

COMMENT MISC-1 (Miscellaneous):

We would like to express our support for the "Glen Isle" project, presently under your consideration. We strongly feel that this project, as presently conceived, will contribute greatly to the progress, well-being and quality of life of Glen Cove. We presently live nearby, in Glen Head, and visit Glen Cove very often.

Oscar and Patricia de Rojas, Glen Head, NY electronic message, dated July 21, 2009

As I said, at every other meeting, I have been in favor of this development, and it's a long-time coming. I only have a couple of concerns from what was just brought up during the presentation.

Dr. Jonathan Turman, Glen Cove resident, business owner, Public Hearing Transcript, City of Glen Cove Planning Board Meeting, June 25, 2009, Section 66, lines 8-13; p.59

And lastly, since RXR took over or -- not took over, but became part of the development team, we really did see an uptick in public outreach and dialogue, and I think that's reflective on a number of meetings, but also the content and quality of the meetings that we can ascertain and the dialogue and the changes in the plan.

We like to see public outreach, we like to see the dialogue, we like to see comments addressed over time, and folks overall seem to be very flexible from our outside observer's viewpoint.

Mr. Eric Alexander, Executive Director, Vision Long Island, Public Hearing Transcript, City of Glen Cove Planning Board Meeting, June 25, 2009, Section 73, lines 24-25; Section 74, lines 1-15; pp.65-66

My name is Richie Zembelli. I'm proud to say I'm a lifelong resident of this community.

I want to say that I want to congratulate the Planning Board, the developers, Mayor Suozzi for this also important project.

I just think it's vital to the community. I grew up here my whole life and think putting it into motion is so important, and that's all I have to say.

Mr. Richie Zembelli, resident, Public Hearing Transcript, City of Glen Cove Planning Board Meeting, June 25, 2009, Section 88, lines 1-25; p.78

I am a strong supporter of this vision for the waterfront of Glen Cove, a vision brought to us by three courageous men, Mr. Rechler, Mr. Monti and Mr. Posillico, and who have planned something that is truly beautiful.

But it's really difficult when you look at a screen and you see these wonderful visions of what the City could be and to try to put it into a reality base. So I would like to try to do that tonight.

And the way I would like to do that is to ask everybody in the audience by a raise of hands, how many people have been to Boston Harbor or Faneuil Hall?...

...Now, Hempstead Harbor is not Boston Harbor. It's a much cleaner harbor. And Glen Cove Creek will be that vision. You know, obviously in a smaller scale.

But when you look at what the -- the jobs that were created, they -- there are six major four-star and five-star hotels, there are hundreds of restaurants, there are thriving businesses.

It has brought vibrant, commercial traffic and retailers and obviously consumers into the area, created thousands and thousands of jobs and made it a wonderful working place.

It did nothing but make that city terrific and a jewel, and that's how I see this vision that these developers have put forward tonight, and that's what I wanted to say. Thank you.

Mr. Stan Levin, resident, Public Hearing Transcript, City of Glen Cove Planning Board Meeting, June 25, 2009, Section 89, lines 7-25; Section 90, lines 1-25; Section 91, lines 1-25; Section 92, lines 1-20, pp.79-82

But I trust the Glen Cove administration to be the citizens' watchdog and ensure that all these environmental requirements will be met.

And I have faith that the developing team that – of RexCorp/Glen Isle will not only adhere to these recommendations, but go beyond what is the standard.

I applaud you all and am thrilled to be finally standing on the threshold of this progress.

Yes, I do have a vested interest, no doubt about it. My office is, as I said, across the street from the development site.

Ms. Jadwiga Brown, resident of Sea Cliff, business owner, 40 Garvies Point Road, Glen Cove, Public Hearing Transcript, City of Glen Cove Planning Board Meeting, June 25, 2009; Section 109, lines 16-25; Section 114, lines 9-25, pp.101-102

As I said when I spoke at the public hearing I am very much in favor of this project. I do understand that there issues that need resolution - however I feel confident that you, the Glen Cove Planning Board, will address each issue and work with the developer in producing a project that will enhance the quality of life in Glen Cove marrying progress with the preservation of nature.

After all the bickering I am delighted to see progress being made and feel comfortable that the FEIS will reflect the needs of the city, the developer and the people in and around Glen Cove. The relationship between the municipality and the developer is unique in that it sees the private sector fully cooperating with the municipality for the mutual benefit of both. It took a long time to get to this point, but we are there and I applaud all those who are part of making this project viable.ity. I now look forward to the next steps - the planning board approving the project and the permits being issued. The city needs the cash flow and the citizens of Glen Cove need the jobs that will be created.

Jadwiga Brown, email dated July 18, 2009

I haven't seen a presentation as nice as this that I can remember. Some very good ones, but this is very nice, very thorough, and it's a good lead into the work that's going to be done and needs to be done in the future. It's obviously not the end; it's the beginning.

Now, speaking as a Second Vice President and member of the Board of the Glen Cove Chamber of Commerce, I want the Planning Board to understand that we are behind the development of the Creek fully properly done, and that is all I have to say.

Glen Howard, 18 Southfield Road, Glen Cove, Second Vice President and member of the Board of the Glen Cove Chamber of Commerce, Public Hearing Transcript, City of Glen Cove Planning Board Meeting, June 25, 2009; Section 123, lines 15-25; Section 124, lines 1-5, pp.109-110

I am a new resident to Glen Cove from Setauket and I am thrilled to see that Glen Cove is developing the waterfront. The City is also taking advantage of the economic crisis in planning this project so that when the market returns (hopefully) it will be under construction. My wife and I would love to live on the waterfront and I would also take the ferry to work as opposed to the train. I do not have any questions at the moment, I just wanted to let the Board know that we support this project and look forward to its completion over the next few years.

