
**FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
MAIN STREET PLANNED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT
PROPOSED ISLANDIA VILLAGE CENTER
WEST SIDE OF VETERANS MEMORIAL HIGHWAY
(NYS ROUTE 454) AND SOUTH SIDE OF
MOTOR PARKWAY (CR 67)**

**INCORPORATED VILLAGE OF ISLANDIA
SUFFOLK COUNTY, NEW YORK**

SEPTEMBER 2008

**FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
MAIN STREET PLANNED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT
PROPOSED ISLANDIA VILLAGE CENTER
SOUTHWEST CORNER OF VETERANS MEMORIAL HIGHWAY (NYS ROUTE 454)
AND MOTOR PARKWAY (CR 67)
INCORPORATED VILLAGE OF ISLANDIA
SUFFOLK COUNTY, NEW YORK**

PROJECT LOCATION: 12.66± acres located on the southwest corner of Veterans Memorial Highway (NYS Route 454) and Long Island Motor Parkway (CR 67) in the Incorporated Village of Islandia, Suffolk County, New York. Suffolk County Tax Map Nos. District 0504 - Section 1 - Block 1 - Lots 7-10.

APPLICANT: Motor Parkway Associates, LLC
1000 Grand Boulevard
Deer Park, New York 11729

Contact: Vincent Pizzulli, Esq.
(631) 574-4510

LEAD AGENCY: Incorporated Village of Islandia
Board of Trustees
1100 Old Nichols Road
Islandia, New York 11749

Contact: Patricia Dorman, Village Clerk
(631) 348-1133

PREPARER & CONTACT: This Final Environmental Impact Statement (“FEIS”) was prepared by:

Freudenthal & Elkowitz Consulting Group, Inc.
1757-24 Veterans Memorial Highway
Islandia, New York 11749

Contact: Theresa Elkowitz, President
David M. Wortman, Project Manager
(631) 435-4800

With technical input from:

ADL III Architecture P.C.
24 Woodbine Avenue, Suite One
Northport, New York 11768
(Project Architect)

Nelson & Pope
572 Walt Whitman Road
Melville, New York 11747
(Project Engineer)

Dunn Engineering Associates, P.C.
66 Main Street
Westhampton Beach, New York
(Traffic Engineer)

DATE OF PREPARATION: September 2008

AVAILABILITY OF DOCUMENT: This document, together with the Voluntary Draft Environmental Impact Statement (“DEIS”), represents a Final Environmental Impact Statement (“FEIS”). It has been prepared for the Lead Agency, and copies are available for public review at the offices of the Lead Agency.

DATE OF FILING: September 30, 2008

This document represents a Final Environmental Impact Statement (“FEIS”) for the application of Motor Parkway Associates, LLC, which consists of an application for a change of zone and site plan approval for the development of the Islandia Village Center.

This FEIS incorporates, by reference, the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (“DEIS”) for this proposed action, dated November 2007 and last revised May 2008. The above-referenced DEIS was accepted as complete by the lead agency, the Board of Trustees of the Incorporated Village of Islandia, on July 1, 2008. The lead agency established a public comment period that closed on August 15, 2008.

Correspondence received during the aforesaid public comment period is provided in Appendix A of this FEIS.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. COMMENTS AND RESPONSES	2
Joseph Iannucci, AIA, Cashin Associates, PC.....	2
Anthony P. Trezza, KPC Planning Services, Inc.....	25
William Hillman, P.E., Suffolk County Department of Public Works.....	27
Stephen M. Jones, Suffolk County Water Authority	36

List of Appendices

- Appendix A - Written Correspondence Received during DEIS Public Comment Period
- Appendix B - Suffolk County Sewer Agency Resolution No. 9-2008
- Appendix C - Traffic Impact Study (Revised September 2008)
- Appendix D - Site Plan Package
- Appendix E - Preliminary Parking Layout for the Embassy Hotel
- Appendix F - Architectural Elevations

