion of Roosevelt Island also contained City Hospital, constructed between 1858 and 1870. City Hospital occupied a large site immediately south of the project site, which at that time contained the Penitentiary. The hospital building extended east-west across much of the Island's width. City Hospital was abandoned in circa 1955 and demolished in circa 1994. In 1892 the small Strecker Memorial Laboratory building, described in "Architectural Resources" below, was constructed southeast of the project site. The building was a gift from the Strecker family to City Hospital. It has recently been restored.

By the middle of the 20th century many of the older institutional buildings on Roosevelt Island had been closed and abandoned, including City Hospital, the Smallpox Hospital, and the Strecker Memorial Laboratory on the southern portion of the Island. Many vacant buildings throughout Roosevelt Island were used for training purposes by the New York City Fire Department (FDNY). By the 1960s, Goldwater Hospital, Coler Hospital, and FDNY training activities were the only active uses on the Island.

In 1968, the city initiated plans for the redevelopment of Roosevelt Island. The New York State Urban Development Corporation (now doing business as Empire State Development [ESD]) retained architects Philip Johnson and John Burgee to create a master plan for the proposed redevelopment. Under Johnson and Burgee's plans, the Island's first residential complex opened in 1975, followed by three additional housing complexes in 1976. Also in 1976, the aerial Tramway connecting Roosevelt Island to the east side of Manhattan opened. The next residential development to be completed was Manhattan Park in 1989, located in the northern part of

¹ The "Works Progress Administration" was renamed the "Works Project Administration" in 1939.

Roosevelt Island. The Roosevelt Island subway station opened in 1990. Subsequent development on Roosevelt Island includes Southtown, a residential and commercial building complex located north of the Queensboro Bridge. The southernmost building in the Southtown complex has 16 stories and is located approximately 650 feet north of the project site on the north side of the Queensboro Bridge. Immediately south of the project site is South Point Park, which was completed in 2011. The park contains two structures, the Strecker Memorial Laboratory, described below, and a comfort station.

D. EXISTING CONDITIONS

PROJECT SITE AND REZONING AREA

ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The Phase 1A Archaeological Documentary Study prepared for the project site and rezoning area concluded that precontact and historic period archaeological resources within the study area were likely disturbed during the 19th and 20th centuries. The Phase 1A determined that archaeological resources could not have survived the construction of the Penitentiary and its various associated buildings, the grading and excavation completed by gangs of laboring convicts throughout the 19th and early 20th centuries, the demolition of the prison, and the subsequent construction of the existing hospital and its associated infrastructure. The locations of the major facilities associated with the Penitentiary that were located on the project site (i.e., the Penitentiary, the wash house, and the workshops) are depicted on historic maps. As shown in the Phase 1A, the daily lives of the prisoners and living and working conditions at the Penitentiary were well-documented during the 19th and early 20th centuries. Existing historic documentation and the extensive disturbance that has occurred on the project site makes it unlikely that the project site contains archaeological resources that could provide new information about the lives of the individuals residing (either voluntarily or as prisoners) on Roosevelt Island during the 19th century.

The Phase 1A determined that the project site has no sensitivity for precontact archaeological resources and low sensitivity for archaeological resources dating to the historic period. Therefore, additional archaeological analysis of the archaeological study area (i.e., Phase 1B archaeological testing) is not warranted. In a comment letter dated March 26, 2012, LPC concurred with the conclusions and recommendations of the Phase 1A study. As noted above, OPRHP determined in its June 19, 2012 findings letter that it also has no archaeological concerns for the project site (see Appendix 7, “Historic and Cultural Resources”). Therefore, as stated above, this analysis focuses on standing structures only.

ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES

The project site contains the Goldwater Hospital and the south pump station. The Goldwater Hospital complex is a known architectural resource and is described below. The south pump station is a utilitarian structure enclosed by black fencing and is not architecturally or historically significant. Therefore, it does not meet criteria for S/NR listing or NYCL designation. The portion of the rezoning area that does not include the project site is developed with a one-way circulation roadway encircling the project site (the loop road) and a concrete seawall, which forms the barrier along the East River to the east and west of the project site. No buildings are located in this portion of the rezoning area.

Goldwater Hospital

As part of Cornell’s consultation with LPC and OPRHP for the proposed project, LPC determined in a comment letter dated April 26, 2012 that the Goldwater Hospital complex appears eligible for listing on the State/National Registers of Historic Places (S/NR-eligible). In a May 31, 2012 *Resource Evaluation*, OPRHP determined that the Goldwater Hospital complex is S/NR-eligible under Criterion A “in the areas of health/medicine and science for its contributions to the scientific study and treatment of chronic diseases” and for the hospital’s research department during World War II that was “part of the U.S. government’s major research initiative into the treatment for malaria. OPRHP also found the Goldwater Hospital complex “significant under Criterion C in the area of art for its mural paintings. OPRHP also determined the hospital complex significant for its “architectural design as a progressive example of institutional architecture” (see Appendix 7, “Historic and Cultural Resources”).

