In a subtle but meaningful shift, the environmental impact review process in New York is beginning to more systematically consider the potential effects of a changing climate on proposed projects, not just the effects that a project might have on the environment. In other words, rather than just considering the greenhouse gas emissions from individual projects, environmental impact statements (EISs) are now considering how a proposed project will be affected by anticipated sea level rise, increased storm surges, and the like. In the past year, most New York City environmental impact reviews for projects located in floodplains have explicitly addressed adaptation to climate change, and several EISs in other parts of the state have also discussed how a changing climate may affect the proposed project.

**Background**

In 1970, the federal government enacted the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), which required federal agencies to evaluate the environmental effects of a wide variety of federal actions, including direct federal undertakings, funding and permitting. Many states followed suit with so-called “mini-NEPA” laws, requiring evaluation of the environmental impacts of state and often local actions. New York State enacted its mini-NEPA law, the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), in 1975. New York City in turn implements SEQRA via its own environmental review procedures, the City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR).\(^1\)

The purpose of these laws is to ensure that government agencies are aware of and disclose to the public the potential impacts of their actions on the “environment.”\(^2\) Although climate change has emerged as among the most important environmental issues, the environmental impact review process has been slow to meaningfully include climate change considerations, and methodologies for analyzing environmental impacts—including climate change—vary across jurisdictions.

The principal challenge in assessing a project in terms of climate change under the traditional methodology of environmental impact assessment is that greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions are a global...
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Consideration of Climate Adaptation and Resiliency Policies

Although specific climate change adaptation guidance is inconsistent among jurisdictions, adaptation has emerged as an important environmental policy, and is reflected in numerous official written government policies. Because an aspect of environmental impact review is considering official laws and policies, those adaptation policies are important elements in encouraging lead agencies to include an adaptation analysis.

In May 2014, the New York State Legislature passed a bill called the “Community Risk Reduction and Resiliency Act,” which would amend certain sections of the Environmental Conservation Law, Agriculture and Markets Law and Public Health Law to promote greater awareness of and preparedness for climate change-associated risks such as sea level rise and flooding. If signed into law, the bill would, among other things, require the Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) to adopt regulations establishing science-based state sea level rise projections. Although this bill would not specifically amend SEQRA, it would further evidence a strong environmental policy to consider how future climate risks affect discretionary state decisions.

Additionally, recently adopted revisions to the City’s local waterfront revitalization program (LWRP) require consideration of climate change and sea level rise for projects located in the designated coastal zone.

Consideration of Climate Resiliency in Recent CEQR and DEC Environmental Impact Statements

While there still is no definitive policy or guidance document setting forth how or when an EIS should consider adaptation to climate change, New York City has begun to routinely include an analysis of a project’s resiliency to certain impacts of climate change in environmental impact statements over the last year or so, as have several DEC SEQRA EISs.

City CEQR environmental review documents for projects located in floodplains (or that will likely be located in future floodplains given projected sea level rise) now include discussions of adaptation and resilience, and also reference the City’s LWRP. The following projects include such a discussion:

- **625 West 57th Street,** Rezoning of portion of a Manhattan block to permit 1.1 million gross square feet of residential, commercial, community facility and parking uses. Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, December 7, 2012 (City Planning Commission).
• **Cornell USA Tech.** Various approvals to allow for the development of an applied science and engineering campus on Roosevelt Island. Final Environmental Impact Statement, March 8, 2013 (Mayor’s Office of Environmental Coordination).

• **Governors Island.** Completion of Park Master Plan and the re-tenanting of approximately 1.2 million square feet of North Island historic structures by 2022, as well as expanded ferry service. Final Supplemental Generic Environmental Impact Statement, May 23, 2013 (Mayor’s Office of Environmental Coordination).

• **Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center Ambulatory Care Center and CUNY/Hunter College Science and Health Professions Building.** Hospital and City university partnering to acquire an approximately 66,111-square-foot, City-owned site on the Upper East Side of Manhattan to build a new ambulatory care center and Science and Health Professions Building. Final Environmental Impact Statement, August 8, 2013 (Mayor’s Office of Environmental Coordination).

• **Willets Point Development Project.** Modifications to previously approved plan for 61-acre district in Queens. Overall project would comprise approximately 108.9 acres and up to 10.34 million square feet of development. Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, August 9, 2013 (Mayor’s Office of Environmental Coordination).

• **Hallets Point Rezoning.** Mixed-use development on eight parcels on the East River in Astoria, Queens, including publicly accessible waterfront open space, an esplanade and a supermarket. Final Environmental Impact Statement, August 9, 2013 (City Planning Commission).

• **Seaside Park and Community Arts Center.** Creation of a new recreational and entertainment destination on the Coney Island Boardwalk, including a 5,100-seat seasonal amphitheater for concerts and other events, the creation of approximately 2.41 acres of publicly accessible open space, and the reuse of the landmarked former Childs Restaurant Building as a restaurant and banquet facility. Draft Environmental Impact Statement, September 15, 2013 (Mayor’s Office of Environmental Coordination).

