


appellate review the earlier interlocutory decision and order of the Court dated November 9, 2010 and entered in the office of the New York County Clerk on November 10, 2010.

Dated: New York, New York
September 12, 2011

BRYAN CAVE LLP

By:  _____

Philip E. Karmel

1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104
(212) 541-2000

*Attorneys for Respondent
Empire State Development Corporation*

TO:

Albert K. Butzel, Esq.
Urban Environmental Law Center
249 West 34th Street, Suite 400
New York, New York 10001
Telephone: (212) 643-0375
albutzel@nyc.rr.com
Attorneys for Petitioners

Jeffrey L. Braun, Esq.
Kramer Levin Naftalis & Frankel LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
Telephone: (212) 715-9100
jbraun@kramerlevin.com
Attorneys for Respondent
Forest City Ratner Companies, LLC

Richard G. Leland, Esq.
Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson LLP
One New York Plaza
New York, New York 10004-1980
Telephone: (212) 859-8978
richard.leland@friedfrank.com
Attorneys for Respondent
Forest City Ratner Companies, LLC

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
APPELLATE DIVISION FIRST DEPARTMENT

In the Matter of the Application of	:	x
PROSPECT HEIGHTS NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT	:	New York County
COUNCIL, INC., ATLANTIC AVENUE LOCAL DEVELOP-	:	Index No. 116323/09
MENT CORP., BOERUM HILL ASSOCIATION, INC.,	:	
BROOKLYN HEIGHTS ASSOCIATION, INC., FIFTH	:	
AVENUE COMMITTEE, INC., PARK SLOPE CIVIC	:	
COUNCIL, INC, PRATT AREA COMMUNITY COUNCIL,	:	PRE-ARGUMENT
INC., STATE SENATOR VELMANETTE MONTGOMERY,	:	STATEMENT
NEW YORK CITY COUNCIL MEMBER LETITIA JAMES,	:	
ALAN ROSNER, EDA MALENKY, PETER KRASHES,	:	
JUDY MANN, RHONA HESTRONY, JAMES GREENFIELD,	:	
MICHAEL ROGERS, ANURAG HEDA, ROBERT PUCA,	:	
SALVATORE RAFFONE, RHONA HETSTONY, ERIC	:	
DOERINGER, JILLIAN MAY and DOUG DERRYBERRY,	:	
	:	
Petitioners-Respondents,	:	
	:	
For a Judgment Pursuant to Article 78	:	
of the Civil Practice Law and Rules.	:	
	:	
- against	:	
	:	
EMPIRE STATE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION and	:	
FOREST CITY RATNER COMPANIES, LLC,	:	
	:	
Respondents-Appellants.	:	
	:	

Respondent-appellant New York State Urban Development Corporation d/b/a
Empire State Development Corporation (“ESDC”) submits this Pre-Argument Statement
pursuant to 22 N.Y.C.R.R. § 600.17:

1. The title of the proceeding is as it appears in the above caption. The
proceeding was filed under Index No. 116323/09 in the Supreme Court of the State of New
York, County of New York.

2. The full name of respondent-appellant ESDC is New York State Urban Development Corporation d/b/a Empire State Development Corporation. Except as noted below, the names of the other parties to the proceeding are listed in the above caption as they appeared in the original caption. By stipulation, former petitioner State Assembly Member James F. Brennan discontinued his participation in the proceeding and his name is therefore not listed in the caption above.

3. The name, address and telephone number of counsel for respondent-appellant ESDC is as follows:

BRYAN CAVE LLP
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104
(212) 541-2000
Attention: Philip E. Karmel

The names, addresses and telephone numbers of counsel for respondent-appellant Forest City Ratner Companies, LLC, are as follows:

KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS & FRANKEL LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
(212) 715-9100
Attention: Jeffrey L. Braun

FRIED, FRANK, HARRIS, SHRIVER & JACOBSON, LLP
One New York Plaza
New York, New York 10004
(212) 859-8000
Attention: Richard G. Leland

The names, addresses and telephone numbers of counsel for petitioners-respondents are as follows:

URBAN ENVIRONMENTAL LAW CENTER
249 West 34th Street, Suite 400
New York, New York 10001
Telephone: (212) 643-0375
Attention: Albert K. Butzel

4. This appeal is taken from the decision, order and judgment of the Supreme Court for New York County dated July 13, 2011 and entered in the office of the New York County Clerk on July 19, 2011, a copy of which is annexed as Exhibit A. The appeal of this final judgment brings up for review the interlocutory decision and order of the same court dated November 9, 2010 and entered in the office of the New York County Clerk on November 10, 2010.