Tony Oliveri, Avalon North, Glen Cove, NY, undated letter, received July 15, 2009

The recent set of successful community outreach that ensued with the inclusion of RXR as a partner on the project addressed a set of earlier process concerns our organization had for this project.

Eric Alexander and Elissa Ward, Vision Long Island, 24 Woodbine Ave., Northport, NY, letter dated June 25, 2009, p. 2

It is encouraging to see that the Planning Board is doing something for the next generation of tax payers in the city of Glen Cove. This is an exciting development coming to life for all to take advantage of. It is also very wise of the city of Glen Cove to take advantage of the current economic crisis, to ensure that we are in a position to capitalize when things turn around. The project is something I fully support, and I can assure you that this sentiment is shared amongst many within my generation.

Melissa Gaudesi, 29 Wedgewood Court, Glen Head, NY, undated letter received July 10, 2009

I am writing to you regarding the Glen Cove Waterfront Project, and its progress. It would be a great idea to develop the 213 acres of land surrounding the Glen Cove creek, This water revitalization-plan will improve surface water quality and flushing on the creek, restore wetlands", "increase recreational boating, water-dependent and water-enhanced *activities* and passenger ferry operations", Clearly, we can't go wrong with an opportunity like this. While *improving* the quality of our water and reviving our wetlands back to life after the infection of toxic wastes, we would be beautifying neglected land, improving our city's reputation, providing our youth with a safe place to hangout (this will decrease the crime rate), decreasing taxes, and our residents would finally have a place to dine or shop without going out of town. The area of land surrounding the Glen Cove Creek (property behind the firehouse) is 1out of 3, of the "historical waterfront communities situated along Nassau County's North Shore and is accessible to motorists by Shore Road" (Pulitzer) - This is a unique property which Glen Cove should be grateful to have, and show it's appreciation, not by leaving it as a toxic waste zone, but instead, cleaning it up and developing it into the Seaport village it should be' and allowing it to flourish: I know your stance on the issue is to keep it on "wait mode"; with all due respect, we should speed up the process. I think you should hold more meetings, with the developers and contractors so the ideal plan, in which you want to be aware of before beginning any further construction. Once the plan is created and approved, the waterfront construction can begin and development can continue until it is finished. Thank you very much for your time and attention,

Lauren MacDonald, 14 Yale Place, Glen Cove NY, letter dated June 2, 2009

As a resident of Glen Cove, for over twenty-five years Linda and I have been excited since we heard of the RXR Glen Isle Waterfront Redevelopment project. As our home at 167 Shore Road faces the Glen Cove Creek, and this great project.

We anxiously await your groundbreaking, so that we can observe the progress being made as it happens, the building of recreation facilities, hotel and restaurants would greatly enhance the Glen Cove area, and bring tourists that never had the opportunity to visit such a fine community and waterfront. Also, the utilization of our waterways for transportation to and from Glen Cove, to all of the surrounding areas around our community.

In addition, this project would be a boost to our local economy in Glen Cove, in the creation, of both temporary and permanent opportunities, for the local residents. We welcome this great project to our city.

Philip & Linda Antico, residents, Glen Cove, NY, letter, dated July 20, 2009

Public debates are healthy and necessary as an important part of the development process but it is not like we are talking about developing protected lands or preserves. This is a project that will transform a blighted industrial area into a thriving mixed use community that many generations will enjoy for many years to come. Not only that, but this project was designed to work in synergy with the existing downtown and amenities that Glen Cove already has to offer its residents and visitors. This project is an opportunity that should not be floundered away because a small minority of people, although very vocal, disapproves of it. Our community should be thankful that this opportunity exists and that there are 50-acres of waterfront land available to do such a development. The whole city has a chance to improve its standing and once again make Glen Cove the place to be on the North Shore. It will also give our residents a chance to enjoy the waterfront once more with designated 25% public space for parks and walking esplanades. Magnificent!

The majority of residents in Glen Cove and surrounding communities want this project to move forward in a diligent and expedient manner. It seems to me that the developers have followed through on everything they have been asked to do with clarity and transparency. And they have also designed a beautiful concept that is mindful of many of the concerns of residents. Give them the chance to build this dream and create a destination for people to come and marvel at all Glen Cove has to offer. Everything improves as a result of this project, including the schools. They city has so many beautiful spots already, this is the one area that has been squandered through the years and it is time for that to change.

The guiding light should be that this project will succeed and that years from now when we look back we could say that this was the right move. Unlock the potential that Glen Cove has and let's move forward not backward.

Michael Stanco, letter dated July 16, 2009.

As a 43 year resident of Glen Cove, living on Hammond Rd and overlooking the creek and harbor, I add my voice to those who see this project as a magnificent addition to the City of Glen Cove. I firmly believe that without it the City will die simply for lack of growth. Without new businesses or entities to grow the tax base (you cannot do that with a park) you would have no funding for the school district and city improvements. The burden of higher taxes would then fall to the homeowners who will at some point decide they have had enough and move out, more than likely selling their properties at deflated values. No one would want to live here because of the inevitability of a poor school district and eventual decay due to the City's inability to maintain roads and municipal facilities.

The fact is this project would bring a level of vitality and beauty to this city that we have never had, and if we do not act upon it, the opportunity could well be lost forever. It has evolved

after much input from the community. The developers have worked hard to accommodate most of the complaints, and have provided accessible parks, and additional wetland protection. There are still some traffic issues which, in my opinion, need to be addressed, but this should not be enough to derail this project. I believe this project should go forward.