The Goldwater Hospital complex was originally built as the Welfare Hospital for Chronic Diseases. The original six-building complex was designed in the Art Deco style by architect Isadore Rosenfield in association with Butler & Kohn and York & Sawyer. It was completed in 1939 under the direction of Dr. Sigismund Schulz Goldwater (1873-1942), the Commissioner of Hospitals. The site plan was developed by Rosenfield to maximize exposure to sunlight and river views, taking advantage of Roosevelt Island’s narrow width to provide the hospital complex with East River frontages on both its east and west sides. In circa 1971, a one-story modernist addition designed by architect William Lescaze—the “Activities Building,” or “Building J”—was constructed at the southern end of the hospital complex (see **Figures 7-1a through 7-8**). The hospital contains both active and vacant medical facilities, offices, a small nursing school; a kitchen; and, in the Activities Building, an auditorium, gym, two chapels, a synagogue, and a mosque.

The hospital complex has a central six-story Administration Building that has a shallow “H” plan, four four-story chevron-shaped Patient Ward buildings (two to the north and two to the south of the Administration Building), a narrow rectangular three-story Laboratory and Morgue building that establishes the hospital’s north end, and a one-story Activities Building at the hospital’s south end (see Figure 7-1a). The hospital complex is organized around a central, north-south corridor that connects the hospital’s original six buildings at the basement, first, and second floors; the corridor was extended to the south to connect to the Activities Building at the basement and first floors. The original six buildings are faced in buff-colored brick with limestone parapets; the Activities Building is a boxy modernist structure faced in brown brick and buff-colored limestone.

Repairs have been made to the brickwork in many areas of the facades of the hospital complex, particularly near the parapets and around some window and door openings. Many windows throughout the hospital complex have been altered with the addition of window air conditioning units and the installation of plexiglass in the opening surrounding most window units. Some windows have also been infilled with brick.

Each Patient Ward (Buildings A, B, C, and D) has two wings that extend at an angle from the corridor in a chevron shape (see Figures 7-1a and 7-3). The south façade of each Patient Ward has concrete balconies and curved concrete slab terraces with metal railings and wood handrails, ensuring that patients had easy access to light and fresh air from the hospital wards. The Patient Wards originally had Rigs ward configurations, not perimeter wards which were typical of hospital floor plans at the time when the Goldwater Hospital was designed. Rigs wards were arranged with open wards “divided into alcoves by 7’-0” high partitions with the beds

perpendicular to the partitions rather than to the exterior wall.”¹ Only the Patient Ward on the fourth floor of the western wing of Ward D remains in its original layout though it is no longer in use (see Figure 7-6). Most doors leading from the wards to the balconies and terraces have been infilled and are inaccessible. Some balconies have been modified by glass enclosures and metal framing creating additional interior space. The Patient Wards also include circular day rooms with large windows, also providing access to light, air, and southern views (see Figure 7-7).

According to information provided by the New York City Design Commission to LPC as part of the environmental review for the proposed project, eight murals were commissioned for the hospital as part of the Federal Art Project (FAP) of the WPA (see Appendix 7, “Historic and Cultural Resources”). The FAP employed artists during the Depression to provide artwork for non-federal public buildings. Among the murals at Goldwater were four murals painted by abstract artists—Ilya Bolotowsky (1907-1981), Albert Swinden (1901-1961), Joseph Rugolo (1911-1983), and Riccardo Dane Chanase (1894-1975). Of the eight murals, only Bolotowsky’s “Abstraction” has been conserved and is currently visible (see Figure 7-7). It is located in the day room in the east wing of Building D’s third floor.

The Activities Building contains two chapels, synagogue, and mosque, among other uses. These religious spaces are small rooms with religious iconography and stained glass in the two chapels (see Figure 7-8). The corridor wall between the chapel and synagogue entrances has colorful mosaic tiles.

STUDY AREA

KNOWN ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES

Strecker Memorial Laboratory (S/NR, NYCL)

The Strecker Memorial Laboratory is located approximately 215 feet south of the project site and 200 feet south of the rezoning area. It is a free-standing late Romanesque Revival style three-story building faced in gray ashlar stone with orange brick window surrounds and quoins. Designed by Withers & Dickson and built in 1892 as a two-story structure, a third story was added in 1905 that was designed by William Flanagan (see **View 18 of Figure 7-9**). Under the direction of City Hospital (also known as Charity Hospital and formerly located between the laboratory building and the Goldwater Hospital complex), the Strecker Memorial Laboratory was used for pathological and bacteriological work. The building has been adaptively reused and currently functions as an electrical substation for the Metropolitan Transit Authority (MTA).

