

## **12.1 INTRODUCTION**

This chapter of the Environmental Assessment (EA) presents MTA New York City Transit's recommendation for the Preferred Alternative for station entrances at the north end of the 72nd Street and 86th Street Stations. The chapter provides the basis for that recommendation, comparing the benefits and disadvantages of the three Build entrance alternatives evaluated for each station in this EA and describing the reasons for recommendation of the Preferred Alternative.

## **12.2 72ND STREET STATION ENTRANCE ALTERNATIVES**

After careful consideration of the goals and objectives identified in Chapter 1, "Purpose and Need" of this EA as well as the engineering, construction, operational, and environmental benefits and disadvantages of the three Build entrance alternatives for the 72nd Street Station, MTA New York City Transit has identified Alternative 1 (Elevators at the Southeast Corner at 300 East 72nd Street) as the Preferred Alternative. Alternative 1 would provide five elevators within a new building at 300 East 72nd Street, at the southeast corner of Second Avenue and 72nd Street.

As described in Chapter 2, "Entrance Alternatives," of this EA, the No Action Alternative for the 72nd Street Station included an entrance (with stairs leading to escalators) in the existing building at 305 East 72nd Street at the northeast corner of Second Avenue and 72nd Street and two elevators in a widened sidewalk on the south side of East 72nd Street east of Second Avenue that would provide access to the station in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). However, as described in Chapter 1, "Purpose and Need," both entrances in the No Action alternative present substantial difficulties and therefore an alternative design must be identified. To provide the required ADA access to the station, all Build entrance alternatives would require acquisition and demolition of the existing building at 300 East 72nd Street and construction of a new elevator entrance building there. Unlike Alternative 1, Alternatives 3 and 4 would also provide escalator entrances in the sidewalk at the intersection. The No Action Alternative and the three Build alternatives for the 72nd Street Station would not affect the planned entrance/ancillary building at the northwest corner of Second Avenue and 72nd Street.

### **12.2.1 COMPARISON OF CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS OF THE 72ND STREET STATION ENTRANCE ALTERNATIVES**

Like the No Action Alternative, all three 72nd Street Build entrance alternatives would result in heavy construction and related disruption (traffic disruptions, noise, dust, etc.) at the intersection of Second Avenue and 72nd Street, similar to what was described in the FEIS. The three Build alternatives would eliminate the need for relocation of a major steam main that runs beneath 72nd Street, which would be required for the No Action Alternative. Overall, none of the 72nd Street Build entrance alternatives would result in significant changes to the conclusions of the

**Supplemental EA to the Second Avenue Subway FEIS:  
72nd Street and 86th Street Station Entrance Alternatives**

---

FEIS or result in new significant adverse impacts during construction. Construction of the station entrance for all three of the 72nd Street Build alternatives would involve construction within and adjacent to the building lot at 300 East 72nd Street, but Alternatives 3 and 4 (like the No Action Alternative) would also require cut-and-cover construction across East 72nd Street and within its north sidewalk, while Alternative 1 would eliminate the need for that cut-and-cover construction. As a result, construction of Alternative 1 would be less disruptive than Alternatives 3 and 4, would require less utility relocation and associated temporary rerouting of pedestrian and vehicular traffic, and require removal of less spoils using fewer truck trips. Since Alternative 1 would require less cut-and-cover construction affecting a smaller area than Alternatives 3 and 4, it would also produce less construction noise.

**12.2.2 COMPARISON OF PERMANENT IMPACTS OF THE 72ND STREET  
STATION ENTRANCE ALTERNATIVES**

All Build alternatives, like the No Action Alternative, would bring new subway structures to several corners of the intersection of Second Avenue and 72nd Street, including the new entrance/ancillary building planned at the northwest corner of that intersection. Alternatives 1, 3, and 4 would result in a new subway entrance building at 300 East 72nd Street. Alternatives 3 and 4 would also include new escalator entrances within a widened sidewalk on the north side of 72nd Street east of Second Avenue and, for Alternative 4, the east side of Second Avenue north of 72nd Street. The area surrounding location of the station entrances in any of the alternatives characterized by a variety of building types, heights, and architectural styles, and none of the Build alternatives would be incongruous with that visual character. For all three Build alternatives, the addition of subway station entrances on a wide crosstown street with a bus route and large apartment buildings would not result in conflicts with land use or neighborhood character.