• **Gun Hill Square.** Development of a pedestrian-oriented open-air urban shopping center and a single residential building containing senior housing, on an approximately 12.6-acre site in the Bronx. Draft Scope of Work, July 2, 2014 (Mayor’s Office of Environmental Coordination).

• **Astoria Cove.** Various zoning and other approvals sought to facilitate mixed-use development on 8.7-acre site in Astoria on the East River. Development will include approximately 1,689 dwelling units (295 affordable units), local retail space including a supermarket and a site for an elementary school. Draft Environmental Impact Statement, April 18, 2014 (City Planning Commission).19

Portions of each City project listed above are either located in the current 100-year floodplain, as designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), or are projected to be located within a floodplain in the future based on projections of the New York City Panel on Climate Change (NPCC). Most of the documents reference the City’s then-proposed revision to the LWRP, which was formally adopted by the City Council in October 2013. The Gun Hill Square and Astoria Cove documents were prepared after the City Council adopted the new waterfront program. Citing the NPCC’s projections, which forecast a local sea level rise of 12 to 23 inches by the end of this century (up to 55 inches with rapid ice melt), the EISs generally consider whether the design of the proposed project would be able to withstand flooding if the 100-year flood level rose by two feet.

In the Gun Hill Square project, which is undergoing scoping, an early stage in the environmental review process, the Draft Scope of Work indicates that, because the project site is located within existing and future projected flood zones, the DEIS will include discussion of (1) projected future sea level rise and likely future flood zones for different years within the expected life of the development; (2) government initiatives to improve coastal resilience; and (3) an analysis of consistency with policy 6.2 of the City’s revised waterfront revitalization plan, which provides for the integration of consideration of projections of climate change and sea level rise into the planning and design of projects in the City’s coastal areas.20

The Astoria Cove DEIS indicates that a small portion of one proposed building is located in a current floodplain, and that additional buildings would be located in the 100-year and 500-year floodplains based on NPCC projections for the 2020s and 2050s.21 For one building projected to fall within the 100-year floodplain by 2050, the DEIS states:

Should the base flood elevation rise to these projected elevations in the future, the Applicant anticipates retrofitting the perimeter of the building with flood prevention systems (either temporary or permanently installed flood gates/shutters), potentially in conjunction with an emergency flood protection plan. In addition, as a small portion of [that building] falls within the [current] 100-year flood zone, provisions to address potential flood risks have been developed in the building design.22

---


20 See New York City LWRP, supra note 18, at 43.
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22 Astoria Cove DEIS at 2-24; see also id. at 15-10.
For buildings proposed in later phases of that project, the DEIS indicates that future building codes and other design requirements will address flood concerns.\(^{23}\)

The Hallets Point Rezoning FEIS considers another proposed mixed-use development along the East River in Astoria, Queens. The Hallets Point FEIS states that “[s]ince the proposed site is on the waterfront, the potential effects of global climate change on the proposed project are considered and measures that could be implemented as part of the project to improve its resilience to climate change are discussed.”\(^{24}\)

After discussing various federal, state and local resilience policies, the FEIS states that “the only issue for which the project can prepare, within its context and location, is potential future flooding, i.e., designing the project to withstand and recover from flooding and to ensure that hazardous materials and other potentially dangerous items would not end up in floodwaters.”\(^{25}\) The FEIS then analyzes the project-area flood elevations using the latest FEMA information, plus sea level rise as projected by the NPCC. The FEIS concludes that while the proposed project would be above the current 100-year flood level and projected mid-century flood levels, it “may be within the range of end-of-century 100-year flood levels.”\(^{26}\) Although not formally called environmental “mitigation,” the FEIS states that proposed buildings “would be flood-proofed and would utilize flood barriers on an as needed basis (i.e., before predicted severe storm events).”\(^{27}\)

In the Seaside Park project in Coney Island, the DEIS discloses that the basement areas of a renovated restaurant would be lower than current flood levels and future flood levels could reach the ground floor. However, the DEIS states that in addition to meeting all building code requirements, all mechanical equipment will be at roof level, and electrical switchgear will be on the first level, elevated two feet above the floodplain.\(^{28}\)

The FEIS for the 625 West 57th Street project in Manhattan, which includes residential, commercial, community facility and parking uses, indicates that the western portion of the project would be subject to flood levels two feet higher than current levels. The FEIS states, however, that the portion of the project site subject to future flooding would only include non-critical retail frontage, and that no residential areas, critical infrastructure or openings leading to lower-lying project areas would be in the areas subject to increased flooding.\(^{29}\)

The other EISs contain similar discussions of potential future flooding, and all discuss measures to make each project more energy efficient and sustainable. The adaptation analyses are limited to flooding and do not include discussion of other potential climate impacts, such as more intense heat waves.