Queensboro Bridge (S/NR, NYCL)

The Queensboro Bridge was designed by engineer Gustav Lindenthal and architect Henry Hornbostel. Constructed in 1901-1908, the bridge spans the East River between East 59th Street in Manhattan and 11th Street and Bridge Plaza North and South in Queens. At the time of construction, it was the largest and heaviest cantilever bridge ever constructed. The Queensboro Bridge was the first bridge to connect Manhattan and Queens, influencing development in Queens. It is 7,000 feet long and is a through-type cantilevered structure with its roadway located between the bridge’s 350-foot-tall piers and trusses, including the stone towers, metal

¹ Isadore Rosenfield and Zachary Rosenfield. *Hospital Architecture and Beyond*. New York, NY: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1969. Page 28.

framework, and finials (see **Views 19 and 20 of Figure 7-9**). The bridge's Beaux Arts-style stair towers in Manhattan and Queens are rough-faced masonry with steel spans and towers. The bridge's piers on Roosevelt Island originally had elevators providing passengers access to the bridge. The designation report for the Queensboro Bridge notes that the bridge has "an inspiring and dramatic silhouette" against the backdrop of Midtown Manhattan and the lower scale buildings in Queens.¹

Steam Plant (S/NR-eligible²)

The Steam Plant is a buff colored brick-faced building that was built in circa 1939 and is located immediately north of the Queensboro Bridge. This approximately 65-foot-tall building provides heating for the Goldwater Hospital and the Coler Memorial Hospital to the north. The Steam Plant has Art Deco design elements emphasizing verticality despite its rectangular form. The most notable components of the building are its two approximately 225-foot-tall brick chimneys. (see **Figure 7-10**).

E. FUTURE WITHOUT THE PROPOSED PROJECT

2018 ANALYSIS YEAR

PROJECT SITE AND REZONING AREA

Architectural resources that are listed on the S/NR or that have been found eligible for listing are given a measure of protection under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act from the effects of projects sponsored, assisted, or approved by federal agencies. Although preservation is not mandated, federal agencies must attempt to avoid adverse effects on such resources through a notice, review, and consultation process. Properties listed on the Registers are similarly protected against effects resulting from projects sponsored, assisted, or approved by State agencies under SHPA. However, private owners of properties eligible for, or even listed on, the Registers using private funds can alter or demolish their properties without such a review process. Privately owned properties that are NYCLs, in New York City Historic Districts, or pending designation as NYCLs are protected under the New York City Landmarks Law, which requires LPC review and approval before any alteration or demolition permits can be issued, regardless of whether the project is publicly or privately funded. Publicly owned resources are also subject to review by LPC before the start of a project. However, LPC's role in projects sponsored by other city or state agencies generally is advisory only.

The New York City Building Code provides some measures of protection for all properties against accidental damage from adjacent construction by requiring that all buildings, lots, and service facilities adjacent to foundation and earthwork areas be protected and supported. While these regulations serve to protect all structures adjacent to construction areas, they do not afford special consideration for historic structures.

It is expected that by 2018 in the future No-Action condition, the Goldwater Hospital complex will be vacant. As described in Chapter 2, "Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy," New York

¹ *Queensboro Bridge*. Landmarks Preservation Commission. April 16, 1974, Number 2. LP-0828. Page 2.

² In a comment letter dated July 19, 2012, LPC noted that OPRHP "indicated that the Steam Plant appears S/NR eligible." See Appendix 7, "Historic and Cultural Resources."

City's Health and Hospitals Corporation (NYCHHC) will vacate the hospital complex on the project site in 2013, and relocate patients and services elsewhere. Though the buildings would be vacant, general building and grounds maintenance is expected to be undertaken.

2038 ANALYSIS YEAR

PROJECT SITE, REZONING AREA, AND STUDY AREA

The project site and rezoning area are not expected to change in the No-Action condition between 2018 and 2038. In the No-Action condition, the project site is assumed to continue to contain a vacant hospital complex and vacant land, and the rezoning area is assumed to continue to include a one-way circulation roadway, promenade, and seawall, under the jurisdiction of RIOC. No notable projects are currently anticipated in the study area between 2018 and 2038. Therefore, no changes to architectural resources on the project site, rezoning area, or in the study area are expected to occur between 2018 and 2038.

F. PROBABLE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

2018 ANALYSIS YEAR (PHASE 1)

PROJECT SITE AND REZONING AREA

Phase 1 would demolish the vacant Goldwater Hospital complex, and the northern portion of the project site would be redeveloped with four new buildings, new publicly accessible open space, and photovoltaic (PV) panels, and below grade parking. Interim facilities may also be constructed on the southern portion of the project site that may include a tree nursery and other vegetated surfaces (such as a meadow).