Marie Coyle, email dated July 16, 2009.

Let me first state my unequivocal support for the Glen Isle waterfront development - for so many reasons economically and otherwise, this project represents a tremendous opportunity for our City.

Eileen Owen Masio, letter dated July 20, 2009

We live in the best community in Long Island! Glen Cove is synonymous with Gold Coast and the Waterfront development will add more luster to our precious golden community!

I grew up in Muttontown, and my 9 siblings live all over Long Island (some even moved to Suffolk – eeh gads!), but my family chose to live in Glen Cove and we are so happy here. Ten years ago I couldn't have imagined this Waterfront Project was possible. But for the past few years I have (not-so-patiently) been waiting to see this become a reality. The project is filled with great aspects for everyone! Personally I dream of the ferry commute to return and that can not happen soon enough as I work in downtown Manhattan.

I wish I had the time to write to you and the local papers on a regular basis to underscore how important this opportunity is to Glen Cove. All sides have been researched, discussed, considered and evaluated. I'm so pleased that it is progressing, finally. Now it is time to break ground!

No other community will be able to hold a candle to Glen Cove, filled with waterfront activities, ideal transportation options, access to the great restaurants and views we already boast, and tons of additional cultural events in a fabulous venue!

I could go on, and on; but I simply wanted to send an email of support. You got that right? Good luck and move forward!

Barbara Peebles, email dated July 31, 2009

RESPONSE MISC-1 (Miscellaneous):

Comments noted.

COMMENT MISC-2 (Miscellaneous):

Any major development project, especially a billion dollar development project such as this, requires an adequate opportunity for public input and review if the process is to be effective.

Perhaps the most critical phase of the public review process is the stage in which the public is asked to review and comment upon the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

In this case, the DEIS was only made available to our committee fifteen days prior to the public hearing and the written comment period is only scheduled to extend until July 10th.

As a result of this short time frame, our analysis and the comments are not as thorough as we would prefer to provide to the Planning Board.

In addition, some of the documents in the appendixes are in draft form and others refer to attachments that were not included. Obviously, we're unable to comment on information that was not provided.

The end result, unfortunately, may be a Final Environmental Impact Statement that does not provide the Planning Board or the City Council with the full depth and breadth of analysis that should form the basis of any decisions on this project.

We would like to suggest that the comment period be extended for an additional sixty days and that tonight's public hearing not be closed, but continued at a second session in another thirty days.

We also suggest that any missing documents be provided and distributed to all parties as a supplement.

The applicant has had four years to prepare the document. Giving the public an extra sixty days and a possible additional hearing session will help ensure that the City ensures the best feedback at this critical juncture.

Eric Swenson, Executive Director, Hempstead Harbor Protection Committee, Public Hearing Transcript, City of Glen Cove Planning Board Meeting, June 25, 2009, Sections 46, lines 13-25; Section 47, lines 1-25; and, Section 48, lines 1-15, pp.41-43

Since we only received this very long and complicated document two weeks ago, is there any chance that the July 10th deadline for additional comments could be extended to give us more time to do a thorough analysis?

Carol Vogt, member, Village of Seacliff Board of Trustees, Public Hearing Transcript, City of Glen Cove Planning Board Meeting, June 25, 2009, Section 64, lines 5-10; p.57

I just have two comments in trying to get through the Impact Statement. It does take a very long time, and I would suggest you give us more time to read through that.

Mary Normandia, Public Hearing Transcript, City of Glen Cove Planning Board Meeting, June 25, 2009, Section 131, lines 15-19, pp.116-117

We need more time to read it, that's the problem.

Pamela Tamaddon, Public Hearing Transcript, City of Glen Cove Planning Board Meeting, June 25, 2009, Section 133, line 25; Section 134, lines 11-13, p.119

I have done my best to read and reply to the DEIS in the comments that follow, but would nonetheless like to request additional time for the public to review the RXR Glen Isle waterfront developers' Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The reasons for this request are:

- The time period given was simply too short for residents to find, read and respond to the information. Not only was the time too short for such lengthy and detailed technical reports to be read and understood, but the materials were cumbersome and hard to follow - especially the online versions - which were the only versions most people were able to access.
- On July 8, while reading the printed copy provided and cross-referencing it with the online edition at the developers' website, I noticed that the online copy had some exhibits missing or

located or referenced improperly, making it virtually impossible for people to read and follow. Anyone who was reading the online version of the DEIS was missing key information. Furthermore, in the early days of the DEIS comment period, locating the DEIS on the City of Glen Cove website was nearly impossible as it was buried under the Planning Board/Zoning Board link and listed simply as "Text" or something similarly obscure, with the words DEIS nowhere to be found. The city and developers must ensure that all available copies of the important documents for public review are identical and properly linked on the web to aid readers and reduce confusion. They should also be clearly marked, accurate, and easy to locate, **before** the public comment period begins.

Carol E. Kenary, President, Landing Pride Civic Association, Glen Cove, NY, letter dated July 20, 2009

I have forwarded the DEIS comments from Carol Kenary, of the Landing Pride Community organization. In the attached, she requests a postponement of the deadline for public comments. I would like to also request a postponement, because we really did not have very much time.

Pat Tracy, electronic message, dated July 20, 2009

Could you please let us know if you have decided to extend the deadline?? I think many more people might have the opportunity to share their thoughts with you and the Planning Board.

