

COMMENT PD-1 (Description of the Proposed Action):

In terms of community facilities, the committee wholeheartedly supports the inclusion of public amenities in the project. We believe that more access and contact by the public with our waterways, the more incentive they will have to be better stewards of this valuable resource. However, most of the concentration of the public amenities are in Block J, which is pretty much the same as the gateway properties, which are not within the control of the developer. Further complicating this is the Phase I Assessment that report that -- states that there's reason to believe -- that contamination may exist on the site. Because it's not clear that these properties will become under the control of the developer, we -- and we believe that the EIS should address that.

Eric Swenson, Executive Director, Hempstead Harbor Protection Committee, Public Hearing Transcript, City of Glen Cove Planning Board Meeting, June 25, 2009, Section 59, lines 10-25 and Section 60, lines 1-9, p.53

OVERVIEW: The HHPC wholeheartedly supports the inclusion of public amenities in this project. We believe that the more access and contact that the public has with our waterways, the more incentive they will have to become better stewards of this valuable resource. Many of the public amenities that are associated with this project are proposed for the Gateway Properties that are not currently under the control of the developer. Further complicating this is the fact that a Phase I environmental assessment report concluded that there is reason to believe that contamination may exist on these properties. The potential for additional remediation in this area would add another roadblock that could delay or preclude acquisition. The DEIS does not adequately address the viability and sequencing of these amenities in the event that some or all of these parcels are not acquired.

HHPC COMMENT # 1: The largest concentration of this project's proposed public amenities is located within Block J. This includes the Turning Basin, Pratt Park pedestrian linkage, kayak and paddle boat rental, lawn amphitheatre, water plaza, a portion of the esplanade and public parking. This area is largely, if not entirely, the same as what the DEIS refers to as The Gateway Properties which are seven parcels currently owned by others and not within the control of the developer (including Windsor Fuel, Nassau Redi-Mix, Brilliant Electric and Air and an office building). The DEIS does not adequately address the impact on the public amenities, or the project as a whole, if some or all of these parcels are unable to be acquired.

RECOMMENDATIONS: The FEIS should address the viability and sequencing of the public amenities in the event that these parcels or some of them are not acquired:

Eric Swenson, Executive Director, Hempstead Harbor Protection Committee, letter, dated July 13, 2009, p.1

In the description of the phasing of the project, the developer states that "regardless of the ultimate sequencing, the immediately adjacent open space and recreational amenities would be constructed in concert with each of the development blocks." The developer also indicates that construction of Block J, which includes the "Gateway Properties" (currently privately owned) would not begin until several years into the development schedule for the east side of the project. This would mean that the largest amount of open space and public amenities in the development plan, other than the esplanade, would not occur until the later stages of the development project-a result that should be avoided.

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

RESPONSE PD-1 (Description of the Proposed Action):

The project's public amenities are not concentrated in Block J, or any other Block, but are spread along the length of the Creek. The amenities associated with Block J include the turning basin, and a portion of the waterfront open space (identified as Gateway Plaza on DEIS Exhibit II-11), which includes a lawn amphitheater and a portion of esplanade. This open space accounts for approximately two acres out of the project's 20 acres of total accessible open space (or approximately 10%). In addition to the large proportion of upland open space, the areas outside of Block J also encompass the proposed marinas and wetland and beach restoration areas.

Based upon concerns expressed by the Planning Board and others regarding the relationship of amenities to the early phases of work, an additional Phasing Alternative has been prepared. See Exhibit II.PD-1. In order to increase the amount of public park area provided in the early phases of the project, the core upland area of Renaissance Park could be developed in coordination with Blocks E and H. In combination with the smaller park between Blocks E and H, this would provide for a substantial public open space within the first phase. In general, construction of the adjacent open space and recreational amenities would occur in concert with each of the development blocks. While the esplanade would likely be built in phases, throughout the duration of the build-out, connectivity along the length of the project site would be available through a combination of public sidewalks along the reconstructed Garvies Point Road and the waterfront esplanade.

COMMENT PD-2 (Description of the Proposed Action):

In terms of transportation, we have long advocated that the DEIS provide access to the waterfront. We feel the document should provide more details regarding access for the public to unload kayaks, parking, public restroom facilities and the like.

Eric Swenson, Executive Director, Hempstead Harbor Protection Committee, Public Hearing Transcript, City of Glen Cove Planning Board Meeting, June 25, 2009, Section 60, lines 10-17 pp.53-54

OVERVIEW: The City and the HHPC have long advocated opening up the city's waterfront area to the public and to the downtown area. The developer has responded by providing for a number of public amenities as part of the project. However details appear to be lacking in the DEIS.

HHPC COMMENT # 19: While the DEIS (at p. II-63) states that "public access to the waterfront is a central element of the proposed development...", details are lacking on public parking locations and number of spaces, kayak offloading areas, public restrooms and other amenities that are needed to make public access a workable reality.

RECOMMENDATIONS: The FEIS needs to provide greater details on public access to the waterfront including, but not limited to public parking locations and number of spaces, kayak offloading areas and public restrooms.

Eric Swenson, Executive Director, Hempstead Harbor Protection Committee, letter, dated July 13, 2009, p.4

RESPONSE PD-2 (Description of the Proposed Action):

Many of the specific details of the waterfront amenities and access points will be developed as the individual site plans for each phase are submitted for review and approval. The Parcel Plans

(I-2, I-4) and Overall Open Space Plan (I-6) describe the conceptual layout of these spaces and the access to them. Public parking is located on all the public roads including Garvies Point Road, Dickson Street and Herb Hill Road, and at the surface lot adjacent to Block J, totaling 296 spaces. The ferry terminal supplies an additional 93 publicly accessible spaces. In addition, parking spaces in the Hotel (Block C) and Office (Block D) buildings provide additional publicly accessible parking spaces. The public parking has contiguous access to pathways, sidewalks or streets that connect to the waterfront esplanade to provide direct, easy, and safe access. Kayaks and boats can be launched at the boat ramp on the western end adjacent to the Hempstead Harbor Club. In addition, hand crafts can be launched from the lower level of the Ecology Pier and in the upper reach of Glen Cove Creek. Public restrooms will be provided near the vehicular turnaround at the western end of Garvies Point Road, as part of the Ferry Terminal, and as part of the Commercial buildings at the eastern gateway for people visiting the waterfront or using the site's recreational amenities. Cafes are anticipated at Block J, restaurants on Block C and at the western point near Block A, and a seasonal concession is proposed at the western end of Garvies Point Road. In addition to these amenities, several open space amenities occur along the waterfront including a beach boardwalk and Sunset Park facing Long Island Sound, an ecology pier, playground, parks, and multiple marinas.

COMMENT PD-3 (Project Description):

Although we very much like the mix of uses at the site, we think these will be a complement rather than a competition with the downtown, the site is more than what's considered the ideal walking distance from the downtown. So efforts to make the – to enhance the walkability as much as possible be encouraged, to see that as many of the residents walk to downtown and people in the downtown walk to the waterfront as possible.

The footprints of the buildings are kind of a contemporary, jagged sort of shape, which doesn't necessarily help the street frontage, but can be made to help the street frontage with use of landscaping and street trees and other things to create a sense of enclosure and comfort for pedestrians along the street. Also, since many of the buildings have parking garages on the lower levels with condominiums above, we want to see that the parking garages are shielded from the street with active uses so that they're not just simply a blank, vacant facade; townhouses or some other use that could wrap those parking garages so that it's an attractive walking space for pedestrians.

Elissa Ward, Director of Sustainability, Vision Long Island, Public Hearing Transcript, City of Glen Cove Planning Board Meeting, June 25, 2009, Section 74, lines 20-25; Section 75, lines 1-25; pp.66-67

The footprints of buildings, particularly on the western portion of the site, are laid out in a very contemporary sort of fashion. The position of buildings relative to the road is not done in a way that creates a "street wall" or defined edge. The street edge helps to give a sense of enclosure to pedestrians, increasing comfort as well as create an environment that helps to slow drivers down. There are large sections of the buildings that are close to the street, but there are also large gaps in the frontage as well jagged edges or points facing the street. This is not to say that the effects of a more traditional street frontage cannot be accomplished with the current plan, but more attention will have to be paid to street trees and landscaping to help create the same effect.

Although the height and massing of the various buildings has been explained in great detail, there has not been much if any description of the appearance of the buildings at the street level. Many of the buildings have parking garages at the lower levels with condominiums above, however there doesn't seem to be any indication whether or not those garages will be screened from view of those at street level. There appear to be townhouses on the sides of the garages that face the waterfront park, but it is unclear if there will be any facing the street. Townhouses or other active uses would be highly recommended along the street frontage.

Part of what makes a street walkable and attractive to a pedestrian, is having interesting and active facades along the street. If the garages are not wrapped with some sort of active use, even if they are attractively designed, the overall streetscape will suffer as a result. Streets without a fair amount of activity on them tend to feel insecure and discourage walking. Having townhouses that provide some "eyes on the street" will help make the street more attractive for walking.

The use of parking garages rather than surface parking for much of the off street parking is good for creating an attractive walkable place. However, care should be taken that the driveways that enter and exit these garages does not break up the continuity of the sidewalks. Frequent auto related interruptions in the sidewalk detract from the walkability of an area. Garage entrances should be designed in a way to make them safe for those who may be walking past them on the sidewalk.

Eric Alexander and Elissa Ward, Vision Long Island, 24 Woodbine Ave., Northport, NY, letter dated June 25, 2009, p.3

RESPONSE PD-3 (Project Description):

Pedestrian access and comfort throughout the district is a paramount goal of the development. The connection to the downtown comprises a continuous esplanade starting at Pratt Park that runs along the entire waterfront connecting to the western shoreline and ultimately Garvies Point Preserve. Starting at the commercial buildings as a gateway to the waterfront, the esplanade welcomes visitors through a series of public amenities (amphitheaters, parks, marinas, restrooms, restaurants) that encourage people to explore the length of the waterfront.

The building footprints are designed so as to create a comfortable low-rise townhouse edge along the waterfront that is set back from the esplanade with landscaping and terracing. Along the other facades, residential units and building lobbies fully surround an internalized garage within each block to effectively shield the parking from view. The careful placement of townhouses and ground floor units along the perimeter of the buildings with lobbies and drop offs ensures activity and "eyes on the street". The irregular shapes of the building footprints do not preclude a sense of enclosure and a comfortable walking environment. Rather, they add variety to the pedestrian experience, creating open spaces that enclose or open to views, and loosening up the traditional street grid to respond to a suburban context with a more free flowing form.

It is noted that the walkability concerns expressed in the comment relate to Smart Growth concepts that have been codified in the U.S. Green Building Council's LEED-ND (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design for Neighborhood Development) rating system. The LEED-ND system is intended to set standards for evaluating smart growth and green building design at

the neighborhood design level. The rating system is divided into five areas: smart location and linkage; neighborhood pattern and design; green infrastructure and buildings; innovation and design process; and regional priority. In addition to the walkability and quality pedestrian environment issue discussed above, the proposed development would embody many of the principles used as the criteria for the LEED-ND standards. Examples include:

Smart Location and Linkage

- Prerequisite 1: Smart Location and Credit 1: Preferred Locations – The project is a previously disturbed, infill site served by existing infrastructure.
- Credit 2: Brownfields Redevelopment – The project reuses land and reduces greenfield development pressure by redeveloping a brownfield site.