The demolition of the Goldwater Hospital complex would constitute a significant adverse impact on this architectural resource. To evaluate the feasibility of retaining the Goldwater Hospital complex to avoid a significant adverse impact to this architectural resource, a study has been prepared—an alternatives analysis—in consultation with OPRHP (see Appendix 7, “Historic and Cultural Resources”). The study considered three alternatives for the Goldwater Hospital campus site to meet Cornell's programmatic and academic needs while also fulfilling the city's objectives and directives for the project. Throughout the planning process, the overall objective of the project has been to meet the city's expressed goal of developing an engineering and applied sciences campus in New York City with a minimum of 1.8 million total gsf, including a minimum of 620,000 gsf for academic space. The three redevelopment alternatives that were developed and analyzed are: 1) maintaining the current site configuration and retaining the Goldwater Hospital structures to avoid adverse impacts to this architectural resource; 2) expanding the existing Goldwater Hospital buildings to meet programmatic and square footage requirements; and 3) demolishing the Goldwater Hospital complex in its entirety, which would result in a significant adverse impact to this architectural resource.

As detailed in the alternatives analysis, the hospital buildings, containing a total of 647,900 gsf, do not contain sufficient square footage to meet the city's development requirements for an applied science and engineering campus of a minimum of 1.8 million gsf of total building space, of which a minimum of 620,000 gsf must be academic use and the campus must have no fewer than 286 faculty and 1,800 students, as stipulated under an agreement between the City of New York and New York City Economic Development Corporation (NYCEDC). The existing

hospital complex does not meet the requirements for academic and corporate co-location facilities due to the small and irregularly-shaped floor plates of most of the buildings and configurations including incompatible floor-to-floor heights and restrictive column spacing. Further, alternatives that were considered to expand or enlarge the hospital buildings to allow them to meet the spatial needs of the proposed project do not meet the program requirements (which call for large and flexible floor plates with generally wide column spacing) and would substantially alter and destroy elements of the building complex that convey its historic significance and compromise the integrity of the Goldwater Hospital complex, adversely impacting this architectural resource. While the demolition alternative would remove the Goldwater Hospital complex from the project site, it is the only alternative that would meet the purpose and need of the Cornell NYC Tech project.

The alternatives analysis concluded that it is not feasible to retain and reuse all or portions of the Goldwater Hospital complex as part of the Cornell NYC Tech project. In a letter dated September 19, 2012 commenting on the alternatives analysis, OPRHP concluded that “there are no prudent and feasible alternatives at this time to demolition of these historic buildings.” LPC concurred with OPRHP’s comments in a letter dated September 25, 2012. Therefore, because it is not possible to meet the goals and objectives of the project while avoiding adverse impacts to the Goldwater Hospital complex, Cornell ~~is~~ has consulting consulted with OPRHP and LPC regarding appropriate measures to partially mitigate the significant adverse impact on this architectural resource. These measures, ~~which would include preservation of the WPA murals to the extent practicable, are being developed and will be implemented by Cornell in consultation with OPRHP and LPC, as set forth in a Letter of Resolution (LOR) to be signed by among Cornell, OPRHP, LPC, and the Roosevelt Island Operating Corporation (RIOC). These measures are described in Chapter 22, “Mitigation.”~~

As described in Chapter 1, “Project Description,” the proposed special district would provide for flexibility in architectural design within limits established to ensure adequate access of light and air to the street and surrounding waterfront open areas, and thus to encourage more attractive and innovative building forms. At this time, design of the project site buildings is ongoing, and thus the figures presented in this chapter are reflective of the design under consideration during preparation of the ~~DFEIS~~. The buildings as currently envisioned include a ~~5~~ 4-story academic building rising to a height of approximately ~~70~~ 60 feet, 69 feet including the building canopy (rather than the ~~eight~~ 8-story potential height described below), a 5-story corporate co-location building rising to a height of approximately ~~80~~ 74 feet (rather than the ~~eight~~ 8-story potential height described below), and a 1-story utility plant (rather than the 40-foot tall structure described below). Therefore, as currently envisioned, the four new buildings to be developed on the northern portion of the project site by 2018 are anticipated to consist of the following: an academic building anticipated to be up to 8 stories in height; a residential building of up to ~~30~~ 31 stories in height (approximately 320 feet); an Executive Education Center building of up to 17 stories; and a corporate co-location building of up to 8 stories. The residential and Executive Education Center buildings would be substantially taller than the vacant hospital complex’s tallest structure, the Administration Building, which is approximately 100 feet tall. Like the site plan of the existing Goldwater Hospital complex, the proposed site plan has been designed to locate buildings and amenities on the project site at an angle that would maximize access to air, sunlight, and views. Public open space would also be incorporated into the project site, with open spaces located throughout the project site, with 1.3 acres created by 2018. In addition, a one- ~~to two~~-story central utility plant would be located in the northern portion of the project site.

By 2018, as part of Cornell's goal to achieve net-zero energy consumption for its Phase 1 academic building, an array of PV panels may be constructed above the roof of the academic building. The PV panels may also extend over a portion of the central spine (creating a canopy), and possibly continue over the roof of the corporate co-location building (see Figure 1-6).

Development on the southern portion of the project site by 2018 may involve the construction of interim facilities that would also contribute to the sustainability goals of the proposed project. These interim facilities may include a tree nursery and other vegetated surfaces (such as a planted meadow). These interim uses would be low in scale.

