



APPENDIX A



July 10, 2008

Honorable Allan M. Dorman, Mayor
Incorporated Village of Islandia
1100 Old Nichols Road
Islandia, NY 11749

Re: Review of the revised Voluntary Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Islandia Village Center Main Street Planned Development District: West Side of Veterans Memorial Highway (NYS Route 454) and South Side of Motor Parkway (CR 67)
SCTM Nos. District 0504; Section 1; Block 1; Lots 7, 8, 9, and 10
Motor Parkway Associates, LLC

Dear Mayor Dorman:

Pursuant to your request, Cashin Associates, P.C. (CA) has:

- reviewed the revised Voluntary Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Proposed Main Street Planned Development District ("Islandia Village Center") prepared by Freudenthal & Elowitz Consulting Group, Inc. dated August 2006, revised November 2007 and revised May 2008;

The purpose of the DEIS is to provide a basis from which the Village Board (Lead Agency) can evaluate the environmental impacts of the subject rezoning and site development, determine the suitability of proposed project mitigations, and fulfill the requirements of the State Environmental Quality Review Act (6 NYCRR Part 617). The DEIS contains a series of project plans, environmental information and traffic data, identifies potential impacts and impact mitigations, and provides descriptions and evaluations of project alternatives.

The following comments are offered for the Village Board's consideration in determining whether the scope, content, adequacy, and accuracy of the DEIS is sufficient for Board acceptance for the public review process. The comments and issues discussed below should be addressed in an Addendum to the VDEIS.

Wastewater

In response to CA's December 17, 2007 DEIS review report, the applicant has submitted Suffolk County Sewer Agency Resolution 41-2005 dated November 21, 2005 indicating the Agency's authorization for Motor Parkway Associates to expand the Windwatch Sewage Treatment Plant in an appropriate amount to serve the proposed development.

The last section of the resolution states that the:

“resolution shall become null and void, and no further force or effect, without any further action by this Agency or notice to Motor Parkway Associates if, within one (1) year from the date of the adoption hereof, an agreement in furtherance of the authorization granted herein (the Construction Agreement), in a form and content satisfactory to the Chairman of this Agency, has not been negotiated and fully executed by all parties thereto.”

Based on the above, it is unclear whether an agreement in furtherance of the authorization has been negotiated and fully executed and therefore whether the agreement is still in effect. Prior to a final decision on the rezoning, documentation should be provided demonstrating that the agreement is still in effect.

Traffic

A review of the Traffic Impact Study, incorporated into the DEIS submitted by the applicant, Motor Parkway Associates, dated September 2003, last revised May 2008, was performed by Cashin Associates. The purpose of the study was to assess the adequacy and accuracy of the DEIS for public review and consider traffic impacts of the proposed development of the 12.66 acres located on the southwest corner of the intersection of Veterans Memorial Highway (NY 454) and Motor Parkway (CR 67).

The proposal intends substantial development of this site: 150 residential condominiums, 15,000 square feet of retail space, 16,992 square feet of office space, two 7,000 square foot “high-turnover (sit-down)” restaurants, a 100-room three-story business hotel, and a seven story, 175-room *Embassy* hotel with a 4,884 square feet conference/banquet room and a “small” restaurant. The site is currently undeveloped.

Based on the foregoing, the following comments relating to the traffic study are provided:

1. The study cites the need to extend the existing northbound left-turn lane on Veterans Memorial Highway (NY 454) to westbound Motor Parkway (CR 67) to a total length of 400'. It includes this modification as a “recommendation,” not as a mitigation measure.

A review of trip generation figures and capacity analysis results shows, however, that the need to extend the left-turn lane comes as a direct result of traffic increases

caused by site-generated trips and not as a result of future ambient traffic flows. This is evidenced by the increases in northbound left-turn volumes from 73 vehicles under 2009 “No Build” Conditions to 146 vehicles under 2009 “Build” Conditions during the morning peak traffic hour. Similar increases occur during the evening peak traffic hour, from 71 to 182, and during the Saturday mid-day peak hour, from 42 to 193. There are also correlating diminishment in levels of service (LOS) for the left-turn movement for each of the peak periods studied. The level of service during the weekday morning peak period drops from LOS E to LOS F; the weekday evening peak period drops from LOS E to LOS F; and the Saturday mid-day period drops from LOS D to LOS E.