All three Build alternatives would avoid the need to displace a portion of the CVS in 305 East 72nd Street, and would instead involve the demolition of the building at 300 East 72nd Street and the permanent displacement of one business and three residential units.

Alternative 1 would not require sidewalk bump-outs, since the entrance would be entirely within the lot line of 300 East 72nd Street, and therefore would not remove curbside parking. Alternatives 3 and 4 would require a bump-out into curbside parking lanes and would permanently remove curbside parking spaces. However, none of the alternatives would result in significant adverse impacts on traffic and parking.

Alternative 1 would increase pedestrian volumes on the southeast corner of 72nd Street and Second Avenue in comparison to existing conditions or the No Action Alternative, but it would not significantly impact the level of service of sidewalks, corners, or crosswalks. Alternatives 3 and 4 would result in increased pedestrian volumes on the northeast corner and north sidewalk similar to those predicted for the No Action Alternative; however, like Alternative 1, they also would not result in significant adverse impacts on pedestrian levels of service.

Ridership projections for the 72nd Street Station indicate that 40 percent of the passengers who will use the north end of the station will come from/go to the northeast of the intersection of Second Avenue and 72nd Street, and 14 percent will come from/go to the southeast of the intersection. Therefore, in terms of street-level access, Alternatives 3 and 4, which would provide entrances on the northeast corner of the intersection, as well as the southeast and northwest corners, would be most convenient for the substantial ridership coming from or going to the northeast. Alternative 1 would have fewer entrances (at the southeast and northwest

corners, but not the northeast) and therefore would be less convenient than the other alternatives. However, since it would still provide a new entrance on the east side of Second Avenue, Alternative 1 would still be convenient for most riders. Since Alternative 1 would still provide two entrances at opposite corners (one on the northwest corner and the other on the southeast), passengers would continue to have entrance options on both sides of the street; as a result, passengers going from/to the northeast would have to cross either 72nd Street or Second Avenue, but they would not have to wait for a walk signal at the intersection.

In subway stations, straight passages with clear sightlines from areas where people congregate and/or areas where station personnel are present are preferred by passengers. In terms of passenger convenience within the station, Alternatives 1 and 3 would provide good access, with straight passages and good sightlines. In contrast, Alternative 4 would be least convenient in terms of subway access in the station, since it would require passengers to use a circuitous route with a number of switchbacks, intermediate landings, and turns that would limit visibility.

### **12.2.3 RECOMMENDATION OF THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE FOR THE 72ND STREET STATION ENTRANCES**

Construction of Alternative 1 would be less disruptive to the community than Alternatives 3 and 4, because it would involve construction in a less extensive area. While all Build entrance alternatives for the 72nd Street Station would involve construction activity for a new elevator building on the site of 300 East 72nd Street (including demolition of the existing building and construction of a new subway entrance building at that location), Alternatives 3 and 4 would also involve construction of new escalator entrances at sidewalk locations on the north side of 72nd Street, as well as construction of an escalator bank beneath 72nd Street. Therefore, Alternative 1 would require less construction activity and would disturb a smaller area than Alternative 3 or 4.

In addition, although Alternative 1 would be marginally less convenient at street level for passengers than Alternatives 3 and 4, it would remain convenient. This is because it would provide two different entrance options, so that the majority of passengers (those arriving from or traveling to the northeast of the intersection) would not have to wait long for a walk signal at that intersection. Within the station, Alternative 1, like Alternative 3, would be more convenient than Alternative 4.