5. An appeal from the interlocutory decision dated November 9, 2010 noted in the preceding paragraph was previously filed. A copy of the pre-argument statement in that earlier appeal – to which are annexed copies of the interlocutory decision and the order granting leave to appeal that decision – is annexed as Exhibit B. The earlier appeal has not been perfected. It is intended that the instant appeal of the final judgment would appeal both the final judgment and the earlier interlocutory order, in lieu of separately perfecting the earlier appeal of the interlocutory order.

6. A second proceeding related to the instant proceeding is captioned Develop Don't Destroy (Brooklyn), Inc., et al. v. Empire State Development Corporation, et ano., Index No. 114631/09. The petitioners in the two proceedings are different, but the respondents are the same, and the issues in the two proceedings are similar. The judgment and order appealed from in the instant appeal were double captioned to resolve both proceedings, but the two proceedings were never formally consolidated. A notice of appeal in this related proceeding is being filed simultaneously with this appeal. It is anticipated that both appeals will

be perfected on the same schedule, and it is respectfully suggested that both appeals be scheduled for argument on the same day before the same panel.

7. In this Article 78 proceeding, petitioners seek to annul ESDC's affirmation on September 17, 2009 of a Modified General Project Plan ("MGPP") for the Atlantic Yards Land Use Improvement and Civic Project (the "Project") in Brooklyn. Petitioners also seek to annul ESDC's determination of September 17, 2009 that under the State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQRA") a supplemental environmental impact statement ("SEIS") was not warranted in connection with its affirmation of the MGPP. Petitioners also challenge ESDC's determination made on December 16, 2010 not to disturb its prior determination not to prepare an SEIS.

8. In its final judgment, the Court ordered ESDC to prepare an SEIS to assess the environmental impacts of a delay in construction of Phase II of the Project (*i.e.*, the Project buildings and associated open space east of 6th Avenue) and to make further findings on whether to approve the MGPP for Phase II of the Project.

9. The grounds for seeking reversal and annulment of the judgment are that the Court did not apply the correct standard of review, overlooked relevant factual information in the administrative record and made other errors. The relevant SEQRA regulations provide that an agency *may* require an SEIS for the evaluation of specific significant adverse environmental impacts not addressed or inadequately addressed in an earlier environmental impact statement. 6 N.Y.C.R.R. § 617.9(a)(7)(i). An agency determination whether to require an SEIS is discretionary and is therefore afforded more deference than other agency SEQRA determinations. *See Riverkeeper, Inc. v. Planning Board of Town of Southeast*, 9 N.Y.3d 219, 231 (2007). Under SEQRA, the agency is required to identify the "relevant areas of

environmental concern,” take a “hard look” at them and make a “reasoned elaboration” of the basis for its determination. *Id.* at 231-32. ESDC fulfilled all of these obligations. It identified the relevant areas of environmental concern associated with affirmation of the MGPP, took a hard look at them and provided a reasoned elaboration for its determination. With respect to the construction schedule, ESDC set forth a detailed explanation for its reliance, for SEQRA analysis purposes, on a reasonable worst-case 10-year construction schedule upheld in earlier court proceedings (*Develop Don’t Destroy (Brooklyn) v. Urb. Dev. Corp.*, 59 A.D.3d 312 (1st Dep’t 2009), *leave to appeal denied*, 13 N.Y.3d 713 (2009), *reargument denied*, 14 N.Y.3d 748 (2010)). ESDC also analyzed whether a delay in this construction schedule would result in new significant adverse impacts warranting an SEIS and concluded that such a delay would not warrant additional environmental review. Moreover, a delay in the Project, were it to occur, would be the result of poor economic conditions rather than the modifications made to the General Project Plan in the MGPP challenged in this proceeding. The administrative record documents provide a detailed explanation of the basis for ESDC’s determination that an SEIS was not warranted in connection with the affirmation of the MGPP. Accordingly, the Supreme Court failed to provide the requisite deference to ESDC’s discretionary determination not to prepare an SEIS and erred in holding that ESDC had not provided the requisite “reasoned elaboration” of the basis for its determination.