Pat Tracy, electronic message, dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE MISC-2 (Miscellaneous):

As requested by several commenters during the public hearing, the public comment period was extended and held open through July 20, 2009. All supporting appendix items and graphics are included in the printed version of the DEIS available at City Hall and the Library, and on the City's website. One comment references a draft appendix item without supporting attachments. This item was a Draft Site Management Plan. The SMP document is in fact a draft document, and was provided to give the public an understanding of the types of plans that are produced to manage environmental conditions. As it is a working draft, it does not yet include all of its appendix items. A complete Site Management Plan will be prepared and submitted to the NYS Department of Environmental Conservation for approval prior to the commencement of any construction activity on the site.

COMMENT MISC-3 (Miscellaneous):

With enough time to prepare, we would like to give you feedback that might help resolve these and other problems, most of which we believe are caused by the density of the development, an issue we believe is the one that we believe must be realistically confronted.

Carol Vogt, member, Village of Sea Cliff Board of Trustees, Public Hearing Transcript, City of Glen Cove Planning Board Meeting, June 25, 2009, Section 65, lines 18-25; pp.58

I feel the City of Glen Cove already has the information it needs in addition to public sentiment to abandon or at the very least, drastically scale down this project.

I collected signatures for the S.O.S. Petition, and no one that I spoke to was in favor of such an immense project on our waterfront.

The negative impact this is going to have on suburban Glen Cove will be physically and economically irreversible.

Someone recently said to me that now they understand how the Indians felt when they were taken advantage of and pushed aside by people who only had their own self-interest in mind.

As a resident of Glen Cove who is not in favor of this department – of this development, I concur with that sentiment. When will our voices be heard?

Ms. Barbara Hall, resident, Public Hearing Transcript, City of Glen Cove Planning Board Meeting, June 25, 2009, Section 86, lines 5-23; Section 87, lines 1-23, pp.76-77

I am writing to express my complete dismay at the proposed Glen Cove Creek project. As proposed, the development's density will put enormous stress on the environment, cause significant traffic issues, and put overwhelming demands on the local services, including schools. I am in favor of developing and protecting the harbor by creating more viable commercial and community use in this area. But the scale of this proposal is so enormous as to be untenable. I am firmly opposed to the project as proposed.

Christina Schatz, 200 8th Avenue, Sea Cliff, NY, electronic mail dated July 7, 2009 and Michele Alexander, 13 Ransom Avenue, Sea Cliff, NY, electronic mail dated July 7, 2009

If there should be development along the water-front, it should be modified to protect the local environment and preserve the quality of life along our coastline.

A. Gutierrez, letter dated July 15, 2009.

Whatever is built along the waterfront should be scaled down from the current proposal to protect the local environment and preserve our quality of life and our coastal landscape.

Alan Mitzner, President, American Pie, LLC, Sea Cliff resident, electronic mail, dated June 19, 2009. Similar comment from Laura Andrysiak, Raymond and Nansi Borom, and Michael and Stefanie Lipsey.

The adverse impacts of this project will likely be far greater than the developers' projections, and the mitigation measures (especially for traffic) proposed by the developer appear to be grossly inadequate.

The proposed development should be scaled down dramatically to protect the local environment and preserve our quality of life and our coastal landscape. We have an opportunity and an obligation to protect our precious North Shore for generations to come.

Andrew Quasha, letter dated July 20, 2009. Similar comment from Ellen Quasha

I find it amazing that such an extensive document could produce so many "insignificant impacts" from a proposed project of this magnitude. Having spent 10 years on the Li Tungsten Task Force monitoring the cleanup efforts I want to see a project go forward that will enhance the community but also one that we will not regret once it is completed. In my opinion, the project as proposed is one that would be better suited to an area in Queens or Brooklyn, where high-rise structures are a matter of course. Comments that have been made by the developer and his "suits" at several meetings only confirm my suspicion that this project is all about profit and not about what's best for Glen Cove. Such comments include, "we're moving ahead with this

project whether you like it or not" and "you must learn to like tall buildings" don't give me a warm feeling.

This suburban community has been picked because we are vulnerable due to mismanaged budgets and deficit spending of prior administrations, and the inability to live within our means. In short, Glen Cove is the "sucker born every minute".

It is argued that the building height and density are necessary to "maximize profit. This was stated explicitly in the Master Plan DGEIS. I did not think it was our mandate to maximize profit for the developer. The notorious contract that was signed by a previous administration has already given away more than we should have in terms of purchase price and considerations. It would only compound that error to capitulate to the developer and give away any claim to being a suburban community for the goal of maximizing profit.

As Tom Suozzi said in his State of the County message in 2007, the project is "much too big the way it's currently proposed". Well it hasn't gotten any smaller after two years of negotiations.

David S. Nieri, letter dated July 18, 2009

The seemingly lack of honest projections of traffic increase, number of new cars expected, stress to utilities such as water and services provided for by the Glen Cove Fire Dept.

Eileen Aherne, email dated July 20, 2009

I have attended two recent meetings and in my opinion you and your consultants have seriously underestimated the Impact on our local traffic, ecology, views, and local services. We live on what is basically a peninsula with Glen Cove at the tip. In the past 8 years I have already witnessed increased local traffic with Sea Cliff used more and more as a cut-through. You cannot even fill the two Avalon's which were monstrous in themselves, and now you are proposing more dense development. I believe that Glen Cove has lost sight of what makes the North Shore special and why we all chose to live here in the first place.

Debra Dumas, 4 Preston Ave., Sea Cliff NY, electronic mail dated July 10, 2009

The adverse impacts of this project will likely be far greater than the developers' DEIS has stated; while the economic and other benefits have not been adequately demonstrated.