None of the alternatives for the 72nd Street Station entrance would result in significant adverse impacts not already presented in the FEIS, and all of the alternatives would provide adequate access and egress. All of the Build Alternatives would require acquisition of the building at 300 East 72nd Street. Whereas Alternative 1 would maximize the use of the footprint of 300 East 72nd Street for the new entrance, Alternatives 3 and 4 would use the property at 300 East 72nd Street and also require additional construction within the north sidewalk of and below 72nd Street. The property acquisition costs of the Build Alternatives would be the same, but since Alternatives 3 and 4 require more cut-and-cover construction and utility relocation, they would be more costly overall. Therefore, Alternative 1 would best meet the purpose and need for the design modifications and more of the goals and objectives (see **Table 12-1**). For these reasons, MTA New York City Transit is recommending Alternative 1 as the Preferred Alternative for the 72nd Street entrance design modification.

**Supplemental EA to the Second Avenue Subway FEIS:  
72nd Street and 86th Street Station Entrance Alternatives**

**Table 12-1**  
**Comparison of 72nd Street Station Entrance Alternatives'  
Ability to Meet Goals and Objectives**

| <b>Project Goal / Objective</b>   | <b>72nd Street Alternative 1:<br/>Elevators at Southeast Corner<br/>(Preferred Alternative)</b>  | <b>72nd Street Alternative 3:<br/>Escalators on North Side of<br/>72nd St</b>  | <b>72nd Street Alternative 4:<br/>Escalators on North Side of<br/>72nd St and East Side of<br/>Second Ave</b>   |
|---|--|--|---|
| <b>Improve Mobility</b>   |  |  |   |
| Street Level Entrance at Location that Best Serves Passengers             | Less convenient for ridership coming from northeast; however, remains convenient because passengers would not have to wait for a light at intersection because entrances available at northwest and southeast corners      | Most convenient for substantial ridership coming from northeast. Allows passengers from the east to descend directly into the subway on 72nd Street.   | Convenient for substantial ridership coming from north-east; however, passengers from the east must double-back to enter the subway since entrance faces Second Avenue. |
| Passenger Convenience: Provide Clear Sightlines and Straight Passageways  | Straight passages and clear sightlines.  | Straight passages and clear sightlines.  | Switchbacks, intermediate landings, and turns less convenient.  |
| <b>Improve, Maintain, or Minimize Impacts to Environmental Conditions</b> |  |  |   |
| Maintain Pedestrian Flows   | No change from No Action Alternative   | No change from No Action Alternative   | No change from Action Alternative   |
| Maintain Traffic Flows  | No change from No Action Alternative   | No change from No Action Alternative   | No change from No Action Alternative  |
| Minimize Required Displacement  | 300 East 72nd St: ground-floor retail and three apartments   | 300 East 72nd St: ground-floor retail and three apartments   | 300 East 72nd St: ground-floor retail and three apartments  |
| Avoid Significant Adverse Impacts to Historic Properties                  | No significant adverse impacts.  | No significant adverse impacts.  | No significant adverse impacts.   |
| Minimize Construction Impact  | Heavy construction and related disruption at intersection; but no cut and cover across 72nd Street. Smallest amount of spoils to be removed; smallest construction and MPT zone; smallest number of spoils removal trucks. | Heavy construction and related disruption at intersection; cut and cover across 72nd Street. Largest amount of spoils to be removed; largest number of spoils removal trucks. Greatest extent of noise impact during construction. | Heavy construction and related disruption at intersection; cut and cover across 72nd Street.  |
| <b>Minimize Cost and Time to Implement</b>                                |  |  |   |
| Minimize Cost   | Least costly alternative because it has the least amount of cut and cover construction and utility relocations.  | More costly than Alternative 1 due to more cut and cover construction and utility relocations.   | More costly than Alternative 1 due to more cut and cover construction and utility relocations.  |
| Minimize Time to Implement  | Similar for all alternatives.  | Similar for all alternatives.  | Similar for all alternatives.   |

### **12.3 86TH STREET STATION ENTRANCE ALTERNATIVES**

After careful consideration of the goals and objectives identified in Chapter 1, “Purpose and Need” of this EA as well as the of the engineering, construction, operational, and environmental benefits and disadvantages of the three Build entrance alternatives for the 86th Street Station, MTA New York City Transit has identified Alternative 7 (Escalators on the North Side of 86th Street East of Second Avenue) as the Preferred Alternative. Alternative 7 would provide two escalator entrances in a widened sidewalk on the north side of 86th Street east of Second Avenue and an elevator entrance in a widened sidewalk on the south side of 86th Street east of Second Avenue.