I. INTRODUCTION

This document is a Final Environmental Impact Statement (“FEIS”) prepared in response to comments received by the Incorporated Village of Islandia Board of Trustees, as lead agency, on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (“DEIS”) for the application of Motor Parkway Associates, LLC. The proposed action consists of an application for the establishment of a Main Street Planned Development District (“MSPDD”); the rezoning of the subject properties (12.66± acres located at the southwest corner of Veterans Memorial Highway and Motor Parkway in the Incorporated Village of Islandia, Suffolk County, New York) to the MSPDD; and site plan approval for the development of the Islandia Village Center. The Islandia Village center consists of one, eight-story residential building with a total of 150 condominium units; one, three-story hotel with 100 rooms; one, seven-story hotel with 175 rooms; two, one-story restaurant buildings; and one, two-story combined retail and office use building.

The DEIS identified and evaluated the potential impacts associated with the development of the Islandia Village Center, and identified mitigation measures, in accordance with the State Environmental Quality Review Act (“SEQRA”) and its implementing regulations at 6 NYCRR Part 617. Specifically, the DEIS evaluated impacts relating to land use and zoning, soils and topography, water resources, ecology, community services and utilities, transportation, air quality, noise, aesthetics and cultural resources. The DEIS was accepted as complete by the lead agency on July 1, 2008, and a public comment period was established, which closed on August 15, 2008. The comments received during the public comment period are included in Appendix A of this FEIS.

This FEIS includes two sections -- Section I, of which this is a part, is the introduction to the document, which describes the purpose of the FEIS as well as what is included in the document. Section II includes responses to comments received during the public comment period.

II. WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE

**Joseph Iannucci, AIA
Vice President
Cashin Associates, PC**

Comment No. 1:

In response to CA's¹ 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.

Response No. 1:

On May 19, 2008, the Suffolk County Sewer Agency re-approved the expansion of the Windwatch Sewage Treatment Plant (Suffolk County Sewer District No. 13) by 350,000 gallons per day (“gpd”). A resolution (No. 1627-2008) approving a construction agreement between Suffolk County Sewer District No. 13 and Motor Parkway Associates LLC was introduced in the Suffolk County Legislature on June 24, 2008. On August 12, 2008, the Public Works Committee referred the resolution to the Suffolk County Council on Environmental Quality (“CEQ”).

¹ Cashin Associates, PC

On August 20, 2008, the CEQ reviewed the proposed expansion of the Windwatch STP and recommended a SEQRA Negative Declaration. On September 9, 2008, Resolution No. 1627-2008 was approved by the Public Works Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature, and it is now scheduled for approval by the Suffolk County Legislature on September 16, 2008. A copy of the Suffolk County Sewer Agency's re-approval is included as Appendix B to this FEIS, and a copy of Resolution 1627-2008 will be forwarded to the lead agency upon approval by the Suffolk County Legislature.

Comment No. 2:

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 diminishments 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.

Response No. 2:

The revised Traffic Impact Study (“TIS”), included as Appendix C to this FEIS has been revised to clarify that the extension of the northbound left-turn lane on Veterans Memorial Highway (NY 454) to westbound Motor Parkway (CR 67), to a total length of 400 feet, is a mitigation measure that is the responsibility of the developer.

Comment No. 3:

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.

Response No. 3:

Sight distance measurements have been taken by Dunn Engineering Associates, P.C. at both proposed access points on Motor Parkway. The discussion in the revised TIS, included as Appendix C to this FEIS, has been expanded to include these observations.

On Veterans Memorial Highway, a lack of any horizontal curves or grade changes allows for unimpeded sight distance. Based on the measurements taken, the sight distance available at the easterly access on Motor Parkway will be approximately 360 feet after minor clearing of vegetation within the right-of-way only. Clearing within the subject site, as proposed, would increase this sight distance further. The westerly site access on Motor Parkway will have available sight distance of approximately 350 feet after some clearing of vegetation within the right-of-way to the south of the subject site. As such, there is more than adequate sight distance available.