The proposed project would also involve the widening of the existing roadway in the rezoning area with temporary construction to provide a functional 32-foot-wide travelway around the project site. The portion of the roadway adjacent to the Phase 1 development would be built to final conditions as the Phase 1 buildings are completed. These project elements would not adversely affect any architectural resources.

STUDY AREA

With the proposed project, no architectural resources in the study area would be destroyed, demolished, damaged, altered, or neglected. The proposed project would not replicate aspects of these architectural resources to create a false historical appearance. Further, because no architectural resources are located within 90 feet of the project site, the proposed project would not be expected to result in inadvertent construction-related impacts to any architectural resources in the study area. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any significant direct adverse impacts to any of the three architectural resources in the study area.

The proposed project's potential to result in indirect, or contextual, impacts, was also evaluated. As described in "Methodology," indirect impacts could result from blocking significant public views of a resource; isolating a resource from its setting or relationship to the streetscape; altering the setting of a resource; introducing incompatible visual, audible, or atmospheric elements to a resource's setting; or introducing shadows over a historic landscape or an architectural resource with sun-sensitive features that contribute to that resource's significance, such as a church with notable stained glass windows.

Strecker Memorial Laboratory

Phase 1 of the proposed project would not be expected to adversely impact the Strecker Memorial Laboratory. While the setting of this small structure would change with the removal of the Goldwater Hospital complex and the redevelopment of the northern portion of the project site with four new buildings ranging in height from up to 8 ~~4~~ to 30 ~~31~~ stories, a central utility plant, and the addition of possible interim facilities on the southern portion of the project site, the setting of the Strecker Memorial Laboratory has already been altered with the removal of the City Hospital in 1994, which was historically located between the Strecker Memorial Laboratory and the project site. Further, the current development of South Point Park has also changed the context surrounding this small building.

The new buildings to be constructed on the project site by 2018 would be located approximately 1,800 feet northwest of the laboratory building and would add to the variety of already existing taller structures on Roosevelt Island north of the Strecker Memorial Laboratory, including the existing 16-story Southtown residential buildings and the taller 21-, 25-, and 29-story Southtown buildings to be completed. The Strecker Memorial Laboratory would not be isolated by the proposed development and would continue to be located within an open setting. Because of the

building's small scale, publicly accessible views of this resource, which are limited to areas near this building, would remain available from existing vantage points. As described in Chapter 6, "Shadows," the proposed project would not introduce significant new shadows, nor would it significantly lengthen the duration of existing shadows on this architectural resource. Further, this building does not have sun sensitive features.

Queensboro Bridge

The Queensboro Bridge would continue to be a highly visible architectural resource extending east-west through the study area north of the project site. While the proposed four new buildings that would be developed on the project site by 2018 would alter the bridge's setting, the bridge's components—including its two approximately 350-foot-tall piers and trusses ~~stone towers~~, the span that extends above the Island, and the spans extending above the East River—would continue to be visible from many areas. In addition, the bridge's silhouette would continue to be viewed against the Manhattan and Queens skylines, among taller and shorter buildings.

Further, the new buildings would not be incompatible with the bridge's setting which includes several tall buildings immediately to the north. Since the Queensboro Bridge's construction in 1909, the bridge's setting has undergone several different building campaigns, including demolition of the Penitentiary on the project site and its redevelopment in 1937-1939 with the Goldwater Hospital complex, the construction of the Tramway and station in 1976, and more recently, the 2004-2007 construction of four 16-story buildings in Southtown, with the southernmost building located approximately 95 feet north of the bridge and 185 feet north of the project site. Therefore, the proposed buildings would not introduce an incompatible visual element to the bridge's setting, nor would the bridge be isolated from its setting.

Because of the bridge's scale, the locations of its two Roosevelt Island piers, and the bridge's spans that continue east and west beyond Roosevelt Island, the bridge's visual prominence in the study area would not be significantly adversely affected. Characteristics for which the bridge qualifies for its S/NR-listed/Landmarked status would not be altered. While the four new buildings would introduce new shadows to the study area, the Queensboro Bridge does not have sun-sensitive features that contribute to its significance. Therefore, the components of the proposed project to be developed by 2018 would not result in a significant adverse impact on the Queensboro Bridge. Longer views to the bridge are described below in "Views from Manhattan and Queens."

Steam Plant

The Steam Plant is located just within the northern portion of the study area but is separated from the project site by intervening buildings and the Queensboro Bridge. These structures limit any visual relationship between the project site and this resource. As such, development by 2018 would not adversely impact the Steam Plant's setting or isolate this resource from its setting. Views to the Steam Plant would continue to be available from vantage points to the north, limited locations on Roosevelt Island from the south close to this resource, and waterfront areas in Queens, including Queensbridge Park and Gantry State Park. Therefore, the proposed project would not adversely affect the Steam Plant.

