

3.9 TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

Comment 3.9-1 (Mr. Dennis Sullivan, Public Hearing, July 14, 2008): I also want to make sure that the record had my concern about the traffic entering from Interstate 84. It has been proposed that the traffic would be kind of distributed between the Exit 1 in Connecticut and the other one off Route 121. And I would like to find out more about that, as I found it unlikely that people from Connecticut would actually drive past Route 121 to get to the site...

Response 3.9-1: *Traffic traveling to the Stateline Retail Center from Connecticut on Interstate 84 has two options for accessing the site. The first is to get off Exit 1 on Interstate 84 and travel west along US Route 6 then turn left into the site at the eastern (main) access. The other option is to stay on Interstate 84, the higher speed roadway, and exit onto Route 121, then travel on eastbound US Route 6 and access the site in the form of a right turn movement at the central access. This later option includes a portion of trips which can be classified as "diverted link and passby trips" which are both attracted to stop at the retail center from the surrounding traffic stream. These trips would include drivers using the Stateline Retail Center sign element, designed to reflect the building architecture, proposed at the top of the retaining wall along Interstate 84 as a visual cue to exit the interstate to access the site and those drivers making impulse stops. Depending on the time of day, some motorists will use the latter since it can be done as all right turn movements, avoids three traffic signals, and eliminates two left turn movements which results in both actual and perceived time savings. Thus, the traffic analysis evaluates the effect of traffic traveling on Interstate 84 from Connecticut using both interchange routes.*

Comment 3.9-2 (Ms. Ann Fannizzi, Public Hearing, July 14, 2008): [T]here was a news article of December 13th, 2007, and it was in the Putnam (indiscernible) and the heading was, Bondi Blasts Connecticut Over Huge Development, and Mr. Bondi's problem with this huge development, which I think we're all aware of, was the question of traffic. And I'll just read just a portion of it. Bondi was furious when he's advised of the plan. Two thousand units of housing on the state line will hurt our County tremendously. We had hoped to use whatever excess capacity as the state board for commercial development. That will now be precluded because Putnam will have to deal with 2,000 new families driving up and down our roads due to the enormous development. I can't imagine what traffic will look like. Now, I'm wondering if the traffic analysis [for] this particular development and its impact on our roads taken into consideration?

Response 3.9-2: *The development in question is "The Reserve". The Reserve project and its traffic generation was included in the traffic analysis in the DEIS. As documented in the DEIS on page 3.9-19:*

"The development projects considered in this traffic analysis are those currently under review (pending) by the Planning Boards in the Town of Southeast and neighboring municipalities and those that have been approved but are not yet built. These No Build projects are listed in Table 3.9-8, Approved or Pending Projects in Site Vicinity. Appendix Tables N-1 and N-2 of Appendix N show trip rates and trips from the No Build projects.

The largest of these projects, the Reserve in Connecticut, with over 2000 residential units and 1,000,000 square feet of nonresidential development, has specific improvements associated with it as outlined in Appendix O. This project will increase traffic in the Study area especially at the Interstate 84 Exit 1 ramp

intersections with Saw Mill Road. Improvements undertaken by The Reserve project were taken into consideration as part of the No Build Condition. Traffic improvements in the Interstate Exit 1 area that were committed to as part of The Reserve project, as shown in Appendix O Figure O-1, include:

- *Widening Interstate 84 Exit 1 eastbound off ramp for a second turn lane*
- *Restriping of Interstate 84 westbound off ramp for revised lane configuration*
- *Signalization of Eastbound ramp intersection with Saw Mill Road*
- *Synchronizing Eastbound Ramp signal with Westbound ramp signal*
- *Re-timing westbound ramp signal*
- *Restriping turn lanes on Saw Mill Road at Exit 1 to provide three to four lanes from US Route 6 past the Interstate 84 ramps*
- *Widening Saw Mill Road to lengthen northbound right turn lane at the eastbound Interstate 84 ramps.”*

Refer to Table 3.9-8, Approved or Pending Projects in Site Vicinity on Page 3.9-21 of the DEIS and Appendix O of the DEIS for additional information on The Reserve.

Comment 3.9-3 (Mr. Frank Moraco, Public Hearing, July 14, 2008): I am a resident of Putnam County, and I own a business in Southeast. I just want to say I welcome a project like this. I think that the County and town needs it, but I would like to know the follow up on the traffic issues. Route 6 is basically a siphoning corridor from Brewster, Westchester into Connecticut. I just want to know if the traffic design is taking into account the fact that a lot of the traffic that's going to be going into this facility may actually be traffic that was going to be on Route 6 any way going down towards other facilities, if that's taken into account in the traffic analysis.