Comment No. 4:

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.

Response No. 4:

The revised TIS, included as Appendix C to this FEIS, notes the provision of deceleration lanes at the site entrances. Based on the *Alignment Plan* (see Appendix D to this FEIS), these lanes can be accommodated within the rights-of-way, and therefore, no dedications would be necessary.

Comment No. 5:

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.

Response No. 5:

The Suffolk County Department of Public Works (“SCDPW”), the agency having jurisdiction over Motor Parkway (CR 67), has reviewed the application and confirmed the suitability of the proposed access plan. Moreover, the provision of a left turn lane at this location is not expected to cause any more difficulty than the existing right turn lane to enter the large office building across Motor Parkway from the subject property. The TIS contained in the DEIS included a discussion of the geometry of this lane-drop area constructed by the New York State Department of Transportation (“NYSDOT”) in the 1990s.

As excerpted from the section of the TIS entitled *Existing Roadway Network*, the geometry of the lane-drop area is discussed as follows:

“Motor Parkway (Suffolk County Road 67) is a major east/west Suffolk County highway facility providing direct access to the site. In the vicinity of the proposed development, Motor Parkway contains two eastbound travel lanes and one westbound travel lane, with additional turning lanes at major intersections. It should be noted that Motor Parkway has two thru lanes westbound at its intersection with Veterans Memorial Highway. West of Veterans Memorial Highway there is a lane-drop transition to a single westbound lane. This lane drop consists of a tangent run-out length, or acceleration length west of the stop bar at Veterans Memorial Highway where the two westbound lanes continue for a distance west of the intersection and a taper length which is the actual length of taper from where the two lane width ends to the point where a single lane width is realized. The current configuration was constructed by the NYS Department of Transportation (DOT) in the 1990’s.

Both of these distances have associated length standards based on Design Speed. Based on the 45 mph speed limit, the appropriate design speed here is 50 mph (posted speed & 5 mph). The standard acceleration distance, as set forth in the NYSDOT Highway Design Manual for acceleration length is 656 feet. Similarly, the lane-drop taper length standard is 600 feet as set forth in the NYS Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices. Measurement of field conditions reveal an acceleration distance of approximately 615 feet and a taper length of 605 feet. Therefore, while the lane-drop taper exceeds the standard, the acceleration length is 40 feet or 6% short of the standard. This is a minor deviation, put in place by state forces when the intersection of Veterans Memorial Highway at Motor Parkway was improved.”

Comment No. 6:

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.

Response No. 6:

The revised TIS, included as Appendix C to this FEIS, includes a discussion of egress to westerly destinations within the section entitled *Access Examination* (p. 76).

Vehicles exiting onto Veterans Memorial Highway will be approaching the Long Island Expressway (“LIE”) and its service roads, a well-signed interchange. Vehicles exiting onto Motor Parkway will arrive at Veterans Memorial Highway a short distance from the LIE and its service roads. It should also be noted that many visitors to the site would have navigated these same roadways to arrive at the site, and would, thus, have familiarity with the surrounding roadway system.

Comment No. 7:

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.

Response No. 7:

The SCDPW, the agency with jurisdiction over Motor Parkway, has reviewed the application and confirmed the suitability of the proposed access plan, without a signal. The site is expected to operate well as proposed. There are no restrictions to adequate sight distance, and the merge area is not anticipated to be a problem. See Responses to Comment Nos. 3 and 5, above, and Comment No. 31.

Comment No. 8:

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.