Under relevant SEQRA provisions, the need to extend the left-turn lane for the purpose of accommodating site-generated traffic is a required measure to mitigate traffic conditions that result from the proposed action. Accordingly, the applicant is responsible for constructing the additional length for the northbound left-turn lane. Otherwise, the development proposal must be modified to eliminate the need for this mitigation. The extension of the left-turn lane is also subject to the review and approval of the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT). The need to provide this mitigation must be included in both the traffic study and the main body of the DEIS.

2. The study states that adequate sight distance exists at both exits from the site along Motor Parkway (CR 67), but provides no quantitative analysis to support the claim. Considering the horizontal and vertical curves on Motor Parkway in proximity to the exits, further analysis is necessary.

Studies have shown that motorists require a simultaneous gap of 6.5 seconds in the traffic flow on a two-lane highway to safely execute a left-turn from an intersecting side street, with a half-second ($\frac{1}{2}$ sec.) added for each additional lane to be crossed. For intersections where only right-turns are permitted, as is the case for the proposed action, the “start-up lost time” figure of 4 seconds, as utilized in *Highway Capacity Manual 2000* capacity analysis calculations, is considered the gap time required for a motorist to safely enter the highway. “Start-up lost time” refers to the time it takes for a motorist to realize a gap exists, react to the gap, and to accelerate to the necessary speed to safely enter the traffic flow.

Standard traffic engineering practice further expands the use of these gap times to be equivalent to safe sight distance times. Along the subject portion of Motor Parkway, the design speed is fifty miles per hour (50 mph), or 73.33 ft./sec. Multiplying this figure by 4 seconds, the result is 293.33 feet, which is the minimum clear sight distance for a motorist to safely exit either of the driveways.

As both exits provide acceleration lanes, however, the lengths of the respective lanes, exclusive of the taper lengths, are subtracted from the safe sight distance figure. As both acceleration lanes are 100 feet long, the study must demonstrate that there is unobstructed sight distance of 193.33 feet from each of the exit driveways.

If this sight distance does not exist, a sight distance easement, or other sight distance improvements, will be required.

3. The traffic study discusses the availability of acceleration lanes at the exits from the site, but does not mention the provision of deceleration lanes on the approaches to the entrances for the site. These should be noted and that their placement is within the existing shoulder areas of the abutting highways. Upon review by NYSDOT and the Suffolk County Department of Public Works (SCDPW), highway dedications may be required to accommodate the acceleration and deceleration lanes.
4. There is a merge of two lanes into one lane, with a right-turn lane into the office complex on the north side of CR 67, in proximity of the easternmost driveway for the site along Motor Parkway. This change from two through lanes to one is characterized by competitive, if not aggressive, driving behavior among westbound motorists jockeying for position. The addition of a left-turn lane to enter this site in the vicinity of this merging movement could exacerbate the situation.
5. There is no direct westerly egress from the site. The study should mention that egress to westerly destinations is accomplished through a series of right-turns from the site exits utilizing Motor Parkway, Veterans Memorial Highway, and the LIE North Service Road.

The lack of direct egress to westerly destinations may prove confusing to visitors to the site. With the presence of two hotels, it is likely that many visitors to the site will not be familiar with the area roadway system. This increases the potential for motorists to become lost or become distracted as they seek ways to head westbound.

6. While it is acknowledged that SCDPW has stated it does not want a traffic signal installed at the easterly site access along Motor Parkway, the placement of a signal should be pursued, considering the sight distance limitations, the westbound merge, the presence of another driveway directly across from this site access, and the lack of direct egress to westerly destinations. Installation of a traffic signal would provide safer and more orderly control of traffic flow at the location.

Signalization would allow for left-turns from the site to westbound CR 67 and the crossing of CR 67 from the offices on the north side of the road. The left-turns from the site would improve and shorten the route for destinations west of the site and reduce the proposal's impacts on the NY 454/ CR 67 and NY 454/ North Service Road intersections. Permitting CR 67 crossings from the businesses on the north side of the road will also improve access from these businesses to the proposed site amenities and reduce impacts on the immediate roadway network. If a traffic signal design is approved, it is recommended that a signal face be provided on the northeast corner of the existing driveway controlling eastbound traffic on CR 67.