Neighborhood Pattern and Design

- Prerequisite 1 and Credit 1: Walkable Streets – The project consists of an interconnected network of walkable streets, an esplanade, and public spaces. Exposed parking is minimized, structured parking is concealed where possible behind active building facades, multiple entrances per block enliven the streetscape, and strategically placed retail adds interest and vitality. Street trees, generous sidewalk widths and a coordinated palette of materials and streetscape elements will add to the walkability and create a linkage to downtown Glen Cove.
- Prerequisite 2 and Credit 2: Compact Development – The project involves residential units of sufficient density to promote livability, walkability and transportation efficiency, and a compact built form that allows for a greater amount of open space, building sizes that are economically suited to handle structured parking, and building heights and massing that create a varied roofscape and maximize views to the water.
- Credit 4: Mixed-Income Diverse Communities – The project will include a mixture of housing types, including stacked townhomes, condominiums, rental apartments, and flats. There will also be a required 10 percent workforce housing component.
- Credit 9: Access to Civic and Public Space – The plan provides for new publicly-accessible open space accounting for approximately 1/3 of the project site. The open space areas are disbursed throughout the site with multiple access points for easy accessibility for project residents and visitors to waterfront.
- Credit 12: Community Outreach and Involvement – The redeveloper has met with numerous community groups and local and state agencies to further enhance collaboration with respect to the project, and has made project modifications to respond to concerns raised during the public review process.
- Credit 14: Tree-lined and Shaded Streets – The project has been designed with ample plantings, including street tree plantings, to enhance and activate the streetscape, reduce heat island effects, and improve air quality.

Green Infrastructure and Buildings

- Prerequisite 4: Construction Activity Pollution Prevention – The project will include an erosion and sedimentation control plan incorporating contemporary best management practices to minimize the potential for soil transport and sedimentation.
- Credit 9: Heat Island Reduction – The project has been designed to incorporate vegetated roofs on the majority of the development blocks.

COMMENT PD-4 (Description of the Proposed Action):

DEIS Section II. C. Project Description and Site Design, page 15. West Side the fourth sentence reads, "The blocks are composed with multi-story elements on the eastern and western wings on top of podiums which enclose each structure's supporting parking with residential units." The parking of vehicles beneath the structures meets the definition of an attached garage. Section 14A of Article VII of the Nassau County Public Health Ordinance requires that "the new construction of every dwelling and multiple dwelling in Nassau County in which there is a fuel-fired appliance or attached garage... shall be equipped with carbon monoxide alarms..." [emphasis added]. In addition, the developer should check with the City of Glen Cove Building Department for carbon monoxide alarm requirements in residential buildings with attached garages.

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

RESPONSE PD-4 (Description of the Proposed Action):

Comment noted. The project will incorporate carbon monoxide alarms in accordance with the County Public Health Ordinance.

COMMENT PD-5 (Project Description):

Tabulated in Appendix M of the DEIS indicates that 5 swimming pools will be located on this property. Please be informed, as agents for the New York State Health Department under Chapter I, Subpart 6-1 of the New York State Sanitary Code, plans are required to be submitted for review and approval to the Nassau County Health Department. In addition, an operational permit must also be acquired prior to the opening of the swimming pools.

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

RESPONSE PD-5 (Project Description):

Comment noted. In accordance with the Code, pool plans will be submitted to the County Health Department for review/approval and for operating permits when the buildings are ultimately developed.

COMMENT PD-6 (Project Description):

Please be informed that if a beach is planned for bathing use then a Permit to Operate must be acquired from the Nassau County Health Department and must operate in accordance with Chapter I, Subpart 6-2 of the New York State Sanitary Code.

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

RESPONSE PD-6 (Project Description):

Garvies Point Beach is an existing publicly-owned beach. The project proposes some physical restoration work (e.g., boardwalk), but no changes to the beach's operation.

COMMENT PD-7 (Project Description):

I am a life long Glen Cove resident, recently married and looking to purchase a home. It is an exciting time in my life as well as an exciting time for Glen Cove with this new development of the waterfront. This will create different housing options for people like my self and my husband to explore within the upcoming years during construction.

I am particularly excited about the workforce housing option as this is something my husband I would be greatly interested. I suppose my question is if Glen Cove residents will be the first to have an opportunity to purchase these units. I am also interested in what the qualifications are.

Meaghan Wren, 2 Center Street, Glen Cove, NY, undated letter received July 15, 2009

While the proposed action includes the development of 86 workforce housing units, there is no mention of the definition of what constitutes a “workforce” unit. Given the need for affordable housing in Nassau County, as indicated in this section (“This new housing stock would support the Master Plan goal of providing for a diversity of housing types and affordability and would help satisfy an identified County-wide need for workforce housing.”), information on proposed income eligibility criteria and unit sale price restrictions should be included in the language of the PDD.

Satish Sood, Deputy Commissioner, Nassau County Planning Commission, letter dated April 21, 2011.

RESPONSE PD-7 (Project Description):

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. The administration of the program would be managed by the Long Island Housing Partnership or other housing advocacy group on behalf of the City. The eventual eligibility requirements for these units would be established in consultation with the City, but it is anticipated that the likely target would be households with incomes ranging between 80-130% of the area median income and some type of local resident preference factor could be considered.

COMMENT PD-8:

HHPC COMMENT # 3: Vegetative roofs provide an aesthetically pleasing and natural way to beneficially utilize some of the stormwater that would otherwise contribute to stormwater runoff. The HHPC has long advocated the use of "green roofs" as a stormwater good management practice. While mention is made of "green roofs" as part of the design and mitigation measures, there is no definition of a "green roof" provided in the DEIS. Exhibit II-12 depicts green areas on the roofs of most of the proposed structures and labels these "roof deck open spaces". This implies that there will be some public or private use of the space in addition to, or possibly in place of, the vegetation. It is unclear as to how much of this space is devoted to vegetation and how much is devoted to walking paths, seating or other amenities and thus it is not possible to determine the extent of mitigation that they will provide.

RECOMMENDATIONS: The proposed green roofs and roof deck open spaces should be better defined. Details should be provided as to what percentage will be devoted to vegetation and what other amenities will be included.

Eric Swenson, Executive Director, Hempstead Harbor Protection Committee, letter, dated July 13, 2009, p.1

Clarify plans for the green roofs as to location, treatment and accessibility.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-8:

The roof decks labeled "roof deck open spaces" are private amenity spaces located in the intermediate roof levels above the garage and 1st floor levels. These roof areas are accessible for tenants and feature swimming pools, sun decks, BBQ and dining areas, shade structures, and plantings, including an intensive green roof system with soil depths between 10" and 3'-0" to support lawn, groundcover, shrubs and trees. These planting areas will be irrigated by a rain water collection system and maintained by a landscape contractor.

The areas labeled "Green Roofs" are the upper level non-accessible building roofs. These areas consist of an extensive green roof system. The remaining upper roof area would consist of mechanical equipment and a roof maintenance path. The extensive green roof system will include 4" of lightweight growing medium and a variety of native sedum plantings. The system will be installed with a temporary irrigation system fed by a rain water collection cistern to assure establishment of healthy vigorous plants during the first year. The system requires minimal maintenance consisting of weed removal the first year prior to the establishment of a full carpet of sedum. Future maintenance and or plant replacement will be provided by the owner. Sections of the Intensive roof systems may have tenant accessible viewing decks.

The design intent is to mitigate storm water runoff by capturing deck runoff in the green areas, which will cover approximately 35-55% of the decks, depending on the building. (The final percentage of green roofs on each individual building will be subject to further detailed building design.) The green roof open spaces and green roof areas will mitigate storm water runoff for the development and reduce the heat island effect by substituting green zones for traditional roof composites.

The roof decks and green roof areas will be further defined in the individual Site Plans for each phase of the project. See Exhibits II.PD-9A through 9C for typical details for green roofs.

COMMENT PD-9 (Project Description):

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and attending 8 meetings with representatives from RXR Glen Isle Partners, LLC and Mayor Suozzi, we would like to express the following concerns, In the Land Development Agreement dated May 14, 2003 (LDA), and referenced in the DEIS, it states, "The Redeveloper and The Agencies shall work together, in good faith, to relocate the Angler's Club to a facility comparable with its existing location at Glen Cove Creek. We discussed several components of the proposed relocation mostly in general terms since there are no specifics to review at this stage of the process. Among

our concerns were parking for Anglers Club Members, security of the club house area and the lack of any adjacent grounds for Club events, We were more or less told that specific details and arrangements would be worked out later when specific plans were drawn, However, a major concern to us was the mention in the section of "Description of Proposed Action", (sec. 2, page II-21), of 24 new boat slips. We have specifically stated to the redeveloper, that we currently have 36 boat slips (actually 39 with courtesy slips). The redeveloper's representative Matt Frank, stated that they used a satellite photo to arrive at the 24 number and it was not an intentional attempt to reduce the number of slips required.

We are a fishing club and water access and boat slips for our members is a priority when discussing any relocation planning. We would like to let it be known that we now have access to approximately 450 linear feet directly on the creek for boat docking purposes, At the very least we would like to maintain our current number of boat slips.

Michael Caruso, Chair, Future of the Club, Glen Cove Anglers, Garvies Point Road, Glen Cove, NY, letter dated June 29, 2009

RESPONSE PD-9 (Project Description):

The proposed relocation of the Anglers Club will replace in kind the equivalent number of boat slips (39) as currently exist – see revised Conceptual Site Plan. Detailed configuration of the slips will be documented and reviewed during the individual Site Plan review for that phase. In addition, there will be approximately 33 parking spaces available along Garvies Point Road within the length of the proposed Anglers Club boat slips.

The expectation is that the Anglers Club will be responsible for maintaining security of the clubhouse building (e.g., posting appropriate signage, locking doors, manning the facility). The relocated building would be located within the overall waterfront open space area. No adjacent land area is proposed for designation as part of the clubhouse grounds. Like other members of the public, the Anglers Club would be able to request the use of a portion of the extensive surrounding open space for special events, subject to approval by the Master Property Owners Association or any public/private partnership or conservancy that may be established to oversee the open space.

COMMENT PD-10 (Project Description):

The RXR Glen Isle Mixed Use Waterfront Development as designed has the potential to be a great asset to the City of Glen Cove. Adding a significant residential component and waterfront recreation to the downtown area can be very helpful for revitalizing downtown Glen Cove. The mix of a Luxury hotel, spa/conference center, 50,000 square feet of office 25,000 sf of retail are well planned and fit perfectly into a vision for a renovated waterfront district. The project has incorporated workforce housing, a range of housing product types into the plan.

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

RESPONSE PD-10 (Project Description):

Comment noted. The mix of uses is intended to facilitate the creation of a critical mass of population and activity to support and revitalize downtown. The project's residential component

has also been designed to provide a variety of unit types that can help diversify the types of housing available in the City.