VIEWS FROM MANHATTAN AND QUEENS

By 2018 longer publicly accessible views to the three study area architectural resources would change from vantage points in Manhattan and Queens as the existing lower-rise Goldwater

Hospital complex would be replaced with four new buildings on the northern portion of the project site, including two lower height buildings of up to ~~8~~ 5 stories and two taller buildings with up to ~~17~~ 13 and ~~23~~ 31 stories.

Strecker Memorial Laboratory

Although the setting of the Strecker Memorial Laboratory would change with the proposed four new buildings, views to this small structure from Manhattan and Queens would continue to be obscured by distance. The four proposed buildings to be completed by 2018 would not obstruct views of the Strecker Memorial Laboratory.

Queensboro Bridge

The proposed development on the project site by 2018 would change views to the Queensboro Bridge from Manhattan and Queens. Publicly accessible views to this architectural resource from Manhattan north of the bridge would continue to include tall buildings located in close proximity to the bridge, including already existing tall buildings north of the bridge, and the four new buildings that would be constructed south of the bridge with the proposed project, including the two taller buildings of up to approximately ~~17~~ 13 and ~~23~~ 31 stories (see Figure 7-1b and “Urban Design and Visual Resources” Figure 8-36). Longer views of the bridge from Sutton Place and the East River Esplanade in Manhattan would also include the new buildings, with some elements of the bridge being partially screened or obscured by the new taller buildings. However, with the proposed project, views of the bridge’s western span across the East River, its two piers on Roosevelt Island, and the bridge’s eastern pier in Queens would continue to be available from Manhattan (see Figure 7-1b and “Urban Design and Visual Resources” Figure 8-35).

Longer views of the bridge from Queens would also be modified by 2018. Views from Queensbridge Park would include partial views of the two new taller buildings in the background with the bridge continuing to be the prominent structure visible in the foreground. As shown in Figure 8-37, as currently envisioned, the two new shorter buildings would be screened from view by foliage, the intervening new taller buildings, and the bridge’s eastern Roosevelt Island pier. If the academic building and corporate co-location buildings were to be taller (i.e., up to 8 stories), portions of these buildings would also be screened from view by intervening structures as described above. Therefore, the proposed project would not adversely affect the visual prominence of the Queensboro Bridge from Queensbridge Park (see Figure 7-1b and “Urban Design and Visual Resources” Figure 8-37). The bridge would continue to be visible from Gantry State Park in Queens. The new buildings would obscure views to some portions of the Queensboro Bridge as it crosses over Roosevelt Island to Manhattan, however most of the bridge’s deck and structural system would remain unobscured. Further, the most proximate views of the bridge structure as it crosses the East River from Queens to Roosevelt Island would remain prominently visible (see Figure 7-1b and “Urban Design and Visual Resources” Figure 8-38). Therefore, while certain views of the bridge from Gantry State Park would be adversely affected, the loss of these views to portions of the bridge would not constitute a significant adverse impact.

Views from South Point Park on Roosevelt Island to the Queensboro Bridge as it crosses over Roosevelt Island would be partially obscured with the four new buildings by 2018. However, these views are already partially screened by the existing Goldwater Hospital buildings (see Figure 7-1b and “Urban Design and Visual Resources” Figure 8-34). Therefore, these changes would not be considered adverse.

Overall, the addition of four new buildings on the northern portion of the project site by 2018 would, in some views, obscure some components of the bridge structure. However, in no cases would the entire bridge structure be fully blocked from view, and many prominent views of the bridge would remain. Therefore, the proposed development on the project site in 2018 would not result in any significant adverse impacts to architectural resources in the study area.

Steam Plant

By 2018, views to the Steam Plant from Manhattan would continue to be obscured by both distance and intervening buildings, including existing buildings north and west of the Steam Plant. Views from Queens to this architectural resource by 2018 would remain available from Queensbridge Park. The visibility of the Steam Plant from Gantry State Park is already extremely limited as views are largely screened by the Queensboro Bridge. The proposed new buildings would not block existing views to the Steam Plant from these vantage points in Queens (see Figure 7-1b and “Urban Design and Visual Resources” Figures 8-37 and 8-38). The Steam Plant would continue to be located within the context of the Queensboro Bridge and tall, newer buildings. Therefore, the proposed project would not adversely affect this architectural resource.