Response No. 8:

The comment is noted. Although on-site circulation and proposed points of ingress/egress are adequate, and the demand for on-site parking will not exceed the number of parking spaces provided, Motor Parkway Associates LLC recognizes the desirability of securing cross-access and parking agreements and has entered into discussions with Ivy Realty, LLC, the owner of the adjacent Met Life office building, to negotiate a cross-access and parking agreement. The proposed Master Plan contemplates a future cross-access point to the Met Life site (at the roundabout on the southern property line), and Ivy Realty, LLC has preliminarily advised that it is amenable to entering into a cross-access and parking agreement with Motor Parkway Associates, LLC. Copies of an executed agreement will be provided to the lead agency if negotiations are successful.

Comment No. 9:

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.

Response No. 9:

The revised TIS, included as Appendix C to this FEIS, reflects that these improvements are mitigation measures that are the responsibility of the developer.

Comment No. 10:

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.

Response No. 10:

Table 2 of the revised TIS (see Appendix C) includes “entering” and “exiting” percentages. This table is reproduced below:

Summary of Site-Generated Traffic

Component	Use	Weekday A.M. Peak Hour		Weekday P.M. Peak Hour		Saturday Peak Hour	
		Entering Veh. (% of total)	Exiting Veh. (% of total)	Entering Veh. (% of total)	Exiting Veh. (% of total)	Entering Veh. (% of total)	Exiting Veh. (% of total)
Residential	Residential Condominiums 150 Units (Land Use Code 230)	12 (17%)	59 (83%)	56 (67%)	28 (33%)	46 (54%)	40 (46%)
Retail	Shopping Center 15,000 S.F. (Land Use Code 820)	30 (61%)	20 (39%)	86 (48%)	93 (52%)	131 (52%)	121 (48%)
Office	General Office Building 16,922 S.F. (Land Use Code 710)	40 (88%)	5 (12%)	17 (17%)	81 (83%)	5 (N.I.) (54%)	4 (N.I.) (46%)
Restaurant	High-Turnover (Sit-Down) Restaurants 2-7,000 S.F. each (Land Use Code 932)	N/A	N/A	93 (61%)	60 (39%)	176 (63%)	104 (37%)
Lodging	Business Hotel 100 Rooms (Land Use Code 312)	34 (59%)	24 (41%)	37 (60%)	25 (40%)	37 (60%)	25 (40%)
	Hotel 175 Rooms (Land Use Code 310)	68 (58%)	49 (42%)	60 (49%)	62 (51%)	76 (50%)	76 (50%)
Total		184	157	349	349	466	366

Note 1: The proposed hotel will be a full-service hotel which provides amenities including a restaurant, conference facilities, spa, and ancillary shops and services.

N.I.: Not included in any of the analyses contained in the Traffic Impact Study.

N/A: Not applicable.

Comment No. 11:

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.

Response No. 11:

The revised TIS (see Appendix C) indicates that some internal credits were taken. In addition, an explanation of internal capture has been included in the revised TIS, within the section entitled *Site Trip Generation Analysis*.

As explained within the revised TIS, internal capture credits are adjustments applied to site-generated traffic figures that account for reductions in travel outside the site due to trips that occur between uses on the site itself. Such internal capture credits are appropriately applied to the proposed development, as it includes the development of residential, retail, office, restaurant and hotel uses on the same site. Based on methodology and adjustment rates provided within the Institute of Transportation Engineers' *Trip Generation Handbook*, internal capture credits were taken within the TIS for the following land use pairings: residential-retail; residential-office; residential-restaurant; and retail-office. No internal capture credit was taken for other relevant use pairings (retail-restaurant, office-restaurant, hotel-office, and hotel-retail) due to a lack of available data. Therefore, the internal capture credits taken within the TIS are considered to yield a conservative overall estimate.

Comment No. 12:

Reference to the Veterans Memorial Highway at Motor Parkway improvements cited on page 75 should provide the back-referenced page number, currently page 64.

Response No. 12:

The revised TIS (see Appendix C) contains changes to the section of the study entitled *Conclusions* to be more descriptive. Accordingly, the reference to a previous section is no longer necessary.