COMMENT PD-11 (Project Description):

The project factored in improved public space and public access as well as important view corridors based on previous meetings.

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

RESPONSE PD-11 (Project Description):

Comment noted. Approximately 35% of the project area is proposed as publicly-accessible open space. The building forms have also been designed to permit an open space network throughout the site and to allow for views through the project between the waterfront and Garvies Point Preserve.

COMMENT PD-12 (Project Description):

This project has many good features that will be a significant benefit to the surrounding community. Care should be taken to ensure that the details are designed and built properly so that a high level of quality is met. In addition issues of walkability and the pedestrian experience should be carefully considered throughout. Kudos to the developer and the City of Glen Cove for partnering on an important project of regional significance.

Vision Long Island supports the concept of this project as it achieves many of the goals of proponents of Smart Growth and is on its way to becoming one of Long Island's premier developments, one that helps set the standard for the future of our region. We have spent over twelve years and 1,400 public presentations listening to Long Islanders work through the challenges of growth and development. We strongly believe that Long Island residents and businesses alike can come together to make projects like the Glen Cove Waterfront an excellent place for our young and old alike. Let's work together to see this project approved and built over the coming months/years.

Eric Alexander and Elissa Ward, Vision Long Island, 24 Woodbine Ave., Northport, NY, letter dated June 25, 2009, 5

RESPONSE PD-12 (Project Description):

Comment noted.

COMMENT PD-13 (Project Description):

At a presentation at the Hempstead Harbour Club on Thursday, July 9, it was indicated that three (3) site plans were available for the entry area to the Club but only one was shown. I inquired of RXR Glen Isle Partners, LLC and was directed to Mr. Darien Monte. He graciously sent to me by e-mail, three site plan diagrams. To my dismay all three were identical except that they showed different ways in which the Club's boat moving equipment (the Con-O-Lift) could be operated. There was no difference in the development of the site. I respectfully request the

Planning Board to further review this area of the Waterfront Redevelopment. While the plan submitted enables the Club to use the Con-O-Lift to move boats, the entrance to the club, with the boat trailer parking in front of it, are potential traffic disasters. The plan also fails to make provision for expansion for use of the boat ramp, which would seem appropriate to accommodate future growth of its use, as boating becomes a more vital asset to the area.

Charles E. Vasoll, Member, Hempstead Harbour Club, letter dated July 12, 2009

RESPONSE PD-13 (Project Description):

As indicated in Response PD-75, analyses of a passenger car towing a boat trailer at the public beach access and the public boat trailer area have been performed and are provided as Exhibits II.PD-2, 3 and 4. As indicated in these analyses, no significant traffic circulation issues are expected.

The proposed conceptual site plan provides for expanded trailer parking, which would allow for and facilitate expanded use of the ramp.

Based on concerns expressed by the Hempstead Harbor Club regarding traffic patterns at the club entrance, an alternate design for the Hempstead Harbor Club access / driveway is provided as Exhibit II.PD-4A. This exhibit depicts the Hempstead Harbor Club driveway off of the northern portion of the new Garvies Point Road circle. The AutoTURN diagrams provided in the exhibit illustrate how the Club's "Con-O-Lift" vehicle can maneuver into and out of the relocated access.

COMMENT PD-14 (Project Description):

We have previously met with representatives of RXR Glen Isle and were pleased with the cooperation that we received with changes made to alleviate some of our concerns. However we have reviewed the Reference (a) document and have the following concerns with the Project as described therein:

- The Exhibit II-6 West Parcel Plan shows a walking trail which appears to enter the Club property from the east. We feel that this trail on our property is unnecessary because the trail can take a path from the newly added parking lot on Garvies Point Road northward into the Garvies Point Preserve property without passing through private property.

James Riordan, Commodore, Hempstead Harbour Club, letter dated July 15, 2009

RESPONSE PD-14 (Project Description):

The path shown on the conceptual site plan illustratively depicts connecting to an existing trail visible from aerial photography. The project is not proposing a new trail at this location.

COMMENT PD-15 (Project Description):

In order to accommodate our Boat Moving Program, we must have a roadway at least 30ft. wide and clear vertically with no overhead obstructions from the entrance to our property to the Boat Launching Ramp. Exhibit II-6 shows trees and shrubbery planted close to the roadway which when grown will interfere with our boat moving operations.

James Riordan, Commodore, Hempstead Harbour Club, letter dated July 15, 2009

RESPONSE PD-15 (Project Description):

The driveway width into the Hempstead Harbour Club is shown as 36' wide and Garvies Point Road is 30' wide. The roadway and access to and from the trailer parking areas and boat launch will be designed to maintain the 30' clearances, and a maintenance program will be implemented to ensure trees and plantings do not encroach on these clearances over time. The Applicant and the City will work with LIPA to ensure utility lines will not create an obstruction. It is anticipated that the utility service will be placed underground in this area (i.e., near the end of Garvies Point Road.)

COMMENT PD-16 (Project Description):

We are concerned about the design of the landscaping between our lower Parking Lot and the Boat Ramp Approach Road. Exhibit II-6 shows two rows of trees or shrubs, one row on our property and one on City property. The row of shrubs on our property will impede the storage of boats on our property. The row of trees or shrubs on the City property will limit the parking available for cars with trailers. The space taken by shrubbery must be kept to a minimum on both sides of the fence. We also need to have an agreement concerning the replacement of the existing concrete retaining wall which was erected by the City partially on our property.

James Riordan, Commodore, Hempstead Harbour Club, letter dated July 15, 2009

RESPONSE PD-16 (Project Description):

A detailed landscape and planting plan will be prepared in coordination with the Hempstead Harbour Club for Site Plan review and approval and will provide detailed locations for all proposed tree plantings. There is no intention to landscape beyond the project property, nor modify the existing retaining wall that is on Hempstead Harbour Club property. As part of the formal site plan application, the detailed site plan will locate trees with all required clearances. For representative landscape plans / details see Exhibits II.PD-7A-H.

COMMENT PD-17 (Project Description):

[Page II-14] How will hand launched craft (kayaks, etc) access the turning basin? Is a "put in" area proposed? Is a secure storage area for these craft proposed? Is parking or vehicular access proposed?

Pat Cleary, AICP, Cleary Consulting, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-17 (Project Description):

A floating launching dock is proposed in the upper reach of the Glen Cove Creek to allow hand launched craft (kayaks, paddle boats, etc.) to access the turning basin. It is intended that a seasonal vendor will maintain and tie up boat rentals during the boating season and remove the craft during the winter. The vendor would be responsible for ensuring appropriate security and storage of the watercraft. Details of any potential boat storage/shelter would be provided during the Site Plan review phase. Public parking would be available in the surface parking lot at Block J, which includes 58 spaces, and along the public street.

COMMENT PD-18 (Project Description):

[Page II-21] Who will operate the luxury yacht marina and the marina adjacent to the Block I condo? Are these marinas restricted to residents of the project?

Pat Cleary, AICP, Cleary Consulting, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-18 (Project Description):

A private marina operator will be selected to operate the two new marinas. The marinas will not be restricted to residents of the project, but would be open to the general public.

COMMENT PD-19 (Project Description):

[Page II-22, 2nd ¶] What assurances does the City have that the tidal weir will be adequately managed to properly maintain water levels in the turning basin by the HOA?

Pat Cleary, AICP, Cleary Consulting, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-19 (Project Description):

The tidal weir is no longer included as part of the project. It has been removed from the development plan under the Proposed Action and should be characterized as a considered, but rejected, alternative. Under the revised Proposed Action, this upper reach of Glen Cove Creek will be re-developed as shown in Exhibit I-7A by construction of a new bulkhead with a maximum of elevation of 1.0', creation of 30,751 sq. ft. of intertidal wetlands and 1,726 sq. ft. of high marsh wetlands, construction of an elevated boardwalk/pier with interpretive signage over the created wetlands, and installation of a transitional lawn edge and upland slope adjacent to the wetland zone. All proposed structures shall be located landward of the existing bulkhead line.

The construction of the Turning Basin and wetlands mitigation area will require regulatory permits from the USACE, NYSDEC, and NYSDOS. Any regulatory permits issued by these agencies will include rigorous environmental monitoring, reporting, and maintenance requirements aimed at maintaining adequate water quality within the Turning Basin. The developer will be responsible for compliance with these monitoring and maintenance requirements during the construction phase of the project and the property owners association will be responsible for the long-term maintenance of the Turning Basin. Failure to comply with the monitoring and maintenance requirements imposed by these regulatory agencies would result in the initiation of enforcement actions by the NYSDEC and /or USACE and would subject the developer and/or property owners association to substantial penalties and fines.

COMMENT PD-20 (Project Description):

[Page II-24, 1st ¶] Are the roof deck open spaces in the large building blocks publicly accessible, accessible for residents of a given building block, or only accessible to adjacent owners/tenants?

Pat Cleary, AICP, Cleary Consulting, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-20 (Project Description):

The roof deck open spaces would be accessible for the residents of each particular block, however the hotel roof deck would be open to hotel visitors.

COMMENT PD-21 (Project Description):

[Page II-24,1st ¶] Are all elements of the open space network publically accessible? Are any “project” open spaces proposed that are not publically accessible?

Pat Cleary, AICP, Cleary Consulting, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-21 (Project Description):

The project provides a complete network of publicly-accessible open space. The only proposed open spaces that are not proposed as publicly-accessible are the roof decks and the grade level patios associated with the townhouse units.

COMMENT PD-22 (Project Description):

[Page II-24,3rd ¶] Explain how the amphitheater’s 2,000 person capacity was established.

Pat Cleary, AICP, Cleary Consulting, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-22 (Project Description):

The amphitheater capacity was established using the New York City Building Code standard of seven square feet per person for informal event seating.

COMMENT PD-23 (Project Description):

[Page II-24, 3rd ¶] Clarify how the ice staking rink will be created in the winter. How would such a facility be operated, managed?

Pat Cleary, AICP, Cleary Consulting, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-23 (Project Description):

Although the design of the ice skating rink will be presented as a detail in the Site Plan submitted for that phase, the Applicant anticipates that responsibility for operation of the ice skating rink would ultimately lie with the Property Owners Association. The Applicant currently operates a similar facility (fountain in summer, skating in winter) at one of its office properties and anticipates that the proposed rink would be created annually and function in a similar manner.

COMMENT PD-24 (Project Description):

[Page II-24,4th ¶] Is the Regina Maris viewed as a project amenity? If so, are stabilization measures necessary to secure it as such? Are specific public access improvements proposed?

Pat Cleary, AICP, Cleary Consulting, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-24 (Project Description):

The Regina Maris is an existing public amenity accessible by the existing esplanade. No further specific access improvements, other than the extension and creation of a continuous esplanade, are proposed as part of the project.

COMMENT PD-25 (Project Description):

[Page II-25, 1st ¶] Further explain the “multi-level interpretative observation pier.”