Dianne Minardi Mullarkey, letter dated July 13, 2009. Similar comment from Michael Brenner, Marilyn Brenner, Robert Wong, Louis Pagliara and 29 Glen Cove residents, Petition, attachment to letter from Carol E. Kenary, President, Landing Pride Civic Association, Glen Cove, NY, dated July 20, 2009; and 13 individual letters, dated July 13, 2009

The impact of this large scale development will have far reaching negative effects on traffic, air quality, noise and air pollution during construction; our first responders and city services.

Marilyn Brenner, letter dated July 13, 2009.

I am wholeheartedly opposed to the project. It is not the time for this country or this city to be trying to employ worn-out models of growth, which succeed only in draining our natural resources, straining the infrastructure, congesting roads, and in benefitting only the people at the top rungs of the economic ladder. This development is not needed. I have read the developer's

plans and find them highly suspicious and self-serving. The climate of the country has changed. We need to get with the new program.

Karen Davy, letter dated July 15, 2009.

Despite the size and complexity of the development, the conclusions reached in every instance in the DEIS are that the environmental impacts resulting from the waterfront development project would be minimal or nonexistent, given the planned design strategies and best management practices implemented by the developer. We question the developer's conclusions, especially in light of, among other things, (1) the known and potential contamination in several areas of the project site, (2) plans to change the tidal flow of Glen Cove Creek, and (3) planned building height and total square footage, especially for Blocks A-C.

Karen Papasergious and Carol DiPaolo, President and Programs Director and Water-Monitoring Coordinator, Coalition to Save Hempstead Harbor, letter dated July 20, 2009

I am writing to urge the city to seriously reconsider approval of the waterfront plan. There are legitimate environmental issues as well as economic concerns to tax payers if this project should come to fruition. This is not the best use for the bit of remaining waterfront in our city. This massive construction will bring added stress on the city's services, added traffic and noise, and destroy a beautiful piece of recreational land.

I sincerely hope this waterfront development will take the best interests of all Glen Cove's citizens into consideration, as well as those citizens of the future.

Carol Kalen, letter dated July 25, 2009

I oppose the RXR Glen Isle plan to develop 23 acres of public waterfront on Hempstead Harbor. 860 condos plus rental units, restaurant and 250 room hotel will cause more traffic, more waste, and more pollution. It will forever change the landscape of our shoreline and destroy a natural waterfront ecosystem. This land belongs to all of us. I don't think it should become another huge luxury condo development.

Series of postcards collected by Mary Normandia, dated July 20, 2009.

We don't want Glen Cove to become Queens

Anne Bruschini, Glen Cove resident, attachment to letter from Carol E. Kenary, President, Landing Pride Civic Association, Glen Cove, NY, dated July 13, 2009

And for all of this, we are told that any increase in the time it takes to get across town will be worth it. The quality of life in this community is under threat from many sides - unscrupulous absentee landlords, inability of the City to enforce existing zoning laws, and developers who try to convince us that we should embrace urbanization. How do we hold the developer accountable when all the magnificent promises don't come to pass? I grew up in, and have lived in Glen Cove my entire life. Although I have traveled widely around the U.S. there is a quality of life in this community and on this island that is unique and worth preserving. That is why I am still here. The fallacy behind always increasing the tax base is that eventually you run out of land and the only way to increase is to build upwards. That is not what we are about.

David S. Nieri, letter dated July 18, 2009

In closing, I believe it's fair to say that you cannot add 3,200 parking spaces and the cars that will fill them to an area, and not feel a significant change in traffic impacts. You cannot build on a 50+ acre plot for seven or more years, and not have inconvenience and noise for many people for a very long time. You cannot add a few green roofs and LEED building principles, and expect them to erase the damage that all this new construction, traffic, pollution and noise will perpetrate on the environment, wildlife and the community. You cannot offer a few pocket parks in between tall buildings, a turning basin which serves no real purpose, and give us view corridors which take away views, and call this an improvement over what's there. Sure it will look better aesthetically, but what will the trade-off be? The DEIS, while comprehensive and detailed in certain places, fails to tell the whole story of the real quality of life and other impacts that will be felt for many years to come, nor does it begin to make the case for the benefits of the project. Will the dubious benefits of this high-rise high-density project be worth the loss of quality of life that it will cause? A dramatically scaled-down version of this project is the only solution for the true benefit of the community and environment.

Carol E. Kenary, President, Landing Pride Civic Association, Glen Cove, NY, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE MISC-3 (Miscellaneous):

The heights for the various buildings proposed for the site vary, ranging from four stories up to 10 and 12 stories on the western parcels (Blocks A-C) and from one to two stories up to eight stories on the eastern parcel (Blocks D-J). Only two of the ten blocks include elements with heights of 10 to 12 stories, and as illustrated in the FEIS visuals, these are only a portion of each building. Along the esplanade, the buildings are primarily four and five stories tall and faced with townhouses. Behind the townhouses, the buildings begin to set back and step up, breaking down the overall massing of the buildings. The multiple setbacks also provide variety in the building massing, avoiding the effect of otherwise bulky buildings with uniform floor plates and uniform height.