As described in Chapter 2, “Entrance Alternatives,” of this EA, the No Action Alternative for the 86th Street Station included an escalator entrance at the northeast corner of Second Avenue and 86th Street in the existing building at 305 East 86th Street and an elevator entrance in a widened sidewalk on the south side of East 86th Street east of Second Avenue that would provide ADA-compliant access to the station. However, as engineering has advanced, it has become evident that the design for the entrance within 305 East 86th Street would present substantial difficulties during construction and therefore an alternative must be identified. The No Action Alternative and the three Build alternatives for the 86th Street Station would not affect the planned ancillary building at the northwest corner of Second Avenue and 86th Street.

#### **12.3.1 COMPARISON OF CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS OF THE 86TH STREET STATION ENTRANCE ALTERNATIVES**

Like the No Action Alternative, all three 86th Street Build entrance alternatives would result in heavy construction and related disruption (traffic disruptions, noise, dust, etc.) at the intersection of Second Avenue and 86th Street, similar to what was described in the FEIS. The three Build alternatives would eliminate the need for major structural modifications to 305 East 86th Street, which would be required for the No Action Alternative. Overall, none of the 86th Street Build entrance alternatives would result in significant changes to the conclusions of the FEIS or result in new significant adverse impacts during construction. Construction of all three Build entrance alternatives would require cut-and-cover construction activities. Alternative 5 would require the least excavation of the alternatives, with less utility relocation, fewer truck trips for spoils removal, and less associated temporary rerouting of pedestrian and vehicular traffic. Alternative 2 would require the greatest amount of excavation and associated disruption.

Alternative 7 would not require any temporary or permanent displacement of residents or businesses, unlike Alternatives 2 and 5. Alternative 5 would require permanent acquisition and demolition of two buildings at the southeast corner of Second Avenue and 86th Street and would therefore permanently displace 15 residential units and two businesses housed within those buildings. Construction of Alternative 2 would require that three active businesses and eight residential units be displaced for up to eight months. Alternative 2 would also limit access to other buildings located on the south side of 86th Street during periods of its construction.

#### **12.3.2 COMPARISON OF PERMANENT IMPACTS OF THE 86TH STREET STATION ENTRANCE ALTERNATIVES**

All Build alternatives, like the No Action Alternative, would bring new subway structures to several corners of the intersection of Second Avenue and 86th Street, including the new ancillary building planned at the northwest corner of that intersection. Alternatives 2 and 5 would

**Supplemental EA to the Second Avenue Subway FEIS:  
72nd Street and 86th Street Station Entrance Alternatives**

---

introduce new subway structures on the south side of 86th Street east of Second Avenue: Alternative 2 would have two new escalator entrances and an elevator entrance, all in a widened entrance, while Alternative 5 would have an off-street elevator building at the southeast corner of the intersection. Alternative 7 would have escalator entrances in a widened sidewalk on the north side of 86th Street and an elevator entrance in a widened sidewalk on the south side of the street. The area surrounding location of the station entrances in any of the alternatives characterized by a variety of building types, heights, and architectural styles, and none of the Build alternatives would be incongruous with that visual character. For all three Build alternatives, the addition of subway station entrances on a wide crosstown street with a bus route and large apartment buildings would not result in conflicts with land use or neighborhood character.