Dated: New York, New York
September 12, 2011

BRYAN CAVE LLP

By: 
Philip E. Karmel

1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104
(212) 541-2000

*Attorneys for Respondent-Appellant
Empire State Development Corporation*

TO:

Albert K. Butzel, Esq.
Urban Environmental Law Center
249 West 34th Street, Suite 400
New York, New York 10001
Telephone: (212) 643-0375
albutzel@nyc.rr.com
Attorneys for Petitioners-Respondents

Jeffrey L. Braun, Esq.
Kramer Levin Naftalis & Frankel LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
Telephone: (212) 715-9100
jbraun@kramerlevin.com
*Attorneys for Respondent-Appellant
Forest City Ratner Companies, LLC*

Richard G. Leland, Esq.
Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson LLP
One New York Plaza
New York, New York 10004-1980
Telephone: (212) 859-8978
richard.leland@friedfrank.com
*Attorneys for Respondent-Appellant
Forest City Ratner Companies, LLC*



SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK — NEW YORK COUNTY

PRESENT: MARCY S. FRIEDMAN

PART 57

116323/09

Index Number : 114631/2009
 DEVELOP DON'T DESTROY
 VS.
 EMPIRE STATE DEVELOPMENT CORP
 SEQUENCE NUMBER : 006
 ARTICLE 78

INDEX NO. _____
 MOTION DATE _____
 MOTION SEQ. NO. 005
 MOTION CAL. NO. _____
supplemental
petition
 his motion ~~is~~ for Art. 78

11/4/11 ec

PAPERS NUMBERED
1, 1A
2, 2A, 3, 3A

Notice of Motion/ Order to Show Cause — Affidavits — Exhibits ...
 Answering Affidavits — Exhibits _____
 Replying Affidavits _____

Memo from M1-M4

Cross-Motion: Yes No

Upon the foregoing papers, it is ordered that this ~~motion~~

supplemental petition is decided in accordance with the accompanying decision and order of the same date.

ENTER:

FILED

JUL 19 2011

COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE
NEW YORK

Dated: 7-13-11

Marcy Friedman
 MARCY S. FRIEDMAN *c.*

Check one: FINAL DISPOSITION NON-FINAL DISPOSITION

Check if appropriate: DO NOT POST REFERENCE

SUBMIT ORDER/ JUDG. SETTLE ORDER/ JUDG.

MOTION/CASE IS RESPECTFULLY REFERRED TO JUSTICE FOR THE FOLLOWING REASON(S):

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF NEW YORK – PART 57

PRESENT: Hon. Marcy S. Friedman, JSC

DEVELOP DON'T DESTROY (BROOKLYN),
INC., et al.,

Index No.: 114631/09

Petitioners,

For a Judgment Pursuant to Article 78 of the Civil
Practice Law and Rules,

- against -

EMPIRE STATE DEVELOPMENT
CORPORATION and FOREST CITY RATNER
COMPANIES, LLC,

Respondents.

PROSPECT HEIGHTS NEIGHBORHOOD
DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL, INC., et al.,

Index No. 116323/09

Petitioners,

DECISION/ORDER

For a Judgment Pursuant to Article 78 of the Civil
Practice Law and Rules,

- against -

EMPIRE STATE DEVELOPMENT
CORPORATION and FOREST CITY RATNER
COMPANIES, LLC,

Respondents.

RECEIVED
JUL 18 2011

Procedural History

These Article 78 proceedings, brought under the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), challenge modification of the plan for development of the Atlantic Yards Project in Brooklyn. In prior proceedings, petitioner Develop Don't Destroy (Brooklyn), Inc. (DDDB) and petitioners Prospect Heights Neighborhood Development Council, Inc. and others (collectively PHND) challenged the affirmance, on September 17, 2009, by respondent New York State Urban Development Corp., doing business as the Empire State Development Corp. (ESDC), of the modified general project plan (2009 MGPP) for the Project, which is to be constructed by respondent Forest City Ratner Companies or its affiliates (FCRC). By decision and order dated March 10, 2010, this court denied the petitions. By decision and order dated November 9, 2010, the court granted leave to reargue and renew. On reargument, the court held that ESDC did not provide a reasoned elaboration for its continuing use of a 10 year build date for the Project and its determination not to require a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS), based on its wholesale failure to address the impact on the build date of the complete terms of its Development Agreement with FCRC and of a renegotiated Agreement between the Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) and FCRC. The court remanded the matter to ESDC for findings on the impact of the Agreements on ESDC's continued use of the 10 year build date, and on whether an SEIS is warranted or required pursuant to SEQRA. (Nov. 9, 2010 Decision at 18.)