It is acknowledged that the buildings would represent a departure from conventional suburban development patterns and the heights of certain building elements would be higher than the predominant development pattern elsewhere in the City. However, the proposed building heights are in conformance with the requirements of the MW-3 district. In addition, the Glen Cove Creek waterfront is a distinct area with a different visual and land use context than the bulk of Glen Cove. It has also been identified both locally and at the State level as an area for concentrated redevelopment. (The project area is one of only four waterfront redevelopment areas on the North Shore identified by the Long Island Sound Coastal Management Program.) A variety of regional planning organizations, including Vision Long Island, have also recognized that the conventional development pattern that characterizes much of Long Island is failing to meet some vital planning objectives, including minimizing sprawl, supporting and enhancing the County's downtowns, providing for a variety of housing types to meet changing demographic needs, and enhancing public access to the coastline, and that more dense development within the core of the Island's communities will be necessary to achieve a sustainable development pattern.

The City's vision for this area is also clearly described in its adopted Master Plan and the adopted Urban Renewal Plan for the Garvies Point Urban Renewal Area, both of which are exhaustively detailed in DEIS Section III.E. Both of these documents recognize the need for

complementary redevelopment in order to supply additional public amenities, help support the downtown, and remedy brownfield conditions.

In addition, there are economic realities that must be confronted. The City, State and federal government have invested well over \$120 million in order to ready this property for productive use. In order to justify the public and private expenditures, a certain level of redevelopment is necessary to make a productive and viable project.

Development activity throughout the City is regulated by the Zoning Ordinance. The project is located in the MW-3 district, which was amended to facilitate waterfront redevelopment following extensive planning by the City. The only area of MW-3 in the City is along the Glen Cove Creek. There is, therefore, no potential for the project to set a precedent in relation to allowable heights or scale elsewhere in Glen Cove.

The DEIS studies and discloses a wide range of potential environmental impacts from the project, as required by the adopted DEIS scope using industry standard assessment techniques. Where potential impacts have been identified, appropriate mitigation measures have been proposed to minimize the impact to the maximum extent practicable. None of the analyses found significant adverse impacts that would be otherwise avoidable. The project will also produce numerous positive impacts for the community. As outlined in the State Environmental Quality Review Act (6 NYCRR Part 617.11.d), in making a decision, the Lead Agency must “weigh and balance relevant environmental impacts with social, economic and other considerations.”

COMMENT MISC-4 (Miscellaneous):

Glen Cove is a place where the N-21 Bus begins and ends its route to Flushing. At the place where the bus stop is, there is not even a bench for the people to sit while they wait for the bus, and yet the City is planning to spend 32 million dollars of public funds on a ferry terminal building.

I protest this misappropriation of public funds to build a housing project for the rich.

Ms. Pat Tracy, resident, Public Hearing Transcript, City of Glen Cove Planning Board Meeting, June 25, 2009; Section 105, lines 6-14; p. 93 and letter dated July 16, 2009.

RESPONSE MISC-4 (Miscellaneous):

The ferry project, while providing a valuable benefit to the proposed project, is a separate and distinct action. The Long Island Bus N21 and N27 routes currently terminate in downtown Glen Cove at the intersection of Glen Street and Bridge Street. Intermodal connections to and from the project's shuttle buses would be available at their current terminus. The Applicant believes that extending bus service to the site would be appropriate and is willing to work with Long Island Bus to achieve that goal.

The project includes a variety of housing types designed to offer alternatives to the traditional suburban development paradigm, which, as noted in the City's Master Plan, is not responsive to the housing needs of a changing population (e.g., empty nesters, smaller households, young families). The project also includes 86 units of workforce housing that would be targeted to provide a housing resource for local community service providers (e.g., teachers, emergency

service volunteers, firemen, police, and other municipal employees) or young, first-time home buyers who would otherwise be challenged to find appropriate and more affordable housing alternatives.

COMMENT MISC-5 (Miscellaneous):

I also protest most strongly in the use of eminent domain. Only a person who has never struggled to own something of his own, such as our Mayor, would agree to this.

In the case of Kelo versus New London, this was a case in the Supreme Court, Susette Kelo was kicked out of her home and her life was disrupted in a major way.

And that project sits today as a field of weeds. Nothing was ever built there, but Susette Kelo and her neighbors lost their homes and their community.

I can only say, "What goes around, comes around." Taking a person's property by eminent domain is stealing, and I strongly protest the use of it in our City.

Ms. Pat Tracy, resident, Public Hearing Transcript, City of Glen Cove Planning Board Meeting, June 25, 2009; Section 107, lines 13-16, p. 95 and letter dated July 16, 2009.

RESPONSE MISC-5 (Miscellaneous):

As detailed in the DEIS, acquisition of seven lots (either privately or publicly owned) in the "Gateway" area at the east end of the project site is required. The Applicant is presently attempting to acquire these parcels through negotiations with the current property owners, and has had preliminary discussions with a party representing four of the five privately owned properties. As described in the LDA, in the event negotiations are unsuccessful the IDA/CDA can act to acquire these properties to assemble the site, and may elect to acquire these properties through the use of eminent domain.

The subject properties are located within the Garvies Point Urban Renewal Area, an area that was studied and declared blighted. The current uses of these properties also conflict with the recommendations of the Garvies Point Urban Renewal Plan and the City's Master Plan. Under these conditions, State law authorizes the use of eminent domain to advance public objectives.

COMMENT MISC-6 (Miscellaneous):

Also, in regards to Sea Cliff, you sent one piece of literature on your DEC or from the DEC for the Village of Sea Cliff.

Don't we have four or five Planning people in the Village of Sea Cliff? You send one?

There's -- tonight I heard other people discuss that this -- this is not enough time. You're pulling -- you're pulling strings. I think I wasted my time tonight.

The people here, they -- this has come to a conclusion, and they will do what they want to, regardless what the people want. Thank you.

