

Shatz, Rachel

From: MMSALSTROM@aol.com
Sent: Friday, December 08, 2006 8:19 AM
To: MMSALSTROM@aol.com; jim.vogel@mindspring.com; atlanticyards
Subject: Re: Response to final draft of EIS for Atlantic Yards development by Prof. Brent M. Porter, Architect; # 107

In a message dated 12/8/06 12:00:13 AM, MMSALSTROM writes:

In a message dated 12/7/06 10:37:44 AM, jim.vogel@mindspring.com writes:

WIND

Comment G-8:

- Was a wind analysis done to determine whether the buildings will create wind tunnels? (461)
- The height of the proposed buildings will create a tunnel- or canyon effect, resulting in a darker and windier environment. (387, 427, 461,530)
- Will the west-east alley from Flatbush to Vanderbilt Avenues become a wind tunnel making the interior space inhospitable? (107)
- Big buildings affect airflow in ways that cause discomfort and accidents. (228)
- How will hurricane winds interact with Gehry's design? (376)
- Brooklyn is in a hurricane path as discussed in *New York Times* article, "High Winds, Then I AS AS RESPONDER NO. 107 WHO GAVE BOTH WRITTEN AND VERBAL TESTIMONY AT HEARINGS IN BROOKLYN CONCERNING ATLANTIC YARDS, I have only been acknowledged as having given verbal testimony at a hearing. However, I submitted written testimony which included solar shadowing diagrams which were contrary to those published in the DEIS. I submitted this written testimony at the hearing when I testified verbally. I also submitted a longer version of our Pratt Institute School of Architecture shadowing research concerning Atlantic Yards by e-mail. The written commentary has not been acknowledged as part of the public record.

Today I am reiterating the fact that the draft EIS's shadowing impact analysis is incorrect and is shown in the final draft of the EIS as being far less impactful than our Pratt Institute research simulated with a highly sophisticated computerized system which projects shadows and shade that proposed and existed buildings create. The main reason there is a broad disparity between the EIS and the Pratt findings is the fact that for those buildings which will be shadowed by the Atlantic Yards development but which at the same time face away from the Atlantic Yards site -- that is, their front facades turn away from the site -- the shadowing of those very same buildings is deleted from the overall shadowing diagrams for a given time of day and month of the year. In other words, the shadowing of these buildings' roofs, their rear walls, their side walls, and their rear yards is completely discounted by being omitted from the shadowing diagram. Why would only the value of sunlight not being blocked from the front facade be the only consideration when shadowing by the Atlantic Yards buildings is taken into account? This is a grave mistake in the draft and final versions of the EIS for the project and will have consequences on our shared energy future for many years to come. The robbing of sunlight for the potential photovoltaic roofs and walls, the passive solar heating through windows, the value of gardens and "green roofs" which help lessen the impact of storm water drainage is bad public policy.

The wind impact of the Atlantic Yards development has not been adequately studied. There will be great impact from the amplification of wind through the heart of the nineteen buildings development. There will be enhancement of wind impact through the new high street walls along both Flatbush and Atlantic Avenues which has bearing on the projected impacts of future hurricane winds. Most important will be the daily downsweep of

high velocity winds caused by the new buildings which will be more than three times the height of the existing surrounding buildings. This impact is termed as the Monroe Effect. Research in Canada has shown the tremendous impact that the downsweep of wind from high buildings has on lowrise neighborhoods. There are other wind impacts as well. Brent M. Porter, Professor, School of Architecture, Pratt Institute.

Additional reference material:

Premiums," Dated September 26, 2006. (107)

- In Canada, projects like this one require a wind analysis. (106)
- It is already necessary to avoid Ashland Place, Hanson Place, and Flatbush Avenue Extension when windy because of extreme conditions. These will probably get worse with 16 very tall buildings. There are other streets near the Pratt Institute where the residential towers create serious wind tunnel effects on the streets. (69, 119, 235, 289, 341)
- A supplemental EIS is required because the DEIS ignored wind impact.