Outside of New York City, several EISs where DEC is the lead agency also discuss the changing climate’s effect on the proposed project. For instance, the DEIS for the Haverstraw Water Supply Project, a proposal to build a desalinization plant for Hudson River water, includes a chapter on global climate change, which discusses projected increased precipitation, droughts and sea level rise, and how those changes would affect water quality (salinity, turbidity, water temperature, etc.) and water levels. The DEIS indicates that the design of the plant takes projected flood levels into account, and is being built to one foot above the current 500-year flood zone, and is designed so that if floods are higher, doors can be elevated to provide additional flood protection.\(^{30}\)

Another EIS considering future climate conditions is the Cumulative Impacts Analysis for the Belleayre Mountain Ski Center located in the Catskills.\(^{31}\) The Cumulative Impacts Analysis addresses rising temperatures and how they would affect a northeast ski area, water availability, increased runoff from more intense storms and changes in vegetation and pests due to rising temperatures.\(^{32}\)

**Consideration of Climate Resiliency in California**

In marked contrast to New York, it is up to the courts to decide whether California may affirmatively foreclose any discussion of the effects of climate change on a proposed project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). In a series of cases, a small number of California courts have held that the purpose of CEQA “is to identify the significant effects of a project on the environment, not the
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significant effects of the environment on the project." In Ballona Wetlands, a California appellate court held that the environmental impact report for a proposed mixed-use residential development did not need to consider whether the project would be threatened by rising sea levels due to climate change.

Although the California Supreme Court declined to hear an appeal of Ballona Wetlands, it subsequently took the appeal in a case with a similar CEQA issue—California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District, which involves the promulgation of air quality standards in the San Francisco area. At issue are air quality standards affecting so-called “new receptors”—in other words, new people, such as those working or residing in a new residential or commercial development in an area with existing air pollution. A trade group representing the building industry challenged the threshold standards, arguing that the “purpose of CEQA is to protect the environment from proposed projects, not to protect proposed projects from the existing environment.” The California appeals court rejected that argument, which it characterized as based on just a “quartet of cases concluding an EIR is not required for a proposed project based solely on the effect of the environment on people who will live and work at the site of the project.” In November 2013, the California Supreme Court agreed to hear the trade group’s appeal, limiting its review to the following issue: “Under what circumstances, if any, does the California Environmental Quality Act . . . require an analysis of how existing environmental conditions will impact future residents or users (receptors) of a proposed project?”

The case was briefed in the spring of this year and has generated enormous interest in the environmental and building communities. Nineteen organizations, including building, business, housing, planning, environmental and municipal groups, have been granted amicus status. The California Supreme Court’s decision will have significant implications for whether CEQA (and possibly other environmental review statutes) can be used to prepare for and adapt to the effects of climate change.

Concluding Thoughts

Notwithstanding the California litigation, it seems clear that environmental impact review statutes such as NEPA, SEQRA and, yes, even California’s CEQA, are not only flexible enough to accommodate disclosure of the effects of climate on a proposed project, but likely to require it. There is no principled reason for excluding disclosure of environmental impacts on the proposed project site, as opposed to the wider environment at large. The definition of “environment” under each statute is broad, and neither the statutes, regulations nor caselaw distinguish between the “environment” of the project site and the wider world. Moreover, it is well-established practice to analyze other environmental effects on the project site itself, such as hazardous contamination, flora and fauna, the presence of archaeological and historic resources, and the like. Omitting such areas from an environmental impact statement would be improper. Likewise, as is becoming accepted practice, discussing the impacts of the future environment due to a changing climate on a proposed project fulfills the purpose of the environmental review laws.
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LEGAL DEVELOPMENTS

AGRICULTURE & FOOD

Appellate Division Found That Occasional Foie Gras Consumption Did Not Have Standing to Seek State Foie Gras Ban

The Appellate Division, Third Department, ruled that the Animal Legal Defense Fund (ALDF) and an individual petitioner lacked standing to seek a ban on force-fed foie gras in an action against New York’s Commissioner of Agriculture and Markets, the Department of Agriculture and Markets and New York producers of foie gras. Petitioners alleged that the force-feeding of geese or ducks to enlarge their livers caused the animals to be diseased and the food products created from them to be adulterated, and that such products should therefore be prohibited from entering the food supply. The Third Department ruled that the individual petitioner, who alleged that he occasionally consumed foie gras and was therefore at an increased risk of the medical condition secondary amyloidosis, could not benefit from “enhanced risk” standing because his “risk of exposure” was minimal (given his “occasional” consumption) and the “indication of harm” was uncertain (given that petitioners had identified no case of secondary amyloidosis being linked to foie gras). The individual’s alleged injury was therefore speculative and conjectural. The Third Department also declined to find that ALDF had standing.