Dean Scheu, 15 Cedar Place, Sea Cliff, New York, Public Hearing Transcript, City of Glen Cove Planning Board Meeting, June 25, 2009, Section 128, lines 4-25; p.113

RESPONSE MISC-6 (Miscellaneous):

The Village of Sea Cliff has been noted as an Interested Agency and included on the document distribution list for this project. Additional copies of the DEIS are available for review at City Hall, the public library and on the City's website.

COMMENT MISC-7 (Miscellaneous):

The DEIS should address the availability and the capacity of shelters in case of an emergency because of the extent of the development. The Emergency evacuation plans should be discussed with the Nassau County Office of Emergency Management and addressed in the DEIS.

Carlos A. Pareja, P.E., Bureau of Environmental Engineering, Nassau County Department of Public Health, letter, July 13, 2009

The development will further impact upon evacuation procedures in the event of an emergency.

Debra Dumas, 4 Preston Ave., Sea Cliff NY, electronic mail dated July 10, 2009

I am very concerned regarding impact on traffic, and emergency response in our city because of the developments

Carlos A. Pareja, P.E., Glen Cove resident, attachment to letter from Carol E. Kenary, President, Landing Pride Civic Association, Glen Cove, NY, dated July 13, 2009

This entire area is in the FEMA 100-year floodplain, and it was actually underwater in 1992. You can see a picture of the area under water in Hurricane Donna in 1960 at the Landing Pride website.

The City has no plans for evacuation and housing of all these people in the case of a hurricane or flooding.

Can 1,844 people and animals be housed in our high school? I think not. What about all their cars?

Ms. Pat Tracy, resident, Public Hearing Transcript, City of Glen Cove Planning Board Meeting, June 25, 2009; Section 104, lines 17-25; Section 105, lines 1-5, p. 93 and letter dated July 16, 2009.

The property sits on a FEMA 100-year flood plain; evacuation of the area would be impossible.

Unknown commentor, copy of petition in Record Pilot, dated April 2007

RESPONSE MISC-7 (Miscellaneous):

FEMA has issued new flood maps for this area of Nassau County, dated September 11, 2009, which incorporate new data and flood zone limits. According to the new FIRM, the western portion of the site is now located in Zone X, areas determined to be outside of the 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, there is no base flood elevation associated with the new development along the western portion of the site (Restaurant, Blocks A, B-1, B-2 and C). The new base flood elevation (100-year elevation) along the eastern portion of the site (from approximately the eastern property line of the new Ferry Terminal property, along Garvies Point Road through a portion of new Block I and Block J) is 12.1 (NGVD 1929 datum). All residential buildings will be set a minimum of two (2) feet above the base flood elevation and all other buildings (office,

restaurant, parking for hotel) will be located at or above the base flood elevation. For the western portion of the site, where there is no base flood elevation since this area is located outside of the regulated flood hazard area, the former FEMA base flood elevation of 14.0 (NGVD) has been utilized for comparative design purposes and to set finished floor elevations in this area of the site.

At full build-out the project would increase the City's population by only 7.1%. The percentage increase in the number of Long Island residents potentially affected during emergency storm events would be even smaller. This relatively minor increase would not be expected to have dramatic impacts on the County's Office of Emergency Management functions. In addition, the project site is not located on an evacuation route that would be used by other residents and would not be expected to result in a bottleneck.

The City does not have a formal evacuation plan. However, the City has an emergency management team, which coordinates effectively with the police and fire departments to respond to weather and other emergencies. The High School is designated as a Red Cross shelter for use in situations where there are voluntary or mandatory evacuations.¹ In previous events, the City's Director of Emergency Management has indicated that residents have often elected to stay at hotels during the evacuation period. The on-site marinas would establish a local emergency plan to protect and secure boats during severe weather.

COMMENT MISC-8 (Miscellaneous):

As a Realtor in Glen Cove, it is my business to stay on top real estate trends and what is happening in our community. I have been following the Glen Isle Project for many years now, attending Council meetings and have written letters to the Glen Cove papers. I cannot begin to tell you the amount of clients that I have that are interested in this project. I also have several friends in the area, who are planning their retirement now and would love to move to this future Glen Cove waterfront community that is going to have such great amenities and an easy commute to the city. My question for you is when can local Realtors begin to market this project and when will pre-sales commence?

Edna Fast, LREB, Director, EZ Fast Realty of LI, LLC, Glen Cove, NY, letter dated July 14, 2009

RESPONSE MISC-8 (Miscellaneous):

The Applicant appreciates the commentator's enthusiasm and support for the project. The project is not yet ready for the commencement of active marketing and pre-sales as it is still at the conceptual site plan stage. After the Planning Board issues its Findings Statement, the Applicant will prepare detailed site plans and other related construction and permitting documents to allow for construction. Completion of the construction of the first two blocks of development is expected to take approximately two years.

¹ The City's Director of Emergency Management has indicated that there has been one mandatory evacuation in the past 37 years. Phone conversation, September 30, 2009.

COMMENT MISC-9 (Miscellaneous):

No ferry operator has been found and currently several ferries in the New York area are threatened with bankruptcy.

Debra Dumas, 4 Preston Ave., Sea Cliff NY, electronic mail dated July 10, 2009

RESPONSE MISC-9 (Miscellaneous):

Although it is a separate project sponsored by the City of Glen Cove, the Applicant and the City have a shared interest in the success of the ferry. In the event that the ferry project fails, the Applicant would be motivated to, and will, cooperate with the City to seek other ferry operators for that site. However, the ferry site and the project are ultimately under the control of the City.