7. While cross-access agreements between adjoining property owners are difficult to obtain, due to liability issues, these, too, should be pursued. Cross-access

agreements would improve circulation for the affected lots, reduce demands at the various access points, and allow for the acceptance of overflow parking conditions, should they occur. Cross-access also provides the potential to improve trip distribution and improve “Build” condition traffic flows, depending on where cross-access agreements could be implemented.

8. The study (page 64) lists improvements needed to provide acceptable 2009 levels of service, delays and volume/capacity ratios. The applicant should be required to provide these improvements, with the exception of the construction of the through lanes on NY 454, to mitigate the proposal’s impact on the NY 454/CR 67 intersection.
9. It is customary to provide “entering” and “exiting” percentages on the Trip Generation Table so that it is clear how the trip generation amounts were assigned. In lieu of this, copies of the associated pages from the *ITE Trip Generation, 7th Ed.*, manual can be provided.
10. The study states that no internal capture of trip was taken, but Table 30 (page 30) shows internal trip credits as being taken. This must be corrected. An explanation of “internal capture” trips should also be provided.
11. Reference to the Veterans Memorial Highway at Motor Parkway improvements cited on page 75 should provide the back-referenced page number, currently page 64.

Parking

The Islandia Village Center Traffic Impact Study addresses the issue of the various land uses proposed and the demand for on-site parking these uses will generate. It argues that the simple summation of each use’s parking needs or applying code requirements would result in providing more parking spaces than needed leaving less space for landscaping or property to be dedicated to the Village.

Applying the Village of Islandia zoning code Parking Schedule, section 177, attachment 7:1 [Amended 2-1-1996 by L.L. No. 2-1996] requirements to the proposed uses on this site yields 862.46 parking stalls required, as shown on the attachment. Additional requirements under the code would add one more parking stall for each hotel employee, plus one for each condominium unit with more than two bedrooms and additions to the restaurants’ requirements if they are to contain bar areas. The information needed to assess the actual number of parking stalls required by code is not provided in the study. This information should be provided to determine exactly how much the number of stalls proposed falls short of the requirements.

On-site parking is a critical factor to this proposal as there is no on-street parking available along the County or State road frontage and most off-site parking would require pedestrian crossings of these highways.

The study discusses shared parking, giving an example of office space and hotel peak parking needs occurring at non-coincidental times. While this is true there will be many times when the parking needs of these uses overlap. In the example provided, for instance, the morning arrival of office workers may occur before most hotel guests have checked out and given up their parking spots.

The other condition where shared parking occurs is in visits to more than one site use in the same auto trip as in a hotel guest using the restaurants. While these shared parking scenarios will reduce the demand for on-site parking, it is difficult to quantify. The study's analysis refers to a *Shared Parking* document (Smith, Mary S., *Shared Parking*, Second Edition, Washington, D.C.: The Urban Land Institute and the International Council of Shopping Centers) and uses its methods in Table 10, Peak Parking Needs, July Weekend and in the Shared Parking Calculations in the appendix.

The study does not explain the "captive adjustments" and factors used in the shared parking analyses. The International Council of Shopping Centers might have some bias in assessing the number of parking spaces required by various businesses. The assertion that the peak parking demand will occur at 6:00 p.m. on a July weekend is not supported. That would be a likely time for Village residents to use the amphitheater and dedicated land.

The condominium parking meets the code requirements of 263 stalls if none of the units has more than two bedrooms. This parking is separated from the analysis as it will not be shared but used exclusively by residents. Will their guests park there or in the areas shared by all the other uses?

The condominium parking facility is not shown in the plans for the site so its circulation and stall layout is not known. The Americans with Disabilities regulations require that seven accessible parking spaces be provided for a lot of this size with minimum 96" wide access aisles. The other 511 parking stalls on the site would need 2% of that total, or 11 accessible stalls, to comply with A.D.A. requirements. The layout of the parking garage beneath the proposed condominium should be provided in order to demonstrate the achievement of the projected number of suitably-sized standard and handicap parking spaces, while accommodating any other essential features such as stairwells and elevator shafts.