Comment No. 13:

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.

Islandia Village Center – Parking Requirements as per Village Code

<u>Use</u>	<u>Requirements</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.

Response No. 13:

As noted in the *Parking* section of the revised TIS (see Appendix C), it is clear that the Parking Schedule in the Village Code should not be applied to this site. The Parking Schedule reflects the peak accumulation of vehicles devoted to a single use. Many of the proposed uses will experience different peak parking times, and the multiple-use nature of the development will reduce the demands of each individual use as a result of known and proven interactions. As such, the application of the Parking Schedule rates would result in an over-construction of parking spaces on the site.

Moreover, the nature of this application, as a planned development district, allows for the adoption by the Village of requirements that are specific to this site and better reflect its somewhat unique nature. As a result, it is not necessary to provide parking to meet existing Code requirements. Through a detailed Shared Parking Analysis, the revised TIS (see Appendix C) illustrates that there will be sufficient parking on the site to meet the needs of the uses, even at peak. Moreover, KPC Planning Services, Inc., planning consultant to the Incorporated Village of Islandia, confirms the appropriateness of the shared parking analysis employed within the TIS (see Response to Comment No. 29).

Notwithstanding the above, the parking requirements for the site were calculated using the criteria in the Village Code Parking Schedule and in Comment No. 13, above. In this calculation, it is noted that no proposed condominium units would have greater than two bedrooms. The expected numbers of employees at peak periods in the two hotels are as follows: eight in the business hotel; and 20 in the larger hotel. Based upon these data, 976 stalls would be required.² The proposed site plan provides 805 parking stalls. This would represent a 17.5 percent shortfall of the Code requirements, were the Code to be applied to the proposed development.

Comment No. 14:

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.

Response No. 14:

See Responses to Comment Nos. 13 and 29. Based on the analysis performed and presented within the TIS, there will be adequate on-site parking.

² It should be noted that this is an estimate, as the layout of the restaurants has not been determined at this time, thus, the size of the bar area is not known.

Comment No. 15:

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.

Response No. 15:

The Shared Parking Analysis accounts for overlap in parking demand by summing the expected demand for each use for each hour of the day, not just their peaks. This is detailed in the series of 13 spreadsheets in the Appendix to the revised TIS (a copy of which is included as Appendix C of this FEIS).

The Shared Parking Analysis procedures used are based on field studies of the various uses. Use of actual demand data is the best way to predict demand of a proposed use. Significant amounts of parking demand data for all months and times are presented in the Appendix to the TIS (a copy of which is included as Appendix C of this FEIS).

The peak demand calculated is based on data and procedures developed from many field studies and compiled and published by the Urban Land Institute (“ULI”), the recognized international leader on issues related to land use and parking. Furthermore, from a practical perspective, it is not in the interest of a developer to construct a development that is under-parked, as doing so will have negative consequences in the operation and marketing of any such site.

In addition, Motor Parkway Associates, LLC and the Village of Islandia will enter into an agreement requiring mutual notice and coordination of the scheduling of any formal events at the Village Green. The scheduling of events will be coordinated and limited to dates and times that do not coincide with the peak operational hours of Islandia Village Center restaurants and any hotel conference events.

Comment No. 16:

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?

Response No. 16:

None of the proposed units has more than two bedrooms. Also, guests of condominium residents will park within the condominium parking structure. The Village Code requirements for condominium units consider, within that requirement, the expectation of visitors. These visitors are not expected to park in the shared areas.

Comment No. 17:

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.

Response No. 17:

The internal layout of the condominium building and its parking structure is currently in its preliminary design stages, which is typical and appropriate for this initial change of zone phase of the overall review process. The final design will be developed in full compliance with New York State Building Code and Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA") regulations.

Comment No. 18:

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.