In December 2010, in response to the court's order, ESDC's environmental consultant, AKRF, Inc., prepared a Technical Analysis of an Extended Build-Out of the Atlantic Yards Arena and Redevelopment Project (Technical Analysis) (Supplemental Administrative Record

[SAR] 7637 et seq.) (fn 1) ESDC also issued a document entitled ESDC Response to Supreme Court's November 9, 2010 Order (ESDC Response) (SAR 7728 et seq.) By resolution dated December 16, 2010, ESDC concluded:

- “1. The Development Agreement and MTA Agreement (collectively, the “Development Contracts”) do not have a material effect on whether it is reasonable to use a 10-year construction schedule for the purpose of assessing the environmental impacts of the Project
2. As of the date of these findings, it appears unlikely that the Project will be constructed on a 10-year schedule. . . .
3. A delay in the 10-year construction schedule, through and including a 25-year final completion date, would not result in any new significant adverse environmental impacts not previously identified and considered in the FEIS [Final Environmental Impact Statement] and 2009 Technical Memorandum and would not require or warrant an SEIS”

(Dec. 16, 2010 Resolution, SAR at 7631.) ESDC further resolved that “such findings do not require any modification to the Tech Memo, and do not disturb the prior determination of the Corporation that no Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement is required for the Project's Modified General Project Plan.” (Id.) Petitioners' Supplemental Petitions challenging ESDC's December 16, 2010 findings followed.

The Atlantic Yards Project has been described as “the largest single-developer project in New York City history.” (Matter of Develop Don't Destroy [Brooklyn] v Urban Dev. Corp., 59 AD3d 312, 326 [1st Dept 2009] [Catterson, J. concurring] [DDDB I], lv denied 13 NY3d 713, rearg denied 14 NY3d 748 [2010].) The Project extends over 22 acres and is to be built in two phases. Phase I includes a sports arena that will serve as the new home of the New Jersey Nets, four to five buildings in the vicinity of the arena, a new MTA/Long Island Railroad (LIRR) rail yard, and transit access improvements including a new subway entrance. Phase II covers construction of 11 of the Project's 16 hi-rise buildings, which will contain commercial space and

approximately 5,000 to 6,000 residential units, 2,250 of which will be affordable housing units.

Phase II also includes development of eight acres of publicly accessible open space.

Petitioners contend that the MTA Agreement and the Development Agreement, negotiated by ESDC at the time of the 2009 MGPP, have significantly extended the time frame for the build-out of Phase II of the Project, rendering the 10 year build date an impermissible basis for environmental analysis. Respondents dispute the impact of the Agreements on the build date. They contend that it was reasonable for them to rely on the 10 year build date, which ESDC used as the basis for its analysis in the 2006 FEIS prepared in connection with the original plan, and continued to use in the 2009 Technical Memorandum prepared in connection with the 2009 MGPP.

ESDC claims, and petitioners do not dispute, that even under a prolonged build-out, the timing of completion of the arena, one of the buildings in the vicinity of the arena, and the other Phase I construction would not be "materially" affected. (Technical Analysis, SAR at 7638.)

The court refers to its March 10 and November 9, 2010 decisions for an extensive discussion of the parties' claims and of the bases for the court's prior determinations.

Use of 10 Year Build Date

Petitioners' initial challenge to the 2009 MGPP was based on the MTA's renegotiation in June 2009 of its agreement with FCRC to sell FCRC the air rights to the rail yard owned by the MTA. These air rights are necessary to construct 6 of the 11 Phase II buildings which are to be built on a platform to be constructed over the MTA rail yard. Under the agreement between the MTA and FCRC that was in effect at the time of ESDC's approval of the Project plan in 2006, FCRC was required to pay \$100 million to the MTA at the inception of the Project for the air

rights. Under the renegotiated agreement, FCRC will pay \$20 million for acquisition of the property interests necessary for the development of the arena block, will provide the MTA with a letter of credit to secure the obligation to build an upgraded MTA/LIRR rail yard, and will pay the balance of the \$100 million on an installment schedule that affords FCRC until 2030 to acquire the air rights necessary for construction of 6 of the Phase II buildings, although it permits FCRC to acquire the air rights for each of the 6 parcels as the full price for the parcel is paid. (See Mar. 10, 2010 Decision at 3-4.) In connection with ESDC's approval of the 2009 MGPP, ESDC's staff characterized the change in site acquisition as a "major change" to the Project. (June 23, 2009 Memorandum, AR at 4677-4678.)

In its decision denying the petitions, this court held that under the applicable standard for SEQRA review, ESDC's elaboration of its reasons for continuing to use the 10 year build-out was supported, albeit minimally, by the factors articulated by ESDC, including its intent to obtain a commitment from FCRC, in a Development Agreement under negotiation, to use commercially reasonable effort to complete the Project in 10 years. (Mar. 10, 2010 Decision at 11.)