The shared parking analysis also does not properly address the 61 parking stalls under the *Embassy Hotel*. It includes these stalls in the shared parking analysis, but they are only realistically available to hotel employees or guests. Accordingly, they should be deducted from the quantities used in the shared parking analysis. Only surface parking stalls should be included.

The business hotel requires 100 stalls plus one for each employee. The distribution of parking spaces is not favorable to this hotel, with most being located away from it.

The *Embassy Hotel* is better situated as to access to parking. The 61 stalls below the building do not have accessible parking. Instead the handicapped parking is outside on the south side of the building. The erosion control plan shows only entering access to the parking below the building.

Cross-access to adjacent properties' parking areas has been recommended to provide better circulation and additional points of ingress/egress for this site. Cross-access would also make shared parking spaces available should the demand for on-site parking exceed the number of parking spaces provided.

As per page 5 of the Consent Agreement, the Village Green will serve as a public space with "public assembly facilities for outdoor public entertainment and use." Parking has been reduced far below minimum Village standards based on proposed space sharing between uses. Page 87, third paragraph of the DEIS, indicates that an assessment of traffic associated with public events was not conducted. Due to the fact that the parkland is being offered to the Village and will be available to all Village residents and the general public, some discussion of access, parking, and trip generation should be provided. As it stands, it does not appear that the proposed public space which is being offered for dedication to the Village would be accessible to, and serve as an amenity for anyone but patrons and residents of the site due to insufficient parking. Moreover, parking on-site by the general public for events could limit on-site business (hotel, retail, restaurant, and office) parking.

Site Circulation and Parking Layout

1. Parking along the north-south two-way travel aisles adjacent to the retail buildings should be oriented perpendicularly to the abutting curb lines. The angled-parking shown on the site plan makes it difficult for motorists traveling in the opposite direction of the obtuse angle of the parking stalls to enter the stalls. There is sufficient width available to provide 90° stalls with travel aisles of standard widths of twenty-four feet (24'). Parking oriented in a perpendicular fashion will also maximize parking availability.
2. Similar to comment #1, the east-west travel aisle with angled parking between the restaurants and the *Embassy Hotel* will be difficult for motorists to negotiate. The presence of the median islands will also tend to encourage motorists to attempt U-turns to access parking stalls. The parking stalls should be oriented perpendicularly and the islands should be removed.
3. The north-south travel aisles adjacent to Veterans Memorial Highway are too close to the highway. Vehicles executing turns from the travel aisles may conflict with vehicles entering the site. The travel aisles should be set back further from Veterans Memorial Highway.

4. Depending on how the retail buildings are separated into individual stores, additional handicap-parking stalls may be required along the sides of the building that face east. The Building Code requires that the handicap-parking stalls be located on the shortest route(s) to the accessible entryways.
5. The roadway jog near the southeast corner of the *Marriot Hotel* may cause conflicts between vehicles traveling in opposite directions. Westbound motorists will tend to cut the corner, due to the natural driving transition between the travel aisles.
6. None of the buildings has a delivery zone to accept truck deliveries.

ATTACHMENT

Islandia Village Center – Parking Requirements as per Village Code

<u>Use</u>	<u>Requirement</u>	<u>Proposal</u>	<u>Parking Stalls Required</u>
Condominiums*	1.75/unit + 1/bedroom >2	150 units +?	262.5 + unknown
Retail space	1/150 sq. ft. GFA	15,000 sq. ft.	100
Office space	1/200 sq. ft. GFA	16,992 sq. ft.	84.96
Restaurants	2/200 sq. ft. or 1/2 seats 1/12 sq. ft. bar area	14,000 sq. ft. + ?	140 + unknown
Business hotel**	1/room + 1/employee	100	100 + unknown # of employees
Embassy hotel **	1/room + 1/employee	175	175 + unknown # of employees

Total required by Village of Islandia code: 862.46 + an unknown # as per above additions.

This number represents the minimum amount of parking required by code. Each condominium unit with more than 2 bedrooms requires 1 additional space. The restaurants require 1 stall per each 2 permanent seats or 2 per 200 square feet G.F.A., which ever is greater, plus 1 for each 12 square feet of standing room in the bar area. The hotels each require 1 additional parking space per employee. These additive factors can not be quantified as the study does not provide the information on these variables:

- a) how many condos have more than 2 bedrooms?
- b) does either restaurant have a bar area?
- c) how many employees will each hotel have?