Only Alternative 7 would not permanently affect the operations of existing buildings on the south side of 86th Street. For Alternative 2, because of the proximity of the escalator entrances to nearby buildings on the south side of 86th Street, the cellar entrances of adjacent buildings (300-302, 304, 308, and 322 East 86th Street) would be permanently removed during construction, which would require interior modifications to these buildings, including installation of sprinklers and other potential modifications, and it may not be possible to reconstruct canopies or awnings at these buildings once construction is complete. Sidewalk seating at local restaurants may also be restricted in order to maintain adequate sidewalk flows. Therefore, the permanent operation of Alternative 2 could impact the operation of adjacent businesses and buildings. Alternative 5 would permanently displace the ground-floor businesses and upper floor residential units from two buildings at the southeast corner of Second Avenue and 86th Street, which would have to be acquired and demolished for this alternative. The buildings are occupied by two businesses (a coffee shop and Schaller and Weber) as well as 15 residential units. In contrast, Alternative 7's escalator entrances would not adversely affect adjacent businesses and no demolition of privately owned buildings would be required, so Alternative 7 would not have detrimental effects on ground-level retail establishments.

Alternative 5 would not require sidewalk bump-outs, since the entrance would be entirely within the lot line of 1654 and 1656 Second Avenue, and therefore would not remove curbside parking. Alternatives 2 and 7 would require a bump-out into curbside parking lanes and would permanently remove curbside parking spaces. However, none of the alternatives would result in significant adverse impacts on traffic and parking.

Alternatives 2 and 5 would increase pedestrian volumes on the south side of 86th Street in comparison to existing conditions or the No Action Alternative, but they would not adversely impact the level of service of sidewalks, corners, or crosswalks. Alternative 7 would result in increased pedestrian volumes on the north side of East 86th Street in comparison to existing conditions, but similar volumes to those of the No Action Alternative, which would also have placed a new entrance on the northeast corner of the intersection. Like Alternatives 2 and 5, Alternative 7 would not result in significant adverse impacts on pedestrian levels of service.

None of the 86th Street entrance alternatives would result in significant adverse impacts to pedestrian safety. A concern was raised by the community that there may be vehicle-pedestrian conflicts at the four residential driveways located on the north side of 86th Street between First and Second Avenues. East 86th Street is already a heavily traveled pedestrian route. Furthermore, the increase in pedestrians at this location with Alternative 7 would not change substantially as compared to the No Action Alternative, and the Second Avenue Subway would not change the volume of vehicles entering or exiting these driveways.

Ridership projections for the 86th Street Station indicate that of the passengers who will use the north end of the 86th Street Station, 68 percent are predicted to come to/from the northeast and 8 percent to/from the southeast, with the remaining 24 percent coming to/from west of Second Avenue. Therefore, in terms of street level access, Alternative 7, with an entrance on the north side of 86th Street, would be more convenient for the majority of the passengers than Alternatives 2 and 5, which would only provide entrances on the south side of 86th Street.

In subway stations, straight passages with clear sightlines from areas where people congregate and/or areas where station personnel are present are preferred by passengers. In terms of passenger convenience within the station, Alternative 2 would be the least convenient, since it would have an upper-level landing with a long passageway with a turn leading to the escalator bank connecting to the mezzanine. In contrast, Alternatives 5 and 7 would provide greater passenger convenience within the station.

### **12.3.3 RECOMMENDATION OF THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE FOR THE 86TH STREET STATION ENTRANCE ALTERNATIVES**

Construction of Alternative 2 would be more disruptive to the community than Alternatives 5 and 7. It would require temporary displacement of three businesses and eight residential units, and access to other buildings on the south side of 86th Street would be substantially impaired during an eight-month period of construction. Once operational, Alternative 2 would have the potential to restrict use of the sidewalk for sidewalk cafes and building canopies, and while the sidewalks would not be adversely impacted, pedestrian circulation area would be more constrained than with Alternatives 2 and 7.

Alternative 5 would require the permanent displacement of businesses and residents from 1654 and 1656 Second Avenue. The buildings are occupied by a coffee shop, Schaller and Weber, and 15 residential units. Schaller and Weber, a German specialty food store, has been a long-time tenant of the area. It is reminiscent of the community's former character as a prominent German neighborhood and is considered an important business by local residents.

In contrast, Alternative 7 could be implemented without temporary or permanent displacement of business and residents or long-term effects on the operation of ground-level retail businesses on East 86th Street. As a result, the cost and the time to implement Alternative 7 is less than the other Build Alternatives. Alternative 7, with an entrance on the north side of 86th Street, would be more convenient for the majority of the riders (68 percent of the passengers entering from or exiting to the northeast) than Alternatives 2 and 5, which would require those passengers to cross 86th Street. Alternatives 5 and 7 would provide more direct access between street level and the mezzanine and better sight lines within the station than Alternative 2.