Response No. 18:

The stalls under the large hotel are treated properly, as these stalls are open for public use to anyone on the site. At the rear of the hotel, the spaces are at-grade and accessible like the other spaces. They are, in effect, surface parking stalls, and hotel guests are also considered to be mixed-use site users.

Comment No. 19:

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.

Response No. 19:

The comment references Village Code requirements for parking, and this issue has been addressed in the Responses to Comment Nos. 13 and 29.

Moreover, the site plan for Islandia Town Center is designed to mimic a downtown “Main Street” style of development. Nonetheless, the business hotel has 57 stalls in an area directly adjacent to the hotel and a drop-off/check-in area directly in front of the building.

As with the rest of the non-residential portions of the proposed Islandia Village Center, hotel patrons and employees have access to the entire parking area of 542 spaces. When the business hotel is reaching peak parking demands, the adjacent retail and office uses are experiencing declining demand or closing. The Shared Parking Analysis within the TIS (see Appendix C) demonstrates that adequate parking will be available at all times.

The layout of the site with the hotel, in proximity to the Village Green, restaurants and retail uses, is expected to be beneficial to hotel patrons who can walk to these facilities.

Comment No. 20:

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.

Response No. 20:

The *Alignment Plan* has been revised to locate accessible stalls under the building near the elevator (see Appendix D to this FEIS). A *Preliminary Parking Plan* has been developed for the Embassy Hotel, and is included as Appendix E to this FEIS. Accessible stalls and ingress/egress routes for this parking area are shown thereon.

Comment No. 21:

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.

Response No. 21:

See Response to Comment No. 8.

Comment No. 22:

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.

Response No. 22:

Motor Parkway Associates, LLC and the Village of Islandia will enter into an agreement requiring mutual notice and coordination of the scheduling of any formal events at the Village Green. The scheduling of events will be coordinated and limited to dates and times that do not coincide with the peak operational hours of Islandia Village Center restaurants and any hotel conference events.

Comment No. 23:

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.

Response No. 23:

The parking proposed along the north-south travel aisles adjacent to the retail buildings is designed to be on-street parking. Perpendicular parking is not appropriate, as it requires wider travel aisles which foster increased vehicle speed, and detract from the goal of providing a walkable downtown atmosphere. Without wider travel aisles, perpendicular parking would require a vehicle exiting a stall to back into the aisle traveling the opposite direction of preferred egress. Adequate circulation is provided within the site to allow navigation in the desired direction. Thus, angled parking is appropriate and feasible, as proposed.

Comment No. 24:

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.

Response No. 24:

As explained in Response to Comment No. 23, perpendicular parking is not an appropriate design for on-street parking as it widens the street and brings a vehicle exiting a stall into the opposite travel direction. There is adequate circulation provided within the site to allow navigation in the desired direction. The medians are proposed as a traffic calming and pedestrian-friendly measure, and a place-making technique. The medians also provide additional tree canopy for shade, and more pervious surface area at the site. If deemed necessary by the lead agency, U-turns will be prohibited.

Comment No. 25:

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.

Response No. 25:

Given the configuration of this intersection and the proposed traffic controls, vehicles in the site that are turning from a travel aisle must yield to entering vehicles, and therefore, will not interfere with the movement of entering vehicles. In addition, the access plan provides for a 40-foot length of throat in the driveway as well as a deceleration lane on Veterans Memorial Highway. This will ensure that, in the unlikely event that entering vehicles are delayed, they will not interfere with traffic along Veterans Memorial Highway.

Comment No. 26:

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.

Response No. 26:

The locations of the handicap stalls on the site plan represent the areas nearest to where entering doors are anticipated. These stalls can be relocated, if necessary after the exact locations of the entry doors are determined, with no net change to the total parking provided.

Comment No. 27:

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.

Response No. 27:

The roadway jog is located in a parking area where speeds are low and driver attention and expectation of conflicting vehicle movements is high. A driver's tendency to "cut the corner" would not be any more dramatic than his/her tendency to do the same as he/she negotiates a left turn at the end of any parking aisle. In this context, no significant conflicts are expected to result.