Pat Cleary, AICP, Cleary Consulting, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-25 (Project Description):

The multi-level observation pier includes an accessible level at the esplanade that transitions via a small stepped amphitheater to a viewing area at a level approximately 3’ lower. The upper level has a gateway trellis structure and an overlook trellis structure with benches for viewing. The intent is to allow the users to step down into the restored wetland and learn about the native wetland flora and fauna through a series of interpretative plaques mounted on the railings. The amphitheater could be used for small nature classes, informal gatherings or for viewing. The concept for the pier is illustrated on DEIS Exhibit III-18.

COMMENT PD-26 (Project Description):

[Page II-39, 1st ¶] Where is the work force housing proposed? Will it be distributed throughout the project?

Pat Cleary, AICP, Cleary Consulting, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-26 (Project Description):

The workforce housing would constitute Blocks F and G (the two blocks of townhouse/flats along Dickson Street.)

COMMENT PD-27 (Project Description):

[Page II-39, 3rd ¶] Will the internal parking garages for the condos, hotel, office and retail buildings be access controlled (i.e gated)?

Pat Cleary, AICP, Cleary Consulting, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-27 (Project Description):

The private parking garages for the multifamily, hotel and office buildings would have vehicular access controls. The surface parking lot adjacent to the retail is not proposed to be gated.

COMMENT PD-28 (Project Description):

[Page II-43, 3rd ¶] Will the coordinated project signage system integrate into the downtown to link the two areas together?

Pat Cleary, AICP, Cleary Consulting, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-28 (Project Description):

Yes. The Applicant believes that coordinated wayfinding signage will be critical in drawing visitors between the waterfront and downtown. Conceptual locations of proposed building identification signs have been included on the PUD site plans, see drawings C-5, C-6 and C-7. Signage details, including building identification / monument type signs, would be reviewed at the site plan review stage.

COMMENT PD-29 (Project Description):

[Page II-46, 10 Phasing Plan] A mechanism should be developed to allow for the Phasing Plan to be adjusted in response to environmental remediation activities, market forces, construction procedures. This mechanism should be addressed in the FEIS, and established in the Findings.

Pat Cleary, AICP, Cleary Consulting, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-29 (Project Description):

While the Applicant contemplates completion of the Project in phases, the precise timing and sequencing of the phases will likely be dictated by the status of environmental remediation activities, market forces, construction procedures and other unknown contingencies. Although the potential impact that these contingencies will have on the phasing plan should be acknowledged in the Findings, it is not possible to develop a meaningful mechanism that can be used to adjust the phasing plan because there is no way to determine if, when or how these unknown contingencies will impact the phasing of the project. The Applicant acknowledges that any significant material changes to the phasing plan(s) described in the EIS would require approval from the Planning Board.

COMMENT PD-30 (Project Description):

[Page II-53, 2nd ¶] When will the thresholds be established [in relation to potential thresholds for use in determining whether future modifications as part of subsequent site plan applications would materially comply with the project reviewed?

Pat Cleary, AICP, Cleary Consulting, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-30 (Project Description):

In order to establish an orderly review process for the subsequent individual detailed site plans, the Planning Board could utilize the range in unit mix in the Proposed Action and Alternative 2 scenarios as the thresholds for establishing a maximum permissible range of flexibility for the PUD Master Development Plan. These could be adopted in the Findings Statement and included in the PUD Master Development Plan Approval. These thresholds could then be used during the detailed site plan review stage to determine whether any potential future site plan modifications materially comply with the PUD Master Development Plan and the conceptual site plan currently being reviewed.

It is suggested that the Findings Statement establish a ceiling or total “not to exceed” unit count and parameters on the amount of variation in unit-type that would be considered insignificant. As currently proposed for the baseline Proposed Action, rental units account for approximately 65% of the total number of dwelling units. One-bedroom units account for approximately 30%; 2-bedroom units account for approximately 54%; and 3-bedroom units account for approximately 17% of the overall residential units.

Potential project parameters could be structured as follows:

Modifications shall be deemed to substantially comply in all material respects with the PUD Master Development Plan and Findings Statement adopted by the Planning Board,

and shall not require supplemental review under SEQRA in order for the Planning Board to review and approve the site plan, if such modifications fall within the following parameters:

- Do not increase the gross aggregate square footage compared to the approved PUD Master Development Plan.
- While the height and number of stories of individual buildings may increase or decrease, building heights of any individual buildings do not increase above the height set forth in the Modified Plan (FEIS Plan) or DEIS Plan (herein Alternative 1 Plan).
- Do not materially change building footprints.
- Do not materially reduce the amount of open space.
- Do not materially change in the overall design, scope or general location of the public amenities.
- Do not increase the total number of residential dwelling units above 1085, provided that the total number of hotel units shall not exceed 125 units, and the size of the hotel building is reduced accordingly.
- Maintain the number of rental units at or below 65% of the overall total number of approved dwelling units.
- Maintain the number of three bedroom units at or below 23% of the overall total of approved dwelling units.

The Applicant may alternatively elect to submit pertinent analyses indicating that variations in the proposed program submitted as part of a detailed site plan(s) would generate impacts within the range studied in the FEIS and mitigated for the Proposed Action and Alternative 2 scenarios on Table I-3. Assuming that all thresholds are met, no further SEQRA review shall be required in order for the Planning Board to review and approve said site plan(s) notwithstanding their variation from the PUD Master Development Plan Approval.

COMMENT PD-31 (Project Description):

General- Required Approvals

There are various proposed traffic mitigation measures which the City of Glen Cove or Nassau County Department of Public Works would need to approve: potential traffic signal or roundabout at Garvies Point Road/Herb Hill Road/Dickson Street; turn prohibitions and lane widening at various intersections. These items should be added to the Required Approvals table.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-31 (Project Description):

Comment noted. Approvals for traffic mitigation measures have been added to the approvals table in FEIS Section I.

COMMENT PD-32 (Project Description):

General- Required Approvals

Provide documentation that the Nassau County Department of Public Works has reviewed this document.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-32 (Project Description):

The DEIS document was forwarded to the Nassau County Department of Public Works on June 9, 2009 and signed for by G. Johnson on June 10, 2009. The project team met with Peter Pyne and Gerard Ennis of the Nassau County DPW in January of 2009 to introduce the project, discuss the existing sanitary sewer system, pumping station and wastewater treatment facility as well as global stormwater management concepts. On September 17, 2009, the project team met with Ken Arnold, Gerald Ennis and Peter Pine of Nassau County DPW to further discuss drainage and sanitary sewer design for the project.

COMMENT PD-33 (Project Description):

General- Civil Engineering / Site Design

In Table I-1 in the Executive Summary, the Required Approvals should include approval from the Nassau County Department of Health for backflow preventers.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-33 (Project Description):

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

COMMENT PD-34 (Project Description):

General- Landscape Design

Consideration should be given to adjust the overall scale of the landscape drawings to more clearly illustrate details such as the tree canopy, shrubs, groundcover, etc.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-34 (Project Description):

Detailed planting plans at a larger scale, clearly depicting tree canopy as well as shrub and groundcover areas, will be submitted as part of the individual Site Plans for each phase. Representative landscape plans / details are shown in Exhibits II.PD-6 and II.PD-7A through 7H.

COMMENT PD-35 (Project Description):

General- Landscape Design

Pyrus calleryana (Bradford Pear) is considered an invasive species and should be substituted.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-35 (Project Description):

Pyrus calleryana has been removed from the plant list.

COMMENT PD-36 (Project Description):

General- Landscape Design

Irrigation and infiltration systems are indicated on sheet C-30. Additional irrigation information shall be provided, such as (but not limited to) areas to be irrigated and the corresponding type(s) of irrigation.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-36 (Project Description):

Detailed irrigation design will be provided as part of the individual Site Plans for each phase. See Exhibits II.PD-6 and 6A, which depict managed landscape areas (irrigated areas) and unmanaged natural landscape areas (non-irrigated areas).

COMMENT PD-37 (Project Description):

The plans should provide planting details and notes.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-37 (Project Description):

Planting details and notes will be included as part of the individual Site Plans for each phase.

COMMENT PD-38 (Project Description):

The detailed plans will need to provide notes pertaining to planting soil requirements.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-38 (Project Description):

As part of the individual Site Plans for each phase, Site Plans will include requisite notes pertaining to planting soil requirements.

COMMENT PD-39 (Project Description):

A rain garden detail is shown on sheet C-31, but the rain garden locations are not indicated on plans. Locations should be provided, and landscape material should be shown on landscape sheets and included in the plant list.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-39 (Project Description):

Locations of proposed rain gardens and detailed landscaping design for the rain gardens will be included as part of the Site Plan Approvals Phase of the project. Inclusion of rain gardens as part of the overall stormwater management and landscape design approach for the project was provided to indicate the intent to incorporate this “green” strategy into the design. The intent is to include native or naturalized plant species within the rain gardens, located along the swales / infiltration trenches where the locations are compatible with the surrounding uses and design.

See Exhibits II.PD-6 and 6A depicting managed landscape areas (irrigated areas) and unmanaged natural landscape areas (non-irrigated areas) and Exhibits II.PD-7A through 7H for representative landscape plans / details at various locations within the proposed project site.

COMMENT PD-40 (Project Description):

The legend on sheet C-17 utilizes broad hatch patterns for proposed shrubs, perennials, and ornamental grasses. More specific information is required on the landscape plans, indicating locations, groupings, quantities, etc. similar to the level of information provided for trees.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-40 (Project Description):

Detailed planting plans at a larger scale, clearly depicting tree canopy, as well as shrub and groundcover areas, will be submitted as part of the individual Site Plans for each phase. See Exhibits II.PD-7A through 7H for representative planting plan details at various locations within the proposed development.

COMMENT PD-41 (Project Description):

The surface treatment (i.e. lawn, ground cover, etc.) of areas adjacent to buildings, roads, and paths is not indicated. Additional information is required to identify and differentiate surfaces.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-41 (Project Description):

The intent of the design is to provide plantings along the buildings which will include shrubs, ornamental plantings, groundcover, etc. The remaining open spaces which are not roads, buildings, walkways or paths will largely be lawn areas, with areas of groundcover, ornamental plantings, flower beds, etc. incorporated throughout. The individual Site Plans for each phase will include the landscape design details necessary to clearly differentiate the proposed surface treatment. See Exhibits II.PD-7A through 7H for representative landscape plans / details at various locations throughout the project site.

COMMENT PD-42 (Project Description):

Any wetlands planting shall be illustrated on the landscape plans and included in the plant list.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-42 (Project Description):

The detailed planting plans including the proposed wetlands plantings and all other site planting will be submitted during the individual Site Plans for each phase and the wetlands mitigation plans reviewed by NYSDEC. See Response PD-74 and Exhibits I-11A-J, Exhibits II.PD-6 and 6A for representative wetland planting details.

COMMENT PD-43 (Project Description):

All wetland areas disturbed by proposed seawall construction or re-construction should include post-construction stabilization.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-43 (Project Description):

Wetland areas disturbed by seawall construction or re-construction will be included in our applications to NYSDEC and USACOE. Appropriate post-construction stabilization will be included as part of these applications.