On the reargument motion, petitioners argued that the continuing use of the 10 year build-out was belied not only by the MTA Agreement but by the detailed terms of the Development Agreement that ESDC actually negotiated, including significantly extended dates for Phase II construction. In remanding to ESDC for findings on the reasonableness of its continuing use of the 10 year build date, this court reasoned that in approving the 2009 MGPP, ESDC claimed to have relied on a provision in the Development Agreement being negotiated with FCRC which would require FCRC to use "commercially reasonable effort" to complete the Project within 10 years, by 2019. The court found, however, that ESDC knew at the time of its approval of the

MGPP, but did not bring to the court's attention, that the Development Agreement would require the arena and Phase I buildings on the arena block to be substantially completed within or reasonably soon after the 10 year build date, but would provide for a significantly extended outside substantial completion date of 25 years, or 2035, for the Phase II construction (11 of the 16 residential hi-rise buildings on the Project site). (Nov. 9, 2010 Decision at 4-5.) The court also discussed at length the substantially greater penalties provided for delays in Phase I construction than for delays in Phase II construction, or for failure to use commercially reasonable effort to complete the Project by 2019, as well as the stringent deadlines for commencement of Phase I construction and the absence of deadlines, with limited exceptions, for commencement of Phase II construction. (Id. at 6-9.)

In determining that reargument should be granted, the decision concluded: The Development Agreement has cast a completely different light on the Project build date. Its 25 year outside substantial completion date for Phase II and its disparate enforcement provisions for failure to meet Phase I and II deadlines, read together with the renegotiated MTA Agreement giving FCRC until 2030 to complete acquisition of the air rights necessary to construct 6 of the 11 Phase II buildings, raise a substantial question as to whether ESDC's continuing use of the 10 year build-out has a rational basis. (Id. at 16-17.)

In its findings on the remand, ESDC claims that it disclosed, at the time of its approval of the 2009 MGPP, that the outside dates for construction would extend "well beyond 10 years." (Dec. 16, 2010 Resolution, SAR at 7631.) As discussed at length in the court's November 9, 2010 decision, that claim is patently incorrect. In what the court termed a failure of transparency, ESDC made no mention of the provision in the Development Agreement for a 25 year substantial

completion date for Phase II and, instead, repeatedly cited the provision requiring FCRC to use commercially reasonable effort to complete the Project in 10 years. (Nov. 9, 2010 Decision at 10-11, 16.) (fn 2)

In remanding the matter to ESDC for further findings on the effect of the MTA and Development Agreements on the reasonableness of the 10 year build date, the court afforded ESDC an opportunity to correct its failure to address the impact of these Agreements, and to respond to this court's preliminary reading, in the November 9, 2010 decision, of the terms of the Development Agreement affecting deadlines for construction of the Project. Significantly, in its findings on the remand, ESDC does not differ with the court's reading of the Development Agreement as providing detailed timetables and firm commencement dates for the arena and Phase I work; no commencement dates for Phase II work, other than the platform which is not required to be commenced until 2025, and one Phase II building on Block 1129 which is not required to be "initiated" until 2020; and far stricter penalties for delays in Phase I work than for delays in Phase II work. (Nov. 9, 2010 Decision at 9-10; ESDC Response, SAR at 7734-7737; Technical Analysis, SAR at 7639 [Block 1129].) Nor does ESDC contest the court's conclusion (Nov. 9, 2010 Decision at 8-9) that ESDC would face significant legal difficulties or, as ESDC puts it, "complexities . . . in establishing FCRC's failure to proceed with the Project in a commercially reasonable manner" so as to meet the 10 year build out. (See ESDC Response, SAR at 7748.) (fn 3)

ESDC nevertheless insists that it was reasonable for it to continue to rely on the Development Agreement provision requiring FCRC to use commercially reasonable effort to meet the 10 year deadline. (ESDC Response, SAR at 7746.) In support of this contention,

ESDC relies on its characterization of the outside dates for Phase II construction in the Development Agreement as the mere creation of "transactional lawyers" anticipating risks (id. at 7746), and its wan assertion that the MTA and Development Agreements do not "preclude" or are not "inconsistent" with a 10 year build-out. (id. at 7748.) While it is correct that the Agreements do not prevent a build-out in 10 years, ESDC itself acknowledges that the negotiation of the MTA and Development Agreements was necessary due to the weak state of the economy. ESDC thus represents that the Agreements were "structured" in order "to get the Project going in a difficult economic climate," by "allow[ing] FCRC to purchase Project property in pieces and to proceed with the platform construction in three distinct phases." (Id. at 7747.) ESDC also acknowledges, as of the date of the findings on the remand (December 16, 2010), that "it appears unlikely that the Project will be constructed on a 10-year schedule, because the construction of the Project's residential buildings has lagged behind the 10-year schedule provided by FCRC to ESDC in 2009, and because of continuing weak general economic and financial conditions." (Id. at 7749.) Its suggestion that it was unaware, when it entered into the Development Agreement and approved the 2009 MGPP, that the same economic downturn would prevent a 10 year build-out, strains credulity at best. ESDC's further assertion that that FCRC has the financial incentive to pursue the Project to a "speedy conclusion" is unsupported by any financial analysis. (Id. at 7748.) Moreover, while FCRC asserts its intent to comply with its commitment to use commercially reasonable effort to complete the Project in 10 years (Gilmartin Aff. dated Dec. 9, 2010, ¶ 27 [FCRC Aff. In Opp., Ex. A]), its papers in these proceedings are devoid of any detail showing its ability to do so. (fn 4)