Comment No. 28:

None of the buildings has a delivery zone to accept truck deliveries.

Response No. 28:

Consistent with the shared parking and mixed-use design of the site, and with smart-growth techniques, loading spaces will be shared with other site users when not used for loading. This is also a common practice in “Main Street” design. Notwithstanding this, dedicated loading spaces for the restaurant uses are depicted on the *Alignment Plan* in Appendix D to this FEIS.

**Anthony P. Trezza
Principal Planner
KPC Planning Services, Inc.**

Comment No. 29:

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 the 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.

Response No. 29:

The comment is noted.

Comment No. 30:

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.

Response No. 30:

Alternative architectural designs for the proposed office/retail and restaurant buildings have been developed, and are provided in Appendix F to this FEIS. The intent of the architectural designs portrayed by these elevations is to create a development with a sense of place and give the Village of Islandia a character and a core. The architecture developed at this preliminary change of zone phase is in its initial design stage, designed primarily to illustrate building massing and form. The alternate architectural styles that are included in this proposal for the two restaurants and the retail/office building are examples of effective “Main Street” architecture, which embody a more varied design style that complements the architecture of the other buildings on the site and in the surrounding neighborhood. The architectural style of these three buildings (see Appendix F) also provides enough contrast and variation to assure a more interesting pedestrian experience for the shopper or anyone who is looking for a compelling and enjoyable village experience.

William Hillman, P.E.
Chief Engineer
Suffolk County Department of Public Works

Comment No. 31:

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.

Response No. 31:

The comment is noted.

Comment No. 32:

Provide sidewalk, sidewalk ramps and curbing along the CR 67 frontage.

Response No. 32:

Sidewalk and sidewalk ramps are included along all roadway frontages, as depicted on the revised *Alignment Plan* in Appendix D to this FEIS.

Comment No. 33:

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.

Response No. 33:

The site plan has been designed to keep all on-site drainage within the site boundaries (see *Drainage Calculations / Structure Tables* in Appendix D of this FEIS).

Comment No. 34:

The latest site plan should be included with the TIS.

Response No. 34:

Future submissions will include the latest site plan package.

Comment No. 35:

On page 14 a linear growth rate of 1.5% is stated. Reference to the LITP 2000 Alternative 2 is needed.

Response No. 35:

Reference to the LITP 2000 is included in the revised TIS (see Appendix C to this FEIS). However, as per subsequent consultations with Mr. Justin Hipperling and other representatives of the SCDPW, the LITP 2000 “No-Build” Alternative rate was utilized.

Comment No. 36:

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.

Response No. 36:

Consultations with Mr. Justin Hipperling and other representatives of the SCDPW, undertaken subsequent to the issuance of this comment regarding the specifics of this development and the trip generation rates utilized, indicate that the appropriate rates were used in this case.

Comment No. 37:

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.

Response No. 37:

The revised TIS, included as Appendix C to this FEIS, states that the restaurants on the site will be of the type that are closed during the weekday A.M. peak hours.

Comment No. 38:

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.

Response No. 38:

Based on discussions with Mr. Justin Hipperling and other SCDPW representatives, given the very low levels of traffic generation by an office use on a Saturday and its corresponding very low percentage of trips compared to the site as a whole, the lack of Saturday trip generation for the office has no significant effect on the analysis results. The revised TIS, included as Appendix C to this FEIS, contains a discussion of this issue.

Comment No. 39:

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.

Response No. 39:

The revised TIS, included as Appendix C to this FEIS, has been modified to indicate that this credit was taken.

Comment No. 40:

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.

Response No. 40:

The revised TIS, included as Appendix C to this FEIS, contains a discussion regarding the method of calculating internal credits within the section entitled *Site Trip Generation Analysis*. See also Response to Comment No. 11.