COMMENT PD-44 (Project Description):

Page II-44 of the DEIS indicates that the "entire open space system will be planted with native plants or naturalized plantings." The Tree Legend and Table on sheet C-17 indicate the use of 27 tree species, only 10 of which are native. The remaining 17 tree species need to be changed, or the text needs to be corrected.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-44 (Project Description):

The design intent is to plant the open space with native or naturalized plantings and more specifically to avoid the use of invasive species. As such, several of the species may be naturalized and not native. These non-invasive naturalized species have been selected because they are common street trees and grow well alongside sidewalks and roadways, such as little-leaf linden (*Tilia cordata*) or provide aesthetic benefits, such as Kwanzan cherry (*Prunus kwanzan*). The Conceptual Landscaping Planting Zone Plan has been revised to increase the abundance of native tree and shrub plantings. Currently, approximately 66% of planted trees shall consist of species native to the northeastern United States and all remaining trees are naturalized and non-invasive. Approximately 57% of the species (12 of 21 species) of shrubs and ornamental grasses utilized on the project site shall consist of species native to the northeastern United States. All remaining planted shrubs are naturalized and non-invasive. Non-native ornamental grasses such as *Pennisetum* and *Miscanthus* shall be mixed with native grasses such as little bluestem (*Schizachyrium scoparium*), big bluestem (*Andropogon gerardii*), switch grass (*Panicum virgatum*), and *Muhlenbergia capillaris*. Two herbaceous species with the invasive potential shall be used on the site: day-lily (*Hemerocallis*) and lilyturf (*Liriope*). Both these species

spread vigorously via rhizomes. To avoid spread of these species, only non-invasive, hybrid cultivars of *Hemerocallis* shall be used on the project site. In addition, these species shall only be used in planting beds located south of Garvies Point Road and shall be bordered by turfgrass or other plantings, sidewalks, buildings to prevent rhizomatous growth beyond the planting area. No *Hemerocallis* or *Liriope* shall be used in planting areas located adjacent to Garvies Point Preserve. The final planting plans will be developed during the individual Site Plans for each phase. See Exhibits II.PD-6 and 6A, depicting managed landscape areas (irrigated areas) and unmanaged natural landscape areas (non-irrigated areas) and Exhibits II.PD-7A through 7H for representative landscape plans / details at various locations within the proposed project site.

COMMENT PD-45 (Project Description):

Chapter II, Exhibit II-5: Are new islands being added to the Pratt Park pond? If so, has this been analyzed relative to any potential impacts on stormwater?

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-45 (Project Description):

No, the project does not involve any alterations to the pond in Pratt Park.

COMMENT PD-46 (Project Description):

Review the consistency of Table II-3 with Drawing C-20, which deal with provided parking in distinct areas of the site. Specifically, the table indicates 79 parking spaces for the restaurant and 58 for Commercial/Cultural space, while the drawing does not correspond to these numbers.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-46 (Project Description):

The intent of Drawing C-20 is to show the arrangement of parking for each of the floors of the proposed buildings and is not intended to illustrate the surface parking lot for the development since the layout of this parking area is clearly depicted on the conceptual PUD plans. The Development Program Summary table in the FEIS Introduction provides the total number of stalls required and provided for each use, including the number of stalls required for the restaurant (provided within Block A) and number of stalls required and provided for the commercial/cultural space.

COMMENT PD-47 (Project Description):

Table II-5A: The table indicates separate Car and Van spaces. New York State requires that all spaces be van accessible, which requires 8-foot wide access aisles. The 5-foot aisles are inadequate.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

New York State Building Code requires that all access aisles for accessible parking spaces be at least 8 feet wide. Correct the width of any 5-foot wide access aisles.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-47 (Project Description):

As part of the individual Site Plans for each phase, the accessible parking will include 8-foot wide access aisles for all accessible spaces. This adjustment has not decreased the parking supply for each building. Sheet C-20 of the PUD Master Plan set has been modified to provide van accessible spaces for all accessible spaces located internal to the buildings. Final design of ADA spaces within buildings and on the site will be prepared in accordance with ADAAG standards / requirements for the number of spaces, access, and all dimensional requirements and will be subject to detailed review during the formal site plan stage of the project.

COMMENT PD-48 (Project Description):

Table II-5A: How many accessible parking spaces are available to the general public, and are they distributed throughout the development?

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-48 (Project Description):

Public parking is available in Block A, Block D, the surface lot adjacent to the commercial/cultural area and along all of the public streets. One (1) accessible space can be made available to the public, if so desired by the City, at the western end of Garvies Point Road at the beach access, three (3) accessible spaces are available to the public in Block A, eight (8) accessible spaces are available to the public in Block D and three (3) accessible spaces are available to the public in the commercial/cultural lot. Final design of the ADA spaces will be prepared in accordance with ADAAG standards / requirements for the number of spaces, access, and all dimensional requirements and will be subject to detailed review during the formal site plan stage of the project. Refer to the Parking Study in the Appendix and Drawing C-20 of the PUD Master Plans for additional information. While the overall number of parking spaces for each building is subject to change based upon construction phasing of the development (see Flexibility discussion in Section I.C), the number of parking spaces required for each building and use will be provided. This will be incorporated into the formal site plan application(s) for the project.

COMMENT PD-49 (Project Description):

Section 6: Utilities (page II-43): Define "smaller" and "larger" storm events.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-49 (Project Description):

The project will be designed to City of Glen Cove and Nassau County Department of Public Works standards.

COMMENT PD-50 (Project Description):

Section 7: Landscaping, Lighting, Signage (page II-43): Will non-essential lighting be turned off after hours?

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-50 (Project Description):

The conceptual lighting plans include lighting to illuminate a variety of uses, such as roadways and sidewalks, surface parking lots, open space pathways, marinas, and building details. Some of this lighting, as is typical, will be required to stay on after business closing hours in order to provide for safety. There may also be limited accent lighting of certain building or landscape details that may be illuminated for a period beyond business closing hours. Other non-essential project lighting would be turned off.

COMMENT PD-51 (Project Description):

Section 8. Operational Information (page II-45): The applicant should state what the maximum length of stay for the hotel would be.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-51 (Project Description):

At this point, the Applicant does not intend on limiting a hotel guest's stay to a maximum number of days. As there is not currently a confirmed operator for the hotel, the operations of the hotel cannot be described with certainty. The hotel is currently conceived as a full-service hotel, not as an extended stay hotel. However, the type of hotel that is ultimately developed will be dictated by the market.

COMMENT PD-52 (Project Description):

Page III.O-9: Under Construction Impacts and Phasing, the applicant should discuss how the work on Garvies Point Road/Herb Hill Road would need to be integrated into the project schedule, and its effect on the duration. The December 2016 construction completion may in fact be delayed, since it is based on a January 2010 start date.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-52 (Project Description):

The City has selected Sidney B. Bowne & Son, LLP to design Garvies Point Road and Herb Hill Road. The Applicant has met with the Garvies Point Road design team in order to coordinate and integrate roadway construction with the conceptual site plan. The Glen Isle construction schedule currently takes into consideration the need to coordinate project timing with the development of Garvies Point Road and will adjust subject to the pace with which the road construction moves ahead.

COMMENT PD-53 (Project Description)

Civil Engineering and Site Design - Plan Comments

Parking layouts should conform to typical City requirements of, "not more than 12 parking spaces shall be permitted in a continuous row and not more than 20 spaces shall be permitted in a single parking area without being interrupted by landscaping approved by the Planning Board".

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-53 (Project Description)

Detailed individual Site Plans for each phase will adhere to City requirements regarding surface parking lot design. The PUD Master Plans have been modified to incorporate the City's requirements.

COMMENT PD-54 (Project Description)

The legends, symbols, and note callouts on the plans needs to be clearer and better coordinated. For example, retaining walls are not specifically identified by either a legend or notes; the shading. And hatching of the various site finishes are not clear.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-54 (Project Description)

Individual Site Plans for each phase will include the requested legends, symbols, note callouts and identification of proposed improvements. The PUD Master Plans have been modified to provide additional notes and call-outs as well as coordinated legend.

COMMENT PD-55 (Project Description)

The site plans will need to provide project specific construction details.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-55 (Project Description)

Comment noted. Individual Site Plans for each phase will include project specific construction details.

COMMENT PD-56 (Project Description)

Parking for the public areas is provided along the public roads and the 58-car surface lot (including 3 handicapped-accessible spaces) east of Block I. The Applicant should substantiate the adequacy of providing 3 accessible spaces, as well as their location relative to providing access to the entire public component of the development.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-56 (Project Description)

Accessible parking for the proposed development has been calculated based upon Federal and State ADA regulations. Public parking is available in Block A, Block D, the surface lot adjacent to the commercial/cultural area and along all of the public streets. One (1) accessible space can be made available to the public, if so desired by the City, at the western end of Garvies Point Road at the beach access, three (3) accessible spaces are available to the public in Block A, eight (8) accessible spaces are available to the public in Block D and three (3) accessible spaces are available to the public in the commercial/cultural lot. Final design of the ADA spaces will be prepared in accordance with ADAAG standards / requirements for the number of spaces, access, and all dimensional requirements and will be subject to detailed review during the formal site plan stage of the project.

COMMENT PD-57 (Project Description)

It is understood that the Development will utilize private carters for the collection of solid waste. However, the Applicant needs to address the location of the development's numerous refuse storage areas, including daily trash and bulk items.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-57 (Project Description)

Each building will include refuse and recycling storage within specific rooms of the building, where the refuse /recycling will be stored until it is picked up by private carters. The locations of these rooms are include on the conceptual PUD building plans, however, the detailed design will be included as part of the individual Site Plans and Building Designs for each phase of the project. The buildings would also include refuse compactors, which would serve to reduce trash volumes and the number of required pickups.

COMMENT PD-58 (Project Description):

Site Design and Landscape Design - Plan Comments:

- Sheet No. C-2 GENERAL NOTES AND LEGEND
- MPT Note 16: Add text to state that disturbed or damaged devices shall be replaced within four (4) hours of notification.
- MPT Note 17: All drainage inlets shall be set to temporary or final grade to ensure drainage of the pavement areas. Inlets shall be adjusted no more than 72 hours prior to paving.
- Drainage Note 2: All RCP shall be Class IV.
- Drainage Note 3: All RCP shall be Class IV.
- Drainage Note 5: Provide minimum required clearances.
- Drainage Note 8: Delete "Registered Architect."
- Sanitary Sewer Note 3: Provide minimum required clearances.
- Sanitary Sewer Note 10: Add "gravity" prior to the term "sewer pipe."
- Erosion Control Measures Note 2: Change "should" to "shall" at the start of the 3rd line; add "by the Developer/Owner" after the word "maintained" in the 3rd line.
- Add the following note in the Erosion Control Measures section: "Provide catch basin filter inserts in all drainage inlets within the Project Area. All inserts shall be maintained by the Contractor for the duration of construction and until the site is permanently stabilized. Contractor shall install new filter inserts in all drainage inlets at completion of the work to be maintained thereafter by the

Owner."

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-58 (Project Description)

The General Notes and Legend Plan Sheet C-2 of the PUD Master Plan set has been modified as requested. Additional detail for these notes will be included as part of the Site Plan phase of the project.

