

A. INTRODUCTION

The Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) prepared for the East Side Access Project, dated March 2001, concluded it will have beneficial energy impacts, reducing the total annual energy consumption for ground transportation in New York State. This reduction in energy consumption will result from the improved transit service introduced by the East Side Access Project and the corresponding reduction of vehicular trips in the Long Island transportation corridor, which consists of Nassau and Suffolk Counties, Brooklyn, Queens, and Manhattan.

B. ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)

The beneficial energy impacts of Alternative A, the no action alternative, would be those of the East Side Access Project as a whole, as described in the FEIS.

C. PROBABLE IMPACTS OF BUILD ALTERNATIVES**ALTERNATIVE B (50TH STREET FACILITY WITHOUT THROUGH DRIVE)**

Alternative B, which would relocate certain decentralized components of the East Side Access Project into a centralized 50th Street facility, would not change the regional and statewide beneficial energy impacts described in the FEIS. Accordingly, this alternative would not result in any significant adverse energy impacts.

ALTERNATIVE C (50TH STREET FACILITY WITH THROUGH DRIVE)

The additional energy benefits described above would also apply to Alternative C. As described in Chapter 7, "Traffic and Transportation," this alternative would relocate the loading dock entrance to East 49th Street and make the East 50th Street side of the loading dock an exit only. The resulting elimination of backing-in movements on East 50th Street would provide some benefits to traffic flow, and therefore an additional positive, although very minor, effect on fuel consumption. Based on the information presented above, the Alternative C would not result in any significant adverse energy impacts.

PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE D (50TH STREET FACILITY WITH THROUGH DRIVE AND PUBLIC OPEN SPACE)

The additional energy benefits described above for Alternative C would also apply to Preferred Alternative D. No significant adverse energy impacts would result.

CONCLUSIONS

Neither Alternative B, C, nor Preferred Alternative D would change the regional and statewide beneficial energy impacts of the East Side Access Project as analyzed in the FEIS (Alternative A). None of the alternatives would result in any significant adverse energy impacts.

*