Comment No. 41:

Without a site plan, reviewing and commenting on the direction distribution is difficult.

Response No. 41:

The Incorporated Village of Islandia circulated the DEIS to the SCDPW, and the DEIS contained both the site plan and the TIS. Notwithstanding this, subsequent submissions as the review process progresses will include copies of the most recent site plan. The revised TIS includes a detailed discussion of the directional distribution applied within the section entitled *Directional Distribution Analysis*.

Comment No. 42:

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?

Response No. 42:

The revised TIS, included as Appendix C to this FEIS, has been modified to eliminate reference to the Computer Associates expansion. The report now proposes mitigation at this intersection and identifies this work as the developer's responsibility. This includes the cited left-turn phase (see the section of the TIS entitled *Roadway Modifications*).

Comment No. 43:

Capacity Analysis should be conducted using SYCHRO when analyzing coordinated traffic signals.

Response No. 43:

Subsequent consultations with Mr. Justin Hipperling and other representatives of the SCDPW on this issue have indicated that the HCS analysis performed for this study is acceptable.

Comment No. 44:

The Peak Hour Factor should be calculated by approach, lane group or movement.

Response No. 44:

The revised TIS, included as Appendix C to this FEIS, includes an analysis performed with an approach-based peak hour factor. The results of the analysis are not significantly changed for those presented in the DEIS.

Comment No. 45:

Were vehicle classification counts conducted or were the heavy vehicle percentages just an assumption?

Response No. 45:

The heavy vehicle percentages used for Veterans Memorial Highway and the LIE Service Roads (five percent) were obtained from NYSDOT published data. The percentage used for other roadways is the default value in the HCS software package.

Comment No. 46:

Is NYSDOT Traffic Signal Operations willing to make the proposed signal timing changes?

Response No. 46:

The TIS study has been submitted to NYSDOT for its review and input as this intersection is within the NYSDOT's jurisdiction.

Comment No. 47:

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

Response No. 47:

The revised TIS, included as Appendix C to this FEIS, has been modified to eliminate reference to the Computer Associates expansion. The report now proposes mitigation at this intersection and identifies this mitigation as the developer's responsibility (see the section of the TIS entitled *Roadway Modifications*).

Comment No. 48:

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.

Response No. 48:

This comment refers to the CR 67 at NYS Rt. 454 intersection noted in Comment 47. The TIS has been submitted to NYSDOT for its review and input as this intersection is within its jurisdiction.

Comment No. 49:

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.

Response No. 49:

Subsequent consultations with Mr. Justin Hipperling and other representatives of the SCDPW have confirmed that the above comment is intended to read, “[t]hat signal timing change should not be made...” The study has been submitted to NYSDOT for its review and input as this intersection falls within its jurisdiction. Nonetheless, the proposed timing change is intended to improve the operation of the overall intersection, with particular emphasis on the major roadway (i.e., the LIE North Service Road).

Comment No. 50:

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.

Response No. 50:

The comment is noted.

Comment No. 51:

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.

Response No. 51:

The comment is noted.

**Stephen M. Jones
Chief Executive Officer
Suffolk County Water Authority**

Comment No. 52:

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.

Response No. 52:

The comment is noted and acknowledged. The plan has been revised to depict the easterly extension of the existing 12-inch water main along Motor Parkway to Veterans Memorial Highway as well as the required pressure reducing valve (see *Utility Plan I* and *Utility Plan II* in Appendix D of this FEIS).

Comment No. 53:

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.

Response No. 53:

The comment is noted.

Comment No. 54:

Additionally, domestic and fireline services will require back flow devices.

Response No. 54:

The comment is noted and acknowledged. The plan has been revised to include back flow prevention devices within the proposed buildings at each of the entering domestic and fire lines (see *Utility Plan I*, *Utility Plan II* and *Utility Plan III* in Appendix D of this FEIS).