

A. INTRODUCTION

As described in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) prepared for the East Side Access Project, dated March 2001, construction activities will require relocation of some utilities. All necessary agreements will be executed with each utility company or governmental agency regarding the temporary or permanent relocation of any utilities. Utility service will be maintained during construction.

B. ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)**UTILITY CONNECTIONS**

As described in Chapter 2, "Project Alternatives," Alternative A, the no action alternative, would have required relocation of utilities and Consolidated Edison underground vaults to permit installation of intake and exhaust ventilation grates along 49th and 50th Streets between Park and Madison Avenues. The excavation required for construction of these ventilation structures would include sidewalks and the full width of the streetbed along both 49th and 50th Streets between Madison and Park Avenues. Extensive relocation of utilities and Consolidated Edison underground vaults (containing electrical transformers serving adjacent buildings) would be required as part of this excavation. Utilities that would be affected include three water lines, six gas lines, two fire hydrants, three street lights, two catch basins, and an electrical manhole. As in all other locations where East Side Access Project construction would occur, utility service would be maintained during construction.

DEMAND

Demand for additional sewer service for Alternative A would be negligible. Based on projected operating conditions, demand for additional water service would be approximately 200,000 gallons per day to make up for normal evaporative cooling tower losses.

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

Alternative B would require relocation of utilities within the portion of 50th Street to be excavated, which is approximately 125 feet long and extends from the western edge of the project site toward the east to the existing exterior wall (bulkhead) of the Grand Central Terminal trainshed below. The wall of the existing terminal is located just east of the loading dock entrance for the Colgate-Palmolive Building at 300 Park Avenue. Along the 125-foot-long

50th Street Facility Revised Supplemental Environmental Assessment

excavation area, the entire width of the 50th Street streetbed would be excavated. No excavation of the sidewalks would be required.

Based on the information provided above, the relocation of utilities required for Alternative B would be less extensive than for Alternative A, because it would involve a much shorter length of excavated streetbed, and would not involve relocation of Consolidated Edison vaults.

DEMAND

The additional water demand for Alternative B would be the same as for Alternative A, approximately 200,000 gallons per day to make up for normal evaporative cooling tower losses. This level of water demand is well below the threshold of 1,000,000 gallons per day specified in the New York City *CEQR Technical Manual* as requiring detailed analysis to assess potential effects on water pressure and supply. As such, the additional demand would be accommodated without difficulty by the municipal water supply system.

As with Alternative A, demand for additional sewer service for Alternative B would be negligible.

Based on the information presented above, Alternative B would not result in any significant adverse impacts to utilities.

ALTERNATIVE C (50TH STREET FACILITY WITH THROUGH DRIVE)

The effects of this alternative on utility connections and relocations, as well as sewer and water demand, would be the same as those described above for Alternative B. Accordingly, Alternative C would not result in any significant adverse impacts to utilities.

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

The effects of Preferred Alternative D on utility connections and relocations, as well as sewer and water demand, would be the same as those described above for Alternatives B and C. Accordingly, Preferred Alternative D would not result in any significant adverse impacts to utilities.

CONCLUSIONS

Alternative B, C, and Preferred Alternative D would require a much less extensive relocation of utilities than Alternative A. The length of street to be excavated would be much shorter, with only 125 feet along 50th Street to be excavated. The build alternatives would not result in significant adverse impacts on utilities.

*