COMMENT PD-59 (Project Description)

- Sheet No. C-5 SITE PLAN SHEET A
- Pedestrian ramps shall be provided at all intersections and along all pedestrian paths to ensure barrier-free movement.
- Provide pedestrian crosswalks where necessary.
- Identify all elements on the drawings either by legend, symbol, or note.
- Label major site components such as the boardwalk, retaining wall, etc.
- Identify the location of public accessible parking for this section of the development.
- Why is Road A 22 feet wide, while other roads are 24 feet wide at a minimum?
- Is restaurant parking going to be 100% valet or self-parking? Indicate the parking location. Demonstrate how valet parking operation will function; the plan needs to illustrate that there will not be excessive queuing along the narrow, circular path.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-59 (Project Description)

The Site Plans will include pedestrian crosswalk locations and accessible ramps. All major site components and elements of the site design will be clearly identified either by legend, symbol or note. Public accessible parking for this area of the development is available within the proposed hotel (Block C) and along public streets (Garvies Point Road).

Road A has been modified to be 24 feet wide. There is no parking along this access road. Minimal traffic is expected along this route as it only provides access to the restaurant. At 24', the road accommodates emergency vehicles with room for exiting vehicles to pass during emergencies. Access and circulation details for delivery, sanitation and emergency vehicles will be provided as part of the formal site plan for this area of the development.

Parking for the restaurant (87 stalls) is provided in Block A (Building A) and will be via valet or self-park in Block A. Valets will shuttle the cars from the restaurant drop off into the Block A parking area. The 400 ft + long access road will include two 12 feet wide lanes which will allow cars to queue while waiting for valet service. The restaurant will employ sufficient valet service to minimize queuing times along the access road.

For clarity, additional notes and call-outs have been provided on the PUD Master Plans. Requisite site details will be provided on future site plan drawings prepared during the formal site plan stage of the project.

COMMENT PD-60 (Project Description)

Sheet No. C-6 SITE PLAN SHEET B

- Is there adequate space at the Herb Hill Road/Dickson Street/Garvies Point Road intersection to accommodate a roundabout if this treatment is ultimately selected?
- Identify public handicapped accessible parking for this section of the development.
- Clarify why concrete walks extend to the curb in front of Block D.
- Review the width of the Fire Access Path along the west side of Block D relative to Appendix D of the New York State Building Code. In addition, the Nassau County Fire Marshall has final jurisdiction over this access path during their Site Plan Review.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-60 (Project Description)

The configuration of the Herb Hill Road / Dickson Street / Garvies Point Road intersection has been modified to include a roundabout. The design of the roundabout will be provided by Sidney B. Bowne & Son, LLC as part of the Garvies Point Road design. Timing of the roundabout design relative the Garvies Point Road design will be coordinated with the City and the applicant prior to site plan preparation of the particular development phase that triggers the roundabout mitigation.

Public accessible parking for this area of the development is available within the proposed office building (Block D) and along public streets (Garvies Point Road, Herb Hill Road and Dickson Street).

Final design of sidewalk systems will be modified as part of the Site Plan phase of the project and may include eliminating some of the concrete walks which extend to the curb in front of Building D.

As part of the Site Plan Approvals Phase of the project, the proposed fire path along the west side of Block D will be designed in accordance with applicable codes and will be submitted to the Nassau County Fire Marshall for review and approval. As suggested by Mr. Alan King of Cameron Engineering on April 14, 2011, the applicant will meet with the Nassau County Fire Marshall prior to preparation of the first site plan application for the project.

COMMENT PD-61 (Project Description)

• Sheet No. C-7 SITE PLAN SHEET C

- Is the distribution of accessible spaces in the surface parking area for Block F commensurate with the number of units in each building?
- How will the development be built along the dividing line between the "Current Area to be Developed" and the "Area of Future Development" if the future acquisition is delayed?

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-61 (Project Description)

The number of accessible spaces in the surface lot for Block F (5 spaces) is correct and is based upon the total number of parking spaces for the Block (101 total), which includes garage and driveway spaces.

If the acquisition of the “area of future development” is delayed, an interim plan will be prepared which will include a portion of the public parking lot adjacent to Block I. A conceptual sketch illustrating a potential interim design is provided in Exhibit II.PD-10. The detailed interim design, if required, will be developed as part of the Site Plan phase of the project.

COMMENT PD-62 (Project Description)

- Sheet No. C-:8 GRADING PLAN SHEET A
- Clarify the accessible route to the restaurant.
- Clarify the grades at the northwest side of Block A; they do not appear to close on the building.
- Review the location of the low point, El. 9.6, in the roundabout.
- Drainage inlets that are located along the projected flow line between the parking lane and travel lane should be relocated to the curb line.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-62 (Project Description)

Appropriate accessible routes will be provided as part of the Site Plan and Building Design phase of the project and final grading of the site and of the northwestern side of Block A will be provided as part of the Site Plan phase of the project. Grading has been modified as required in order to correctly depict the proposed conceptual grading on the PUD Master Plans.

The final design of the roundabout at the beach access will be included as part of the Garvies Point Road Roadway Improvement project which is being implemented by the City. The Applicant’s consultant has begun coordinating with the City’s consultants to assist with the roadway design and will suggest shifting of the low point within the roundabout.

Final design of the drainage improvements along Garvies Point Road will be included as part of the Garvies Point Road Roadway Improvement project which is being provided by the City.

COMMENT PD-63 (Project Description)

Sheet No. C-9 GRADING PLAN SHEET B

- Add finish floor elevations to plan.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-63 (Project Description)

Finished floor elevations are shown on the PUD Master Plans and will be included on all future site plan drawings, prepared as part of the Site Plan phase of the project.

COMMENT PD-64 (Project Description)

- Sheet No. C-10 GRADING PLAN SHEET C
- Add finish floor elevations to plan.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-64 (Project Description)

Finished floor elevations are shown on the PUD Master Plans and will be included on all future site plan drawings, prepared as part of the Site Plan phase of the project.

COMMENT PD-65 (Project Description)

- Sheet No. C-11 UTILITY PLAN SHEET A
 - Review potential conflicts at utility crossings.
 - Review hydrant locations and spacing, particularly along the south side of the development.
- The Nassau County Fire Marshall will review this design during their review of the site plan.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-65 (Project Description)

Detailed utility design will be provided as part of the Site Plan phase of the project. Project buildings would be sprinklered in accordance with NYS Uniform Fire Prevention and Building Code requirements. Hydrant locations and spacing as included on the conceptual PUD plans are based upon initial discussions with the City of Glen Cove Fire Chief. Final review and approval by the City of Glen Cove Fire Chief and the Nassau County Fire Marshall will be included as part of the Site Plan phase of the project. Conceptual utility design has been modified to address the revised development layout – see PUD Master Plans.

COMMENT PD-66 (Project Description)

- Sheet No. C-12 UTILITY PLAN SHEET B
- Review potential conflicts at utility crossings.
- Review note 'Exist. 12" water main to remain.' It appears that the main is identified as a 6" main.
- Review hydrant placement.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-66 (Project Description)

The commenter correctly notes that the water main is a 6" main. The call-out has been modified on the PUD Master Plans and will be included on the detailed Site Plans. Detailed utility design will be provided as part of the Site Plan phase of the project. Hydrant locations and spacing as included on the conceptual PUD plans are based upon initial discussions with the City of Glen Cove Fire Chief. Final review and approval by the City of Glen Cove Fire Chief and the Nassau County Fire Marshall will be included as part of the Site Plan phase of the project. As suggested

by Mr. Alan King of Cameron Engineering on April 14, 2011, the applicant will meet with the Nassau County Fire Marshal prior to preparation of the first site plan application for the project and will forward copies of meeting minutes to the City.

COMMENT PD-67 (Project Description)

- Sheet No. C-13 UTILITY PLAN SHEET C
- Confirm that fire hydrants are permitted off a 6" main as opposed to an 8" main.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-67 (Project Description)

Detailed utility design, including water system distribution design, will be provided as part of the Site Plan phase of the project and / or as part of the City's roadway improvement plan design.

COMMENT PD-68 (Project Description)

- Sheet No. C-14.LIGHTING PLAN SHEET A
- Site plans will need to provide a comprehensive point by point photometric analysis.
- Are light fixtures dark skies compliant?

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-68 (Project Description)

A point-by-point photometric analysis of the site lighting design will be included as part of the Site Plan phase of the project. The development project will not result in adverse lighting impacts: all site lighting fixtures will be specified to be sharp cut-off dark sky compliant fixtures and will meet City Ordinance requirements for maximum lighting levels at property lines.

COMMENT PD-69 (Project Description)

Sheet No. C-15 LIGHTING PLAN SHEET B

- Installation, wiring, and circuitry details will be reviewed during site plan approval.
- Revise the 24" clearance from the face of curb to the closest part of the light pole.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-69 (Project Description)

Detailed lighting design, including installation, wiring and circuitry and details such as clearance requirements from face of curb to the closest part of the light pole, will be included as part of the Site Plan phase of the project.

COMMENT PD-70 (Project Description)

- Sheet No. C-17 LANDSCAPE PLAN SHEET A
- Special consideration should be given to the species selection of plant material west of Block A

regarding the plants' salt tolerance.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-70 (Project Description)

Detailed landscaping design, including consideration of plants' salt tolerance levels, will be included as part of the Site Plan phase of the project. See Exhibits II.PD-6 and 6A depicting managed landscape areas (irrigated areas) and unmanaged natural landscape areas (non-irrigated areas) and Exhibits II.PD-7A through 7H for representative landscape plans / details at various locations within the proposed project site.

COMMENT PD-71 (Project Description)

- Sheet No. C-20 BUILDING PARKING PLANS
- Clarify the discrepancy between the drawing and the Table II-3 in the DEIS, which respectively indicate 0 and 79 parking spaces associated with the restaurant. Indicate the location of the restaurant's parking.
- Clarify the parking discrepancy for Block J. The drawing does not indicate any parking, while the DEIS Table II-3 indicates 59 parking spaces.
- Accessible spaces appear to have been calculated on a building-by-building basis, as opposed to an overall-site basis. Based on this methodology, the number of accessible spaces appears to satisfy or exceed the code requirements, with the exception of the West Block. Provide additional accessible parking on the West Block.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-71 (Project Description)

The intent of Drawing C-20 is to show the arrangement of parking for each of the floors of the proposed buildings and is not intended to illustrate the surface parking lot for the development since the layout of this parking area is clearly depicted on the conceptual PUD plans. A note indicating such has been included on drawing C-20 of the PUS site plans. The Development Program Summary table in the Introduction provides the total number of stalls required and provided for each use, including the number of stalls required for the restaurant (87 stalls provided within Block A) and number of stalls required and provided for the commercial/cultural space.

Accessible parking has been calculated on a building-by-building basis. The accessible parking for Block A/ West Block is shown diagrammatically on the plan (drawing C-20). Seven accessible stalls have been included in Block A. This text discrepancy has been addressed on sheet C-20 of the PUD Master Plans.