2038 ANALYSIS YEAR (FULL BUILD)

PROJECT SITE AND REZONING AREA

By 2038 the full build out of the proposed project would be complete. As described above, the demolition of the Goldwater Hospital complex for Phase 1 would result in significant adverse impacts on that one architectural resource. By 2038 in the future with the proposed project, the southern portion of the project site would be developed with ~~six~~ five new buildings, new landscaping, publicly accessible open space, roadway improvements, and a second central utility plant. At full build, the entire project site would contain ~~40~~ nine new buildings with academic, corporate co-location, residential, and Executive Education Center uses. As described above, the specific design of the project site buildings is ongoing, and thus the figures presented in this chapter are reflective of the design under consideration during preparation of the ~~D~~FEIS. At this time, the specific designs shown in the figures for the full build reflect academic buildings of up to ~~8~~ 4 to 7 ~~and 10~~ stories rather than the 12-story potential height; corporate co-location buildings of ~~8~~ 5 to 7 ~~and 6~~ stories, rather than the 10-story potential height; and the ~~13 to 31~~ 22- ~~and 27~~-story residential buildings. The additional ~~six~~ five buildings developed in Phase 2 are anticipated to range in height from approximately ~~4-5~~ to 27 stories (approximately ~~59~~ 74 to 280 feet tall). The new buildings to be developed on the project site by 2038 would be substantially taller than the vacant hospital complex that would occupy the site in the No-Action condition. The new buildings would contribute to a unified campus. The proposed project would be a pedestrian-oriented campus centered around a north-south walkway that would extend through the project site. By 2038 the project would include a minimum of 2.5 acres of publicly accessible open space that would form a network of open spaces among the proposed ~~40~~ 9 buildings. In addition, with the full build out of the proposed project, the reconstruction of the existing roadway with a new bicycle path, sidewalk, and new plantings would be complete in the rezoning area (see “Urban Design and Visual Resources” Figure 8-40).

STUDY AREA

Although the full build out of the proposed project would result in a new academic campus with ~~40~~ nine buildings, most of which would be substantially taller than the existing Goldwater

Hospital buildings, the varied heights of the proposed buildings would be similar to the range of building heights of existing nearby buildings on Roosevelt Island north of the project site.

As with the Phase 1 development, with the full build out of the proposed project the three architectural resources in the study area would continue to be located in an area characterized by structures of different scales, architectural styles, and from different construction periods on Roosevelt Island. With the full build out of the proposed project, no architectural resources in the study area would be destroyed, demolished, damaged, altered, or neglected. The proposed project would not replicate aspects of these architectural resources to create a false historical appearance. As described in 2018 analysis year, there are no architectural resources within 90 feet of construction activities. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any direct impacts to any of the three architectural resources in the study area.

The proposed project's potential to result in indirect impacts has also been evaluated and is discussed below.

Strecker Memorial Laboratory

The setting of the Strecker Memorial Laboratory with the full build out of the proposed project would be further changed, as the additional ~~six~~ five buildings on the project site would be located closer to the Strecker Memorial Laboratory but would still be approximately 215 feet from this architectural resource. The redevelopment of the project site would not be expected to adversely affect the Strecker Memorial Laboratory as the context of this architectural resource, particularly in the area between the laboratory building and the southern portion of the project site, has previously been altered with the demolition of City Hospital in 1994 and the construction of South Point Park. Therefore, the full build out of the proposed project would not adversely affect this architectural resource.

Queensboro Bridge

The full build out of the project site would not directly affect the Queensboro Bridge. Although the setting of the Queensboro Bridge would be further altered with the development of ~~six~~ five additional new buildings and landscaping on the project site, the bridge would remain a highly visible architectural resource in the study area. Although some views to the bridge from South Point Park on Roosevelt Island would be obscured with the full build out of the project, these views are already limited and partially obscured by the Goldwater Hospital complex buildings. Views from the park would remain available from the eastern and western edges of the study area south of the project site.

The bridge's most prominent components would continue to be visible from many locations in the study area and the bridge's silhouette would continue to be viewed among taller and shorter buildings in Manhattan and Queens, in addition to the tall buildings located in the study area on Roosevelt Island to the north. Further, the ~~six~~ five buildings to be developed on the southern portion of the project site would be located away from the bridge. The proposed buildings, similar to Phase 1, would not introduce an incompatible visual element to the bridge's setting, nor would the bridge be isolated from its setting. Due to the scale and breadth of the bridge, including the spans that continue east and west beyond Roosevelt Island, the bridge's visual prominence in the study area would not be significantly adversely affected by the full build out of the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a significant adverse impact on the Queensboro Bridge.

Steam Plant

The full build out of the project site would not significantly adversely impact the Steam Plant as it is already largely screened from view from the south by the intervening Queensboro Bridge. The project would not isolate the Steam Plant or alter its setting or visual relationship with the streetscape. Nor would it introduce elements that would be incompatible with the Steam Plant's setting. The full build out of the project site would not adversely affect the Steam Plant.

VIEWS FROM MANHATTAN AND QUEENS

With the full build out of the proposed project, certain views to the three architectural resources in the study area would be altered.

Strecker Memorial Laboratory

Views from Manhattan to the Strecker Memorial Laboratory would continue to be extremely limited due to the building's small scale and the screening effect of distance. While the Strecker Memorial Laboratory's setting would be somewhat changed with the proposed project in longer views from Queens, as with views from Manhattan, this small building would remain largely screened from view by distance. The full build out of the project site would not obstruct any longer views to this architectural resource.