These factors all represent additions to the 863 minimal number of parking spaces required under Village of Islandia code. The proposal calls for 802 total parking spaces.


- * The Parking Schedule does not list "condominiums", *per se*.
Land Use 2, Apartment house or Town house was used: 1.75 parking spaces per dwelling unit, plus 1 additional space for each additional bedroom above 2 in each unit.
- ** The schedule does not differentiate hotel types. Use 2, Hotels or motels, requires 1 parking space per sleeping room or suite, plus one for each hotel employee.

As stated above the comments and issues discussed should be addressed in an Addendum to the VDEIS.

If you have any questions or need additional information please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

CASHIN ASSOCIATES, PC



Joseph Iannucci, AIA
Vice President

Cc: Village of Islandia Trustees
Patricia Dorman, Village Clerk, Village of Islandia
Joseph Prokop, Esq.
Gerald Peters, Building Inspector, Village of Islandia
Kyle Collins, AICP, KPC

9092.372

I:\PROJECTS\VILLAGE OF ISLANDIA\9092.372 - Motor Parkway Assoc EIS review\Reports\MB second DEIS review July 2008.doc



PLANNING SERVICES, INC.

August 15, 2008

Honorable Allan M. Dorman, Mayor
Incorporated Village of Islandia
1100 Old Nichols Road
Islandia, NY 11749

RE: Review of Voluntary Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Islandia Village Center Main Street Planned Development District: West Side of Veterans Memorial Highway (NYS Route 454) and South Side of Motor Parkway (CR 67)
SCTM#: 504-1-1-7,8,9 & 10
Motor Parkway Associates, LLC

Dear Mayor Dorman:

On July 15, 2008, the Board of Trustees of the Village of Islandia deemed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Main Street Planned Development District (Islandia Village Center) prepared by Freudenthal & Elkowitz Consulting Group, Inc. dated August 2006 and last revised May 2008, adequate for public review and initiated the required 30 day comment period. We have reviewed the DEIS and offer the following specific comments and recommendations for the Village's consideration:

1. We agree with the shared parking analysis provided in the DEIS, based on the standards and procedures established by the Urban Land Institute, which are widely used and accepted in the industry. In keeping with the principle of establishing a Village Center which includes a mix of land uses, including residential and commercial, within the context of a traditional "main street" design, shared parking is a critical element in meeting this objective. Compatible and complementary occupancies within the proposed development will reduce the number of car trips because occupants are more likely to find it convenient to walk to nearby services. Therefore, it is contradictory to the principles of good planning to utilize the standard parking requirements of the Zoning Code, which will result in an overabundance of parking, thereby compromising the opportunities for natural landscaping and creative site planning.

Although there are a number of goals in a project of this nature, one of the most important elements is the flexibility of design, particularly as it relates to the

traditional zoning requirements. It would not be possible, or desirable, to create a Village Center, with flexibility, by relying on the requirements of the Zoning Code, including parking. In fact, to do so would undermine the very nature of a PDD, which is to apply different development standards in order to achieve a desired outcome – in this case, the creation of a Village Center.

2. The Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) must include alternatives as it relates to the architectural style of the proposed commercial buildings. Because this is a mixed-use PDD, the detailed design elements are critical in evaluating whether or not the project will be successful in establishing a Village Center within the context of a “main street” style of development. Architecture, in this regard, places an emphasis on beauty, aesthetics, human comfort, and creating a sense of place. The architectural styles of the proposed buildings will physically define the streets as places of shared use and adds character, provides visual interest, builds value, promotes security, and helps define the community. It is a major consideration by the Planning Board in evaluating the merits of the proposed project and therefore alternative architectural styles need to be discussed and evaluated in detail in the FEIS, particularly as it relates to the overall streetscape contemplated for this site.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please call me at (631) 998-3919.

Sincerely,



Anthony P. Trezza
Principal Planner

cc: Village of Islandia Trustees
Patricia Dorman, Village Clerk
Joseph Prokop, Esq.
Joseph Iannucci, AIA, Cashin Associates, P.C.