In short, ESDC's invocation of the commercially reasonable effort provision rings hollow

in the face of the specific deadlines in the Development Agreement – discussed at length in the November 9, 2010 decision and not disputed by ESDC on the remand – which clearly contemplate a schedule for construction of the post-arena phase of the Project that may not see even one Phase II building “initiated” until 2020, that does not require commencement of the construction of the platform on which 6 of the 11 Phase II buildings will be built until 2025, and that may extend beyond the purported 2019 build date for 16 years, until 2035.

The court accordingly finds that ESDC’s use of the 10 year build date in approving the 2009 MGPP lacked a rational basis and was arbitrary and capricious. In so holding, the court recognizes, as the Appellate Division held in a prior litigation involving the Atlantic Yards Project, that a mere inaccuracy in the build date will not invalidate the basic data used in the agency’s environmental assessment. (See DDDB I, 59 AD3d at 318. See also Committee to Preserve Brighton Beach v Council of City of New York, 214 AD2d 335 [1st Dept 1995], lv denied 87 NY2d 802.) However, as the Court also held, ESDC’s choice of the build year is not immune to judicial review but, rather, is subject to review under the rational basis or arbitrary and capricious standard that is applicable to judicial scrutiny of any agency action in an Article 78 proceeding. (DDDB I at 318.) In the instant case, ESDC’s continuing use of the 10 year build date was not merely inaccurate; it lacked a rational basis, given the major change in deadlines reflected in the MTA and Development Agreements.

SEIS

Having concluded that ESDC’s use of the 10 year build date lacked a rational basis, the court turns to the issue of whether ESDC was required to prepare a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement prior to its approval of the 2009 MGPP. In concluding that an SEIS was not

required, ESDC relies on a Technical Analysis prepared by its environmental consultant in December 2010 after the remand, and on the 2006 FEIS and the Technical Memorandum prepared at the time of the approval of the 2009 MGPP. The Technical Memorandum concluded, and the Technical Analysis affirms, that the 2009 MGPP will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts that were not already disclosed in the FEIS. The Technical Memorandum assumed a 10 year build-out but examined environmental impacts on certain conditions such as traffic and transit under a delay scenario, due to adverse economic conditions, extending to 2024. The Technical Analysis purports to examine an "Extended Build-Out Scenario" to 2035. (Technical Analysis, Section E, "Construction Period Impacts," SAR 7669, *et seq.*)

The conclusion in the Technical Analysis that an extended delay to 2035 would not have significant adverse environmental impacts that were not addressed in the FEIS is, in turn, based on the repeated assertions that the delay in the build-out would result in prolonged but less "intense" construction, and that most environmental impacts are driven by intensity rather than duration. As the Technical Analysis states, "the determination of significant adverse impacts during construction relies mainly on the intensity of construction activities and their potential effects on the environment. Since these activities would move through the development area as Project components are being constructed, they would not have prolonged effects on individual uses in the area. Therefore, most areas of environmental concern would be independent of the overall duration of Project construction under the Extended Build-Out Scenario." (Technical Analysis, SAR at 7670; 7685 ["[W]ith the prolonged schedule, there would be less overlap of [construction] activities for different buildings, resulting in overall lower intensity in construction

activities on the Project site.”).) The Technical Analysis concludes that for such areas of environmental concern as traffic, noise, and air quality, the adverse environmental impacts would be the same as, or less than, those identified in the FEIS. (*Id.* at 7689-7694 [traffic]; 7698-7704 [noise]; 7694-7698 [air quality].)

The Technical Analysis, which was prepared with marked speed in the month after the remand, does not support these findings with any technical studies on the effects of significantly prolonged construction on various areas of environmental concern. Rather, it appears to take the position that it is a matter of common sense that less intense construction will result in lower impacts for conditions such as traffic, noise, and air quality.