Therefore, while none of the alternatives would result in significant adverse impacts not already presented in the FEIS and all alternatives would be able to provide adequate access and egress, Alternative 7 would best meet the purpose and need for the design modifications as well as the goals and objectives (see **Table 12-2**). For these reasons, MTA New York City Transit is recommending Alternative 7 as the Preferred Alternative for the entrance at the 86th Street Station.

**Supplemental EA to the Second Avenue Subway FEIS:  
72nd Street and 86th Street Station Entrance Alternatives**

**Table 12-2**  
**Comparison of 86th Street Station Entrance Alternatives’  
Ability to Meet Goals and Objectives**

| <b>Project Goal / Objective</b>   | <b>86th Street Alternative 2:<br/>Escalators on<br/>South Side of 86th St</b>  | <b>86th Street Alternative 5:<br/>Elevators at Southeast<br/>Corner</b>   | <b>86th Street Alternative 7:<br/>Escalators on<br/>North Side of 86th St<br/>(Preferred Alternative)</b>                                 |
|---|--|---|---|
| <b>Improve Mobility</b>   |  |   |   |
| Street Level Entrance at Location that Best Serves Passengers             | Less convenient for ridership coming from northeast.   | Less convenient for ridership coming from northeast.  | Most convenient for substantial ridership coming from northeast   |
| Passenger Convenience: Provide Clear Sightlines and Straight Passageways  | Switchbacks and intermediate landing less convenient and would limit visibility.   | Straight passages and clear sightlines.   | Straight passages and clear sightlines.   |
| <b>Improve, Maintain, or Minimize Impacts to Environmental Conditions</b> |  |   |   |
| Maintain Pedestrian Flows   | Greater pedestrian flows on south sidewalk but no significant change from No Action Alternative.   | Greater pedestrian flows on south sidewalk but no significant change from No Action Alternative.  | No significant change from No Action Alternative.   |
| Maintain Traffic Flows  | No significant change from No Action Alternative   | No significant change from No Action Alternative  | No significant change from No Action Alternative  |
| Minimize Required Displacement  | Temporary displacement (up to 8 months) of four businesses and eight apartments during construction; permanent effects to businesses on south side of 86th Street related to closing cellar access and stoops.   | Permanent displacement of two buildings (1654 & 1656 Second Avenue) with ground-floor retail (coffee shop and Schaller & Weber); 15 apartments.               | No temporary or permanent displacement.   |
| Avoid Significant Adverse Impacts to Historic Properties                  | No significant adverse impacts.  | No significant adverse impacts.   | No significant adverse impacts.   |
| Minimize Construction Impact  | Heavy construction and related disruption at intersection; Cut and cover across 86th Street for passageway; Largest amount of spoils to be removed; largest number of spoils removal trucks; Greatest extent of noise impact during construction. Temporary displacement (up to 8 months) of four businesses and eight apartments during construction. | Heavy construction and related disruption at intersection; no cut and cover across 86th Street for passageway; least excavation and amount of spoils removal. | Heavy construction and related disruption at intersection; cut and cover across 86th Street for passageway.                               |
| <b>Minimize Cost and Time to Implement</b>                                |  |   |   |
| Minimize Costs  | More costly than Alternative 7, because it requires the temporary displacement (up to 8 months) of four business and eight apartments during construction and requires the greatest amount of excavation.  | More costly than Alternative 7 because it requires the permanent acquisitions of two buildings with ground-floor retail and 15 apartments.                    | Least costly alternative. It does not require displacement, unlike Alternatives 2 and 5, and requires less excavation than Alternative 2. |
| Minimize Time to Implement  | Additional lead time would be required to temporarily relocate commercial and residential tenants.   | Additional lead time would be required to relocate commercial and residential tenants.  | No additional lead time would be required to relocate displaced tenants.  |

\*