COUNTY OF SUFFOLK



STEVE LEVY
SUFFOLK COUNTY EXECUTIVE

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

THOMAS LAGUARDIA, P.E.
CHIEF DEPUTY COMMISSIONER

GILBERT ANDERSON, P.E.
COMMISSIONER

LOUIS CALDERONE
DEPUTY COMMISSIONER

July 8, 2008

RECEIVED
JUL 10 2008

BY: _____

Ms. Patricia Dorman, Village Clerk
Incorporated Village of Islandia
Board of Trustees
1100 Old Nichols Road
Islandia, New York 11749

**Re: Voluntary Draft Environmental Impact Statement
Main Street Planned Development District
Proposed Islandia Village Center
w/s NY 454 & s/s CR 67**

Dear Ms. Dorman:

Please refer to your recent submittal of the Revised May 2008 Voluntary Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Main Street Planned Development District for the proposed Islandia Village Center. We had unofficially reviewed the Traffic Impact Study (TIS) portion of this document and via letter of April 18, 2008 (see attached), we transmitted our comments on the TIS to Dunn Engineering. Please incorporate our comments into the official public record for this project.

A permit from this Department will be required pursuant to Section 136 of the Highway Law for the proposed access and any improvements this Department deems necessary along the County right-of-way.


Before a permit is issued by this Department for these improvements, documentation pursuant to Section 239F of the New York State General Municipal Law must be forwarded to us from the Town Building Department for our review and comments.

An impact fee will be required.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact myself or Justin Hipperling, Highway Planning and Permits at 852-4100.

Very truly yours,

William Hillman, P.E.
Chief Engineer

By: 
Justin Hipperling
Highway Planning & Permits

cc: Patrick Lenihan, P.E., Dunn Engineering ✓

SUFFOLK COUNTY IS AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY/AFFIRMATIVE ACTION EMPLOYER

KR

COUNTY OF SUFFOLK



STEVE LEVY
SUFFOLK COUNTY EXECUTIVE

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

THOMAS LAGUARDIA, P.E.
CHIEF DEPUTY COMMISSIONER

GILBERT ANDERSON, P.E.
COMMISSIONER

LOUIS CALDERONE
DEPUTY COMMISSIONER

April 18, 2008

Mr. Patrick Lenihan, P.E.
Dunn Engineering Associates, P.C.
Consulting Engineers
66 Main Street
Westhampton Beach, NY 11978

**Re: CR 67, Motor Parkway and NY 454, Veterans Memorial Highway, Village of Islandia
Proposed Islandia Village Center**

Dear Mr. Lenihan:

Please refer to your October 5, 2007 letter transmitting a site plan and Traffic Impact Study (TIS) for the proposed Islandia Village Center development. We have reviewed this information and offer the following preliminary comments:

1. We will permit "right turns in – right turns out" at the westerly entrance to/from CR 67 and "right turns in – right turns out" and a westbound CR 67 left turn lane only at the easterly entrance to/from CR 67.
2. Provide sidewalk, sidewalk ramps and curbing along the CR 67 frontage.
3. All drainage must be contained on-site. For future plan submittals provide existing grades on all intersections/streets abutting CR 67 so we can check drainage flow lines. The existing intersection/street curb lines and centerline grades should be provided a minimum of 100 feet beyond the CR 67 right-of-way line.
4. The latest site plan should be included with the TIS
5. On page 14 a linear growth rate of 1.5% is stated. Reference to the LITP 2000 Alternative 2 is needed.
6. The Trip Generation should be calculated using the higher of "Peak Hour of Generator" or "Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic" for each land use and peak hour.
7. On page 26 it is stated that the Restaurant (Land Use 932) will be closed during the AM peak hour and so no trips will be generated during the AM peak hour. Unless the hours of operations are already determined and restricted as part of the application, this assumption should not be made and trips should be generated during the AM peak hour as per ITE.