Queensboro Bridge

While the proposed project would add ~~40~~ nine new structures to the project site, view to the Queensboro Bridge from Manhattan from the north would not be obstructed by the full build out of the proposed project (see Figure 7-1b and "Urban Design and Visual Resources" Figure 8-45). Views to the Queensboro Bridge from points in Manhattan south of the bridge would continue to include the western span over the East River and portions of the bridge spanning Roosevelt Island and limited views of the eastern span over the East River (see Figure 7-1b and "Urban Design and Visual Resources" Figure 8-46). The central portion of the bridge would be obscured in some views but would remain visible in other views. The bridge's setting would change with the full build out, however, this architectural resource would continue to be visible from many areas.

Views to the Queensboro Bridge from Queensbridge Park would not be adversely affected with the addition of new, taller buildings in the background since the new buildings would become part of the mix of buildings in Manhattan already visible from this park (see Figure 7-1b and "Urban Design and Visual Resources" Figure 8-44). The central span of the bridge and the western expanse over the East River would be screened from view from certain vantage points in Gantry State Park. However, in no cases would views of the bridge be fully obstructed and many prominent views to the bridge would remain (see Figure 7-1b and "Urban Design and Visual Resources" Figure 8-43). The bridge's silhouette would continue to be viewed within the context of Midtown Manhattan's tall buildings and the lower height buildings in Queens. While certain views from Gantry State Park would be adversely affected, the loss of these views to portions of the bridge would not constitute a significant adverse impact. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse impacts to the Queensboro Bridge.

Steam Plant

Views from Manhattan to the Steam Plant would continue to be extremely limited by the screening effect of distance, the building's smaller scale, and the building's proximity to the Queensboro Bridge. The setting of the Steam Plant in views from Queensbridge Park would

include the project site buildings in the background. Views from Gantry State Park would include the new taller buildings in the foreground, but views would not be obstructed (see Figure 7-1b and “Urban Design and Visual Resources” Figures 8-43 and 8-44). Therefore, views to the Steam Plant would not be adversely affected.

G. CONCLUSIONS

The demolition of the Goldwater Hospital complex would result in a significant adverse impact on this architectural resource. Pursuant to Section 14.09 of SHPA, a study has been prepared in consultation with OPRHP to evaluate the feasibility of retaining elements of the Goldwater Hospital complex to avoid a significant adverse impact to this architectural resource (see the Alternatives Analysis provided in Appendix 7, “Historic and Cultural Resources”). As described above, only the alternative that maintains the Goldwater Hospital complex in its entirety would avoid a significant adverse impact to this architectural resource. However, this alternative would not fulfill the city’s requirement for developing an engineering and applied sciences campus containing 620,000 gsf of academic space, nor would it allow for the overall development of the city’s minimum requirement of 1.8 million gsf of space for the campus. In addition, the hospital’s existing 647,900 gsf is contained in buildings that, in general, do not meet the requirements for academic and corporate co-location buildings. Similarly, the expansion alternative would meet certain square footage and programming needs, however, the type of space that could be developed would not provide the spatial configuration needed for dynamic interdisciplinary application hubs for academic or corporate co-location uses, which are central to the project’s purpose and need. In consideration of Cornell’s purpose and need for the proposed project, it is not possible to retain and reuse the Goldwater Hospital complex as part of the proposed project. Therefore, there is no prudent and feasible alternative to avoid a significant adverse impact to the Goldwater Hospital complex.

Measures to ~~minimize or partially mitigate~~ the significant adverse impact to the Goldwater Hospital complex ~~are being developed and will~~ will be implemented by Cornell in consultation with OPRHP and LPC. ~~These measures, which would include preservation of the WPA murals to the extent practicable, would be as set forth in an LOR to be signed by the applicant among Cornell, OPRHP, LPC, and RIOC. The proposed project would not result in any significant adverse impacts to architectural resources in the study area. These measures are described in Chapter 22, “Mitigation.”~~

As described above, the specific design of the project site buildings is ongoing, and thus the figures presented in this chapter are reflective of the design under consideration during preparation of the ~~D~~FEIS, rather than the maximum envelope allowable under zoning. Overall, the addition of new shorter and taller buildings and landscaping elements on the project site would alter the settings of the three architectural resources in the study area. However, the Strecker Memorial Laboratory and the Steam Plant would continue to be located in the context of taller buildings and views to these architectural resources would not be obstructed by the proposed project. While the setting and views to the Queensboro Bridge would change with the full build out of the project site, in no cases would views of the bridge be fully obstructed. Further, many prominent views to the bridge would remain available. These changes to the settings and views of the study area’s architectural resources would not adversely affect the characteristics for which the historic properties meet or may meet S/NR and NYCL criteria. While the specific form and height of the academic and corporate co-location buildings could be somewhat different and taller than illustrated, the conclusions of this historic and cultural

resources analysis would remain the same. Therefore, the project would not result in significant adverse impacts on study area architectural resources. *