COMMENT PD-72 (Project Description)

Sheet No C-24 TYPICAL SECTIONS SHEET D

- Correct titles for Bulkhead & Beach Access Stairs.
- Retaining wall details and designs need to be provided to ensure structural stability.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-72 (Project Description)

Titles for details will be modified as necessary as part of the Site Plan phase of the project. Retaining wall details and design will be provided as part of the Site Plan phase of the project.

COMMENT PD-73 (Project Description)

Sheet No. C-25 TYPICAL SECTIONS SHEET E

- Section AA does not indicate any wetland restoration planting of disturbed area.
- Section CC does not illustrate the location of the mean low water as related to the planting depth of Smooth Cordgrass. According to the United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, as a general rule, Smooth Cordgrass should be planted in water depths between 1" and 18".
- Notes indicate a spring planting season. An additional note should be added to prevent planting before the last frost date.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-73 (Project Description)

Section AA is taken along the beach. There is no proposed wetland restoration planting at this location as this area is not proposed to be disturbed as part of the project. As part of the Site Plan phase of the project and the NYSDEC permit application, Section CC will be modified to provide the location of mean low water relative to the planting depth of Smooth Cordgrass. The intention is to provide planting of Smooth Cordgrass in water depths as required by NYSDEC.

COMMENT PD-74 (Project Description)

- Sheet No. C-26 TYPICAL SECTIONS SHEET F
- Section AI indicates the use of species listed on the Captains Cove Slope Planting Specifications. The plans should be revised to include additional information as to location and elevation.

Planting layout should also be shown on the landscape plans.

- The Captains Cove Slope Planting Specifications specifies a planting rate for the Smooth Cordgrass using seed, while the notes on section AI indicate 2" peat pots. Seeding is not a preferred method of establishment for this species, and should be installed using peat pots or bare root. Revise the plans accordingly.
- See notes for Sheet 25 regarding the Smooth Cordgrass planting season and water depths.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-74 (Project Description)

Planting Specifications for the wetland and shoreline restoration areas at Captain's Cove, Renaissance Park, and the Upper Reach of Glen Cove Creek are provided below. Detailed plan

and section views of the proposed restoration areas will be submitted to the USACE, NYSDEC, and NYSDOS as part of permit applications for the project.

Plant Species and Size

Upland Shrubs (3-4' in height, 2 gallon containers on 12' centers):

Northern Bayberry	<i>Morella pensylvanica</i>
Groundsel Bush	<i>Baccharis halimifolia</i>
Beach Plum	<i>Prunus maritima</i>

Upland Herbaceous Plants (2" plugs on 18" centers):

Switch Grass	<i>Panicum virgatum</i>
Seaside Goldenrod	<i>Solidago sempervirens</i>
Butterfly Milkweed	<i>Asclepias tuberosa</i>
Smooth Aster	<i>Aster laevis</i>

High Marsh Plants (2" plugs on 18" centers):

Salt Hay	<i>Spartina patens</i>
Spike Grass	<i>Distichlis spicata</i>

Low Marsh Plants (2 " plugs on 18" centers):

Smooth Cordgrass	<i>Spartina alterniflora</i>
------------------	------------------------------

Whole Marsh Sods (4-9 sq. ft. sods distributed evenly throughout receiving areas):

Planting Windows

Low Marsh Sod Transplanting: March 1 to June 30

Low Marsh, High Marsh, and Upland Slope Plugs: Spring Season April 15 to June 15

Upland Slope Shrubs: April 1 to May 15

Elevation Requirements

Upland Slope Plants: > 6.0'

High Marsh Plants: 4.4 - 6.0'

Low Marsh Plants: 1.0' - 4.4'

Planting Methods and Specifications

Site Preparation

Planting substrates shall be free from debris, noxious weeds, toxic substances or other materials harmful to plant growth. Prior to commencement of planting operations, the Contractor shall complete a Soils Test in accordance with ASTM D 5268 and ASTM D 4972 to determine the pH, organic matter, soluble salt, and nutrient contents, as well as soil texture, of the planting substrates. Separate sample collections shall occur for each planting area, and be random over the separate areas.

Prior to the commencement of the planting operations, the Contractor shall verify that finished grades are as indicated on the plans, and the finishing and compaction

requirements have been completed in accordance with design specifications. After grading is complete, heavy equipment is prohibited from entering planting areas.

Herbivory Fence

Herbivory Fence shall be installed after final grades in the marsh areas and upland slope planting areas are completed. Herbivory Fence shall be installed prior to or concurrently with installation of the low and high marsh and upland slope plants. Under no circumstances are these plants to be planted outside the containment of a satisfactorily installed Herbivory Fence.

Fence Materials shall be as follows:

Herbivory Fence shall be made of the following materials:

Wood Stakes on 10' centers: Untreated hardwood lumber, pointed-tip stakes. Stakes must be free from large knots that weaken the strength of the stake.

Fence Fabric: 6-ft high panel deer exclusion fence, UV-stabilized, minimum 600 lbs/ sf breaking strength, or equivalent item

Fabric may be attached to wood stakes using heavy-duty zip-ties or 1.5 inch hot dipped galvanized u-nails.

Nylon twine: Braided nylon mason's line #18 gauge cord with tensile strength of 150 pounds.

Plastic flagging tape or Mylar tape

Herbivory Fence shall be installed after final grades in the marsh and upland slope planting areas are completed and approved by. Herbivory Fence shall be installed prior to or concurrently with installation of the marsh and upland plants. Under no circumstances are these plants to be planted outside the containment of a satisfactorily installed Herbivory Fence.

Stakes shall be pounded vertically into the substrate. Herbivory Fence shall be installed a minimum of 18 inches away from the first row of wetland planting. At least one stake shall be also be installed in the interior of each cell to provide support for nylon twine and flagging tape. Planting cells should be approximately 50' x 50' in size. The fence fabric shall be secured at the top, middle, and bottom to the wood stakes with plastic ties. All fence shall be placed so that the bottom of the fence lies entirely on the substrate. Upon completion of the outer perimeter of each cell and the installation of interior stakes, nylon twine shall be strung across the tops of the planting areas from the perimeter stakes to the interior stakes. The nylon twine shall be wrapped around the top of the stake several times. The twine shall be strung to the next stake and wrapped again before continuing on to the next stake. Mylar or plastic flagging, trailing at least 12 inches of tape from the tie, shall be tied to the top of each hardwood stake (both perimeter and interior). The flagging shall also be tied along the interior nylon twine. Stringing of the

interior twine and tying of flagging may be done after planting in a cell is completed; however, no planted area is to be left exposed without interior lines and flagging at the end of any workday. No unused strands of nylon twine, fence fabric, packaging materials, wood stakes or any other construction debris shall be left on the Project Site after fence installation and guarantee maintenance has been completed. Herbivory fencing may be removed after two growing seasons if 85% coverage/survivorship is attained.

Plant Material

Plants shall be well-shaped, well-grown, vigorous plants having healthy and well branched root systems. Plants shall be free from disease, harmful insects and insect eggs, sun-scald injury, disfigurement, and abrasion. Plants shall be free of shock or damage to branches, trunks or root systems that may occur during digging and preparation for shipment, method of shipment or actual shipment. Marsh plants shall be acclimated to saline conditions (20 ppt) when delivered and this needs to be maintain until they are planted. Plants should be from a suitable geographic location to ensure proper adaptation to Long Island climate and edaphic conditions. Plants shall not be injured in handling. Plants shall not be handled by the trunk or stems. Materials shall not be dropped from vehicles.

Plant Installation

Plugs:

Plugs shall be planted at a depth of no more than 1 inch deeper than grown in the nursery. The top of the rootstock mass shall be a minimum of 1 inch below the soil surface. Plants shall be set plumb, with the root system oriented downward, and held in position until sufficient soil has been firmly placed by hand around the root mass. The plant shall be set even with or slightly higher than the surrounding grade. It shall be unacceptable to step on or around planting holes for the purposed of placing backfill. All planting shall be done "in the dry", i.e. while the tide is below the elevations of the area being planted.

Shrubs:

Plant pits shall be dug approximately 4 inches wider than the stock size. To encourage well-aerated soil to be available to the root system for favorable root growth, plant pits shall be constructed with sides sloping towards the base. Prior to placing a shrub, fertilizer shall be placed in the bottom of each plant pit. At no time shall fertilizer be placed in the water column or on top of the soil surface.

Fertilizers shall only be applied to upland shrubs. Shrub shall be a slow release tablet with a 20-10-5 nitrogen-phosphorus-potassium ratio. Fertilization rate shall not exceed manufacturer's specifications for appropriate-sized shrub.

Transplanting of Low Marsh Sods:

Marsh sods must be re-planted within 48 hours of being removed or uprooted. Marsh sods may not be transplanted when the ambient temperature are below 33 degrees Fahrenheit.

Any wrack and debris that has collected in the low marsh planting areas shall be thoroughly removed and disposed of in an offsite licensed facility prior to transplanting. These areas shall be raked clean and smooth. All transplanting shall be done "in the dry", i.e. while the tide is below the elevations of the area being planted. The Contractor shall schedule planting on a daily basis to account for the diurnal tidal cycles. Transplanting holes shall not be dug while planting substrates are inundated.

Sods shall be removed with caution by a long reach excavator position on top of the existing or reconstructed bulkhead. A Wetland Specialist shall be on-site to supervise transplanting of low marsh sods during all transplanting activities. Excavator bucket shall be guided to proper depth to ensure that roots and rhizomes remain intact. The long reach excavator may place a stockpile of sods and then have other machinery, such as a bobcat, move the hummocks to the final transplant area. Transplanted marsh sods shall be approximately 4-9 square feet in area. Holes for the sods shall be dug, so that the backfill goes no higher than the top of any mussels at the base of the plant material or no lower than the base of the mussel bed. If mussels are not present, the hummocks must be backfilled up to the maroon part of the stems of the *Spartina alterniflora*. The green part *Spartina alterniflora* stems should not be covered with backfill material. All backfill shall be smoothed, leveled and tamped so that there are no holes, divots or ponding around the sods. The grade immediately around the sods shall be re-checked no sooner than 48 hours after fill placement and any holes, divets or ponding must be fixed by adding fill or regrading.

Maintenance

Upland plants shall be irrigated to ensure 1 inch of water per week through natural precipitation or supplemented by irrigation.

Any plants not installed on the day of delivery at the project site shall be stored and protected in designated areas from direct exposure to wind and sun. Any areas used for temporary storage of low and high marsh plants must be enclosed with perimeter Herbivory Fence to prevent grazing by waterfowl. Plants must not be stored on-site for more than 7 days before planting. If planting is delayed for more than 6 hours after delivery, the plants shall be watered.

Installed plants shall be maintained in a healthy growing condition. Maintenance of planting areas during construction shall include preventing the intrusion of weeds, grass, and other undesired vegetation, watering, and adjusting grades for settling. Grass, weeds, and other undesired vegetation shall be removed before reaching a maximum height of 12 inches.

Any planted areas disturbed prior to completion of the guarantee/maintenance period of five growing seasons shall be repaired or reinstalled in accordance with the above specifications.

During the guarantee/maintenance period and until final acceptance, mechanical weed removal, hand pulling and herbicide application may be utilized to keep materials free from invasive vegetation.