8. On page 26 it is stated that the General Office Building (Land Use 710) will be closed during the Saturday peak hour and as such no trips will be generated during the Saturday peak hour. Unless the hours of operations are already determined and restricted as part of this application, this assumption should not be made and trips should be generated during the Saturday peak hour as per ITE.
9. On page 29 it is stated that no credit for internal traffic is taken for the high-turnover restaurants. However, in table 3 a 10% Residential/Restaurant internal credit is shown.
10. The method for calculating the internal credits for all the land use components should be described. The pass-by credits for Retail and Restaurant (thought 40% is on the high side of the ITE data) seem acceptable but there is no way to evaluate the method used for the internal credits without more information.
11. Without a site plan, reviewing and commenting on the direction distribution is difficult.
12. On page 58 it is stated that the addition of a westbound protected-permissive left turn phase was required for the proposed Computer Associates Phase II expansion, which has been indefinitely postponed. However, the westbound left turn phase is used in the Supplemental Capacity Analysis. Will this actually be constructed? If so, by whom?
13. Capacity Analysis should be conducted using SYCHRO when analyzing coordinated traffic signals.
14. The Peak Hour Factor should be calculated by approach, lane group or movement.
15. Were vehicle classification counts conducted or were the heavy vehicle percentages just an assumption?
16. Is NYSDOT Traffic Signal Operations willing to make the proposed signal timing changes?
17. Will NYSDOT construct the improvements to CR 67 at NYS 454 (pages 64-65)? If NYSDOT has not agreed to this and the applicant is not going to construct it, there is no reason to include it in the same table and column as signal timing changes. If the improvements are not made to the CR 67 at NYS 454 intersection there will be significant impacts to the specific movements.
 - AM Peak No Build vs. Build – WB LT D/51.8 to E/56.6, NB LT E/70.9 to F/210.9
 - PM Peak No Build vs. Build -- WB LT F/102.9 to F/168.9, NB LT E/58.0 to F/81.9
 - SAT Peak No Build vs. Build – NB LT D/46.5 to E/73.3
18. Was a queuing analysis performed in conjunction with the signal timing modifications? Even if the signal timing changes improve delay, as per the Highway Capacity Manual, if the changes create queuing and blocking problems then the timing modifications should not be used.
19. The southbound right turn movement to CR 67 @ LIE NSR degrades from a D with 45.2 seconds of delay for the 2009 no-build to an F with 100 seconds of delay in 2009 build with modifications. That signal timing change should be made as it will have an adverse impact on the intersection.

Mr. Patrick Lenihan, P.E.
Page 3
April 18, 2008

A permit from this Department will be required pursuant to Section 136 of the Highway Law for the proposed access and any improvements this Department deems necessary along the County right-of-way


Before a permit is issued by this Department for these improvements, documentation pursuant to Section 239F of the New York State General Municipal Law must be forwarded to us from the Town Building Department for our review and comments.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact myself or Justin Hipperling, Traffic Engineer I at 852-4100.


Very truly yours,

William Hillman, P.E.
Chief Engineer

By: _____


Justin Hipperling
Traffic Engineer I

WH:JH:RR:dm



VILLAGE OF ISLANDIA

SUFFOLK COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY

Stephen M Jones
Chief Executive Officer

Administrative Offices: 4060 Sunrise Highway, Oakdale, New York 11769-0901
(631) 563-0219
Fax (631) 563-0370

July 15, 2008

Patricia Dorman, Village Clerk
Village of Islandia
1100 Old Nichols Road
Islandia, NY 11749

Re: Islandia Village Center PDD
SCTM# 0504-1-1-7 thru 10

Dear Ms Dorman:

Your notification for SEQR Coordination was received and reviewed by our agency.

Please be advised that our agency, the Suffolk County Water Authority, has no objection to the Village of Islandia Board of Trustees assuming Lead Agency status for the project captioned above.


The Authority's distribution system is adequate to provide water to the site, however, the developer will be responsible for the cost of tying in the dead end main on Motor Parkway easterly to Veterans Highway with the addition of a pressure reducing valve.

The subject project is within a low pressure area, however the applicant acknowledges this and indicates that they will comply with all SCWA's requirements to ensure that the distribution system is designed accordingly. The applicant also notes that low-flow plumbing fixtures will be used to further reduce potable water use.

Additionally, domestic and fireline services will require back flow devices. You may contact Donna Stein, SCWA's RPZ Supervisor at 631-563-0244 for further information on back flow prevention.

I thank you for the opportunity to comment on this application and am available to address any questions you may have.

Very truly yours,


Stephen M. Jones
Chief Executive Officer

SMJ:kk