Response 3.9-3: *The Traffic Impact Study contained in the DEIS included consideration of “pass-by” trips. These “pass-by” trips represent the portion of traffic which is already on the adjacent roadway system and which would be attracted to a commercial development. The “pass-by” trip estimate used conforms with the criteria of the New York State Department of Transportation. The access and related traffic improvements are designed to adequately accommodate all of the trips entering and exiting the site.*

Comment 3.9-4 (Ms. Lynn Eckhart, Public Hearing, July 14, 2008): [W]hen they discuss the widening of Route 6, I was curious to who would pay for the [improvements], whether it will be on our dime or New York State or whether that will be applicant who pays for that.

Response 3.9-4: *The access improvements on US Route 6 including the widening to provide turn lanes and signalization at the primary site access will be undertaken at the sole expense of the Applicant. Refer to Figure 3.9-1 for a depiction of the Conceptual Access Improvements Plan.*

A Conceptual Access Improvement Plan and SYNCHRO Analysis for the project have been provided to the NYSDOT. Refer to Appendix E, Correspondence for a copy of the transmittal letter dated August 13, 2008 from John Collins Engineers, P.C. The NYSDOT responded to this submission with the comments documented in their letter dated 11/20/08 (Appendix E). The attached drawings from the Project Traffic Engineer depict the Conceptual Access Improvement Plan presented to the NYSDOT in response to their 11/20/08 comments. The Applicant will continue to work with the State to finalize the roadway improvement plan and obtain a Highway Work Permit.

Comment 3.9-5 (Mr. George Tremblay, Public Hearing, September 8, 2008): How many of the three entrances would have a traffic light?

Response 3.9-5: *A traffic signal is proposed at the main (eastern) access to the retail portion of the development. The secondary access to this parcel is proposed as a right turn entry/right turn exit and will not be signalized. The access to the standalone office building will also not be signalized.*

Comment 3.9-6 (Mr. Jesse M. Vazquez, PhD., Letter #2, September 28, 2008): As a homeowner on Joe's Hill Road, Dingle Ridge Road, 121, and other local arteries leading to Stateline, we are concerned that the increase in traffic would further erode the safety on those roads and bring increasing congestion. On Joe's Hill Road alone, in recent years, I have witnessed the increase in traffic volume and speed of vehicles using this road as a short cut to and from the Danbury border. That volume gradually increased after a stretch of Joe's Hill was blacktopped as part of a small residential development a number of years back. Exiting one's driveways is now a quite risky during the AM and PM rush hours and in between. The developer does not seem to account for this in his report. It seems clear that prospective shoppers headed for a future shopping mall are likely to add to the volume of traffic on this and other side town road. The second stream of traffic will come from delivery trucks and vans headed for Stateline, day and night. What assurances do we have that our back roads will not turn into a freeway for trucks and shopper traffic?

Response 3.9-6: *Truck traffic to and from the Stateline Retail Center will access the site via the US Route 6 driveways. The majority of this traffic would travel on either the US Route 6, Interstate 684, Interstate 84 or the US Route 22 corridors. There is not expected to be any significant increase in truck traffic from the project on Joe's Hill Road. It is expected that existing residences along Joe's Hill Road will patronize the proposed development and many of these vehicles are already present on this roadway since they are currently shopping at other locations and would use Joe's Hill Road to access US Route 6 to get to these locations. It is not expected that there will be a significant increase in the amount of new traffic from the proposed development that will be added to this roadway.*

Comment 3.9-7 (Mr. Jesse M. Vazquez, PhD., Letter #2, September 28, 2008): [The project] benefits Southeast precious little in the long run, but would have the potential of adding more traffic, and possibly more blight to an already poorly developed corridor leading to Brewster Village, and will greatly demand much from our existing services and infrastructure.

Response 3.9-7: *Refer to Response 3.3-4 in Section 3.3 of this FEIS for a response pertaining to the blight, existing services and infrastructure portion of the comment.*

During typical peak periods, this section of US Route 6 has significant reserve capacity. As indicated on the site generated traffic figures contained in the DEIS, the proposed development is expected to generate new traffic on the roadway system and the access improvements are designed to accommodate the additional vehicles. As identified in the Traffic Impact Study, it is also anticipated that a portion of the trips will be attracted from the existing traffic stream and will not be new trips added to the roadway system.