COMMENT MISC-10 (Miscellaneous):

Due to the fact that the Glen Cove Anglers Club had very little mention in the Draft Scope for "Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Glen Cove Creek Mixed-Use Waterfront Development", and absolutely no mention in the final scoping document we would like to express our concerns to you in writing.

At this time the Glen Cove Anglers Club is quite concerned by the lack of relevance shown in those documents, pertaining to the Anglers Club. Although we are specifically mentioned in the "Contract for Sale of Land for Private redevelopment by and among the Glen Cove IDA, Glen Cove CDA, and Glen Isle Development Company LLC dated May 14, 2003, page 15 section 2.12, they have not given any mention to the Angler's Club in other documents.

GCAC is directly affected by the development, and would ask the Glen Cove Planning Board to request that the developer include us in the Final Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Glen Cove Anglers Club, Letter dated May 29, 2009

RESPONSE MISC-10 (Miscellaneous):

This comment was submitted prior to the publication of the DEIS. The DEIS includes discussion of the Angler's Club in Sections II and III.E.

COMMENT MISC-11 (Miscellaneous):

When we think about the 23 acres at the mouth of Glen Cove Creek, we remember this is the place that was once called Musketo Cove. Musketo is the Matinicock Indian word meaning "land of rushes". This is where humanity started in Glen Cove thousands of years ago, so I don't think it is an exaggeration to say these 23 acres comprise a shrine. They are Glen Cove's equivalent to Plymouth Rock. Should we bury a shrine under condos? "Thoughtful citizens would answer, "No, never."

If this project goes forward, in a modified way, it should guarantee the preservation of those precious 23 acres, and if there is to be housing, it should be affordable for Glen Cove residents.

Ralph Cioffi, letter dated July 16, 2009

RESPONSE MISC-11 (Miscellaneous):

DEIS Section III.N includes detailed discussion of the likely occupation of the area during the precontact period. Official European settlement of the area began after 1668. Establishment of saw and grist mills set the tone for the industrial and trade development of the Cove. Subsequent development in the area resulted in significant disturbance and degradation of the area. The proposed project is intended to transform this blighted area into a mixed-use, transit-oriented neighborhood that supports Glen Cove's downtown and reintroduces public access to the waterfront. The project also includes a comprehensive open space network and program totaling approximately 20 acres of publicly-accessible open space. In addition, the project includes 86 units of workforce housing that would be targeted to provide a housing resource for local community service providers (e.g., teachers, emergency service volunteers, firemen, police, and other municipal employees) or young, first-time home buyers who would otherwise be challenged to find appropriate and more affordable housing alternatives.

COMMENT MISC-12 (Miscellaneous):

Sea Cliff is a "one-square mile village" bordered by Prospect Avenue to its west and Glen Cove Avenue to its east. It has been established in the past year that there are approximately 1,500 cars passing in each direction along Sea Cliff's treed and winding Prospect Avenue on a daily basis. Both of these Avenues are mere 2 lane local roadways. Glen Cove Avenue itself has entrances to both the local high school and middle schools where the students in our community cross on a regular basis before during and after school hours.

The Sea Cliff Landmarks Association is urging the Glen Cove Planning Board to require a "Draft Environmental Impact Statement" addressing the effect of this massive development plan within the City of Glen Cove's on its "sleepy" historic neighbor Sea Cliff. Sea Cliff will be smothered and run over from the expanse of this proposed development, our unique way of life changed forever since our early beginnings in 1870. We are your neighbor, what you do will negatively alter a community steeped in its own and your history forever.

Eve E. Haim, Sea Cliff Landmarks Association, President, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE MISC-12 (Miscellaneous):

The DEIS includes an evaluation of potential traffic impacts on Prospect Avenue and other potential diversion or "cut-through" routes.

COMMENT MISC-13 (Miscellaneous):

Due to the complexity of the project and site, the DEIS should acknowledge the various York State Department of Environmental Conservation Divisions and distinguish their respective roles, including the Division of Environmental Permits (DEP), Division of Fish, Wildlife & Marine Resources – Marine Habitat Protection (MHP), Division of Solid and Hazardous Materials (DS&HM), Division of Environmental Remediation, Division of Air Resources (DAR), Division of Water (DOW), Bureau of Habitat.

Roger Evans, Regional Permit Administrator, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Division of Environmental Permits, Region One, letter dated July 31, 2009

The document should identify the different divisions within the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation that will be involved in the distinct aspects of each phase of the project.

Roger Evans, Regional Permit Administrator, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Division of Environmental Permits, Region One, letter dated July 31, 2009

RESPONSE MISC-13 (Miscellaneous):

Comment noted. The Division of Environmental Permits (for coordinated administration of various permits), the Division of Fish, Wildlife & Marine Resources – Marine Habitat Protection (for review of items such as wetland permits), the Division of Solid and Hazardous Materials (for review of issues related to hazardous waste management), the Division of Environmental Remediation (for review of Site Management Plans and issues related to remediation efforts), the Division of Air Resources, the Division of Water (for review of issues such as coastal erosion hazard area permits and possible Long Island well permits), and the Bureau of Habitat (for review of wildlife issues) will all have a role in the review and/or permitting of this project.

COMMENT MISC-14 (Miscellaneous):

Pages 1-5 & 6, the summary of required approvals should be revised to include Art. 19, Air Pollution Control (or explain why Art. 19 does not apply), Art 15, Long Island Well (dewatering), SPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharges (not "SPDES permit").

Roger Evans, Regional Permit Administrator, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Division of Environmental Permits, Region One, letter dated July 31, 2009

RESPONSE MISC-14 (Miscellaneous):

Comment noted. The approvals table in FEIS Section I has been updated.