Even assuming *arguendo* that ESDC's common sense assumption is correct, under established standards for environmental impact analysis, the duration of construction activities is a factor that is required to be taken into account in assessing the impacts on both environmental conditions such as traffic, noise, and air quality, which are amenable to quantitative analysis, and conditions such as neighborhood character, open space, and socioeconomic conditions, which are largely subject to qualitative analysis. ESDC does not dispute that the CEQR Technical Manual establishes an accepted analytical framework for government agencies in assessing a project's likely environmental effects. (*See* Ch. 2 at 2-1.) This Manual, which provides for the “reasonable worst case scenario” to be used for the analysis (*id.* at 2-3), repeatedly refers to the duration of the construction as a factor to be considered in performing the environmental assessment. As to conditions such as traffic, air quality, and noise, the Manual states that duration is not the sole factor but is to be considered among other factors, including construction intensity and project location. (Ch. 22 at 22-4, 22-6.) As to neighborhood character, the Manual

provides that a construction impact analysis "looks at the construction activities that would occur on the site (or portions of the site) and their duration." (Id., at 22-6.) Similarly, the Manual provides that "[a] construction impacts analysis for open space should be conducted . . . if access to the open space would be impeded for an extended period during construction activities." (Id. at 22-7.) As to socioeconomic conditions, the Manual states that "[i]f the proposed project would entail construction of a long duration that could affect the access to and therefore viability of a number of businesses, and the failure of those businesses has the potential to affect neighborhood character, a preliminary assessment for construction impacts on socioeconomic conditions should be conducted." (Id. at 22-6.)

Notwithstanding these established guidelines for environmental analysis, the Technical Analysis does not undertake a meaningful assessment of the impacts of the potentially vastly extended period of construction on the various areas of environmental concern. As indicated above, it takes the position that the impacts on most areas of environmental concern will be "independent" of duration. (See supra at 10). Although it purports to examine construction delays to 2035 under its Extended Build-Out Scenario, in discussing areas such as traffic, noise and air quality, it in fact assumes, as did the Technical Memorandum, that Phase II construction will not be stalled or deferred for years, but will proceed continuously on a parcel-by-parcel basis, and that the impacts will accordingly be less "intense" or will move throughout the Project, minimizing the impacts. (Technical Analysis, SAR at 7683, 7685; 7689-7690 [traffic and transportation]; 7694-7696 [air quality]; 7698 [noise]. See Technical Analysis, SAR at 7677-7680 [summarizing Technical Memorandum].)

The Technical Analysis takes a similar approach to other areas of environmental concern

which were the subjects largely of qualitative analysis. The Technical Analysis does not undertake any analysis of extensive delays between the completion of the arena, anticipated for 2012, and Phase II construction – the commencement of which, as indicated by the Development Agreement, may be delayed until 2020 for the first Phase II building on Block 1129, and until 2025 for the beginning of Phase II construction of the platform that will support 6 of the 11 Phase II buildings; and the completion of which, as indicated by the Development Agreement, may be delayed until 2035. Notably, the Technical Analysis is silent as to the impacts on neighborhood character and socioeconomic conditions of vacant lots, above-ground arena parking, and construction staging which may persist not merely for a decade but, as petitioners aptly put it, for a generation.

More particularly, as to neighborhood character, the Technical Analysis fails to evaluate the impact of extensive delays in the build-out of Phase II. The Technical Analysis concludes that construction impacts on neighborhood character under the Extensive Build-Out Scenario would remain “localized” in the immediate vicinity of construction, but “would be less intense because there would be less simultaneous activity on the site.” (SAR at 7704.) Again, the Technical Analysis focuses on intensity of the construction, and does not address the impacts of a construction period that could extend not merely for a decade but for 25 years. As to the above-ground parking lot and construction staging area on Block 1129, the Technical Analysis rests on the bare assertion that although it “would be prolonged with the Extended Build-Out Scenario, it would not be occupied by a 1,100-car surface parking lot for the entire construction duration. As sites are developed on Block 1129, the above-ground interim parking lot would be reduced as parking is provided below-grade. Furthermore, construction of at least one of the four buildings

on Block 1129 would be started by 2020." (*Id.* at 7705.) The Technical Analysis asserts that 2020 is merely an "outside date" (*id.*), and does not evaluate the impacts of the potential 8 year or more delay between the construction of the arena and the commencement of any construction of underground parking for the arena.

As to open space, the Technical Analysis notes that the provision of eight acres of publicly accessible open space is a "key component of the Project." (*Id.* at 7686.) As touted in the FEIS, the open space element of the Project will connect the neighborhoods to the north and south of Atlantic Avenue, for the first time in a century. (FEIS, Ch. 16, AR at 1061.) The Technical Analysis further notes that the FEIS identified a "temporary significant adverse open space impact . . . between the completion of Phase I and the completion of Phase II." (SAR at 7686.) However, the analysis of the impact of significantly delayed construction on open space is limited to the conclusory assertion that "[w]ith the Extended Build-Out Scenario, the temporary impact identified in the FEIS would extend longer, but would continue to be addressed by the incremental completion of the Phase II open space. As each of the Phase II buildings is completed, the adjacent open space would be provided in conformance with the 2006 Design Guidelines." (*Id.*) Again, although the Technical Analysis purports, under its Extended Build-Out Scenario, to examine the impacts of a delay until 2035 in building the Project, it assumes, as did the Technical Memorandum, that the Phase II buildings will be proceed on a parcel-by-parcel basis, and does not examine the impacts of years of potential delays before the commencement of any of the Phase II buildings.

In concluding that preparation of an SEIS is not warranted, the Technical Analysis also repeatedly cites mitigation measures imposed by the FEIS and by an Amended Memorandum of

Environmental Commitments (Amended Memo) made as part of the approval process for the 2009 MGPP. (See Technical Analysis, SAR at 7680; Amended Memo, SAR at 8034.) However, these measures were adopted to mitigate the adverse environmental impacts identified in the FEIS and Technical Memorandum, which assumed that the build-out of the Project would take 10 years. The Technical Analysis does not consider the adequacy of these mitigation measures for a significantly prolonged construction period.

The regulations which implement SEQRA provide that the lead agency – here, ESDC – “may require a supplemental EIS, limited to the specific significant adverse environmental impacts not addressed or inadequately addressed in the EIS that arise from: [a] changes proposed for the project; or [b] newly discovered information; or [c] a change in circumstances related to the project.” (6 NYCRR 617.9[a][7][i][a]-[c].) As discussed in the prior decisions, the court’s review of a SEQRA determination “is limited to whether the agency identified the relevant areas of environmental concern, took a ‘hard look’ at them, and made a ‘reasoned elaboration’ of the basis for its determination.” (Matter of Riverkeeper, Inc. v Planning Bd. of Town of Southeast, 9 NY3d 219, 231-232 [2007] [citing Matter of Jackson v New York State Urban Dev. Corp., 67 NY2d 400, 417 [1986].) An agency’s determination whether to require an SEIS is discretionary. (Id. at 231.) “The lead agency . . . has the responsibility to comb through reports, analyses and other documents before making a determination; it is not for a reviewing court to duplicate these efforts.” (Id. at 232.) The agency’s determinations under SEQRA “must be viewed in light of a rule of reason. Not every conceivable environmental impact, mitigating measure or alternative must be identified. . . The degree of detail with which each factor must be discussed obviously will vary with the circumstances and nature of the proposal.” (Matter of Jackson, 67 NY2d at

417 [internal quotation marks and citations omitted]. Accord Matter of Eadie v Town Bd. of the Town of N. Greenbush, 7 NY3d 306, 318 [2006].)

As the Court of Appeals has repeatedly emphasized, “the courts may not substitute their judgment for that of the agency for it is not their role to weigh the desirability of any action or to choose among alternatives.” (Riverkeeper, Inc., 9 NY3d at 232 [internal quotation marks, citations, and brackets omitted].) Nevertheless, judicial review must be “meaningful.” (Id. at 232.) It is the court’s responsibility to “ensure that, in light of the circumstances of a particular case, the agency has given due consideration to the pertinent environmental factors.” (Akpan v Koch, 75 NY2d 561, 571 [1990].)

Thus, a determination not to undertake a full environmental review will be set aside where the agency fails to address affected areas of environmental concern. (See e.g. Matter of Chatham Towers v Bloomberg, 18 AD3d 395 [1st Dept 2005], modfg on other grounds 6 Misc 3d 814 [Sup Ct, NY County 2004], lv denied 6 NY3d 704 [2006] [negative declaration held improper]; Matter of Segal v Town of Thompson, 182 AD2d 1043, 1046 [3d Dept 1992] [negative declaration improper where “little or no consideration was given to a variety of potential environmental impacts”].) An agency determination under SEQRA will also be set aside where the agency’s review of the environmental impacts is unsupported by studies and data or is conclusory. (See e.g. Tupper v City of Syracuse, 71 AD3d 1460 [4th Dept 2010], lv denied 74 AD3d 1880; Matter of Baker v Village of Elmsford, 70 AD3d 181 [2d Dept 2009]; Matter of Serdarevic v Town of Goshen, 39 AD3d 552 [2d Dept 2007].)

Here, ESDC’s hastily prepared Technical Analysis performs a perfunctory analysis of the impacts of the extended delay in constructing the Project. As discussed above, the Technical