During the guarantee/maintenance period, twice-yearly inspections (between May and August) to identify and remove any invasive vegetation (i.e. *Phragmites australis* (Common reed grass), *Ailanthis altissima* (Tree-of-Heaven), *Eleagnus angustifolia* (Russian olive), mugwort (*Artemisia vulgaris*) or other invasive species) All plant vegetation and naturally recruiting native vegetation shall remain undisturbed. Mechanical weed removal shall consist of the removal of stems and rhizomes. Should invasives cover 5% or more of the site herbicide may be applied.

Necessary environmental permits must be obtained for any herbicide treatments. Herbicides shall be used with extreme caution in regard to safety and health. All manufacturer's safety instructions to avoid adverse impacts to human health must be followed. Any spray materials shall be applied with great care to avoid collateral damage to surrounding, native or planted vegetation. Applications to herbaceous invasives shall consist of a glyphosate based herbicide with a non-ionic surfactant. Applications to woody invasives shall consist of spraying the cut stump. All herbicides shall be applied by hand painting, back-pack sprayer or other controlled means to prevent damage to desirable planted vegetation. All spraying shall be done at times when wind does not exceed a velocity of five (5) miles per hour.

Survivorship Guarantee/Maintenance Period

As required by NYSDEC in their Salt Marsh Restoration and Monitoring Guidelines (Niedowski, 2000), applicant shall be responsible for ensuring 85 percent survival of the planted vegetation over five (5) growing seasons. Eighty-five percent (85%) survival shall not be required over five growing seasons if greater than 85% coverage of native vegetation is observed. The plant guarantee period shall commence on the date of the completion of construction, and shall end on October 15 on the fifth growing season. Plant losses due to attributed to herbivores, disease, drought, wind, or storm events shall not lower the minimum survival or coverage requirements. If replacement plants are installed at the end of the five year period to attain 85% survival or coverage, replacement plants shall be guaranteed for an additional growing season from the date of replanting. For low marsh sods, replacement will consist of a 3 ft by 3 ft plot with *Spartina alterniflora* plugs placed 6 inches on center, or a total of 36 plugs.

See Exhibit II.PD-6 and 6A depicting managed landscape areas (irrigated areas) and unmanaged natural landscape areas (non-irrigated areas) and Exhibits II.PD-7A through 7H for representative landscape plans / details at various locations within the proposed project site.

Suitability of Restoration Area in the Upper Reach of Glen Cove Creek for Tidal Wetland Vegetation:

Several comments have been received regarding the ability of tidal wetland vegetation to survive at the base of the Glen Cove Creek outflow and accordingly, the following discussion has been provided:

Tidal wetland plants, such as *Spartina alterniflora*, *Spartina patens*, and *Distichlis spicata*, have cellular and physiological adaptations that allow them to tolerate salinity and periodic inundation. Salinity and inundation are stresses on plants and these select species are among the very few plants that have adaptations to tolerate these stresses. These species do not need salinity for survival and growth. The absence of these species in freshwater environments largely results from these species being outcompeted by other plant species in fresh waters rather than these plants needing salinity for growth and survival. Accordingly, it is appropriate to plant tidal wetlands vegetation in the proposed wetland restoration in the upper reach of Glen Cove Creek because of their tolerance of the most stressful environmental conditions (low freshwater flow in Glen Cove Creek and high saline water flow due to astronomical or storm tides) rather than planting freshwater plant species which may only tolerate the more benign environmental conditions (high freshwater flow in Glen Cove Creek and low saline water flow due to low tides).

However, it should be noted that the freshwater inputs of Glen Cove Creek may make the proposed wetland restoration site suitable to a wider range of plant species due to the reduced salinity. For example, plant species commonly found in brackish or coastal fresh marshes may also survive tolerate the environmental conditions at the site due to the magnitude of the freshwater inputs. These brackish species include narrow-leaved cattail (*Typha angustifolia*), big cordgrass (*Spartina cynosuroides*), and bulrushes (*Scirpus americanus* and *S. robustus*). There is no salinity data available for the upper reach at Glen Cove Creek. However, during the site plan approval and permit application phase of the proposed project, the applicant will conduct salinity measurements, particularly during low freshwater flow and high tide conditions, to determine if the salinity is suitable for these species. If the salinity does not exceed the tolerances of these brackish species, these plants shall be incorporated into the high marsh of the proposed wetland restoration at the upper reach of Glen Cove Creek to increase the plant diversity in the restoration site.

Plant communities dominated by these brackish plants are typically characterized as “Coastal Fresh Marshes” under the New York State Tidal Wetlands Land Use Regulations Act (Part 661) and are classified as a type of tidal wetland. Furthermore, we know that there is a 3.6’ tidal range at the upper reach of Glen Cove Creek, so it is certainly a tidal wetland rather than a freshwater wetland. Therefore, the potential inclusion of brackish species such as *Typha angustifolia*, *Spartina cynosuroides*, or *Scirpus sp.* based on low salinities at the upper reach of Glen Cove Creek will not prevent this restoration site from serving as mitigation for the Large Vessel Marina.

COMMENT PD-75 (Project Description)

- Sheet No. C-27 FIRE TRUCK TURNING MANEUVERS SHEET A
- Given the marina use on the west end of the site, AutoTURN analyses of a passenger car towing a boat trailer (AASHTO design vehicle P/B), showing the maneuver easily ending with the boat trailer facing the water.

- The AutoTURN diagrams need to analyze turning movements and maneuverability for delivery vehicles, sanitation vehicles, and emergency vehicles to and from the restaurant.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-75 (Project Description)

AutoTURN analyses of a passenger car towing a boat trailer at the public beach access and public boat trailer area are provided as Exhibits II.PD-2, 3 and 4 and illustrate that sufficient area has been provided for trailers to safely maneuver to and from the boat ramp. It is not unusual for the cars and boat trailers to occupy opposite lanes of roadways when making turns. Otherwise, expansive areas of pavement would be required to accommodate all movements within designated lanes. There is adequate sight distance along Garvies Point Road to allow the cars with boat trailers, as well as the public utilizing Garvies Point Road, to safely share these roadways.

The base PUD design incorporates a new access / driveway for the Hempstead Harbor Club, with a new monument sign for the club at the western end of the new public boat and trailer parking area. Based on concerns expressed by the Hempstead Harbor Club regarding traffic patterns at the club entrance, an alternate design for the Hempstead Harbor Club access / driveway is provided as Exhibit II.PD-4A. This exhibit depicts the Hempstead Harbor Club driveway off of the northern portion of the new Garvies Point Road circle. The AutoTURN diagrams provided in the exhibit illustrate how the Club's "Con-O-Lift" vehicle can maneuver into and out of the relocated access.

AutoTURN diagrams for delivery vehicles, sanitation vehicles and emergency vehicles to and from the restaurant will be provided as part of the Site Plan phase of the project. As requested, an AutoTurn diagram indicating satisfactory movements for a 24 foot long box truck for deliveries to the restaurant at the Point has been included in Exhibit II.PD-5. Given the restaurant's size it is anticipated that smaller trucks and vans will make deliveries to this area of the site, which will allow reduced hardscape areas, thereby minimizing impacts to the site.

COMMENT PD-76 (Project Description)

- Sheet No. C-31 CONCEPTUAL STORMWATERMANAGEMENT DETAILS
- All notes referencing "design engineer" need to be clarified.

Alan J. King, Jr., P.E., LEED AP, partner, Cameron Engineering & Associates, LLP, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-76 (Project Description)

All notes will be modified as part of the detailed Site Plans. Details have been modified to address the revised stormwater strategy for the project.

COMMENT PD-77 (Project Description):

The benefit of so-called amenities, such as pocket parks between tall buildings, or a turning basin for kayakers, do not outweigh the loss of quality of life which will never be recaptured in suburban Glen Cove.

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

RESPONSE PD-77 (Project Description):

The City's Master Plan explicitly calls for increased public accessibility and recreation along Glen Cove Creek:

“The Vision for Glen Cove Creek. Respect the natural, scenic and historic resources that define Glen Cove's ‘Gold Coast’ character, as well as manage development to encourage increased accessibility and recreational amenities along with a mix of complementary uses.”

Create a network of parks and open spaces in the Glen Cove Creek waterfront, adding up to a new “central park” for all of Glen Cove's residents.

The 20 acres of publicly-accessible open space on the waterfront is a significant and invaluable public amenity. This is particularly true for inner-ring suburban communities, such as Glen Cove, that are highly developed and where most of the shoreline is in private control and access restricted and where opportunities for park expansion are limited.

The Glen Cove Creek is also identified by the NYS Department of State's Long Island Sound Coastal Management Plan as an area where concentrated waterfront redevelopment should occur (one of only four areas along the North Shore.) In addition, there are economic realities that must be confronted when developing brownfield sites, and density is required to provide the opportunity to remedy brownfield conditions and supply desired public amenities.

Quality of life issues are discussed in Sections II.E and II.O.

COMMENT PD-78:

There are way too many rental properties in Glen Cove.

Robert Wong, letter dated July 13, 2009.

RESPONSE PD-78:

The project as conceived consists of a mix of ownership units and rental units in order to provide for a diversity of housing opportunities. (Rentals account for 559 out of the 860 units, or approximately 65%).

COMMENT PD-79:

As an 82 year old Korean War Veteran in a wheelchair with Parkinson's Disease I hope to speak to you on behalf of all people with limited mobility. The Glen Cove Creek Esplanade is currently opened to the public and is handicapped accessible. My family and I often stroll the Creek and watch birds fly overhead and turtles in the wetlands. If the Cove is destroyed you will be doing a disservice to less ambulatory people of the North Shore. There's plenty of housing out there

already. There is not however plenty of open space waterfront. Don't let these unscrupulous developers ruin this special place.

Alphonse Normandia, letter dated July 19, 2009.

RESPONSE PD-79:

The esplanade will be extended along the length of the Creek and will be open to the public and will be handicapped accessible. This would significantly expand waterfront access for the general public, including those with limited mobility, since most of the Creek frontage is currently inaccessible to the public. The entire esplanade will be accessible and will be designed in conformance with ADA standards / requirements for maximum slopes, path widths and routes to / from buildings in order to ensure access for all persons.

COMMENT PD-80:

Maps show the Captains Cove area as a public park. When and how did this land become private and for sale to the highest bidder?

Alphonse Normandia, letter dated July 19, 2009.

RESPONSE PD-80:

Captains Cove is not a public park. It is a Superfund site that is currently owned by the City of Glen Cove. The City has partnered with a private partner to facilitate the redevelopment of Captains Cove as part of the City's vision, as outlined in its Master Plan, to create a mixed-use waterfront community with significant public amenities and waterfront access.

COMMENT PD-81 (Project Description):

§ II F, pg II-67, (revise accordingly) ¶ 4 (*Same comment for ExecSum, §C, pg I-5*)

A clarification (insert) should be included that acknowledges "There is an existing administrative process/procedure to secure regulatory approval of the intended land use on properties currently in the federal or state regulatory programs. This process/procedure entails administrative filings (e.g., change in use notice, environmental easement, Site Management Plan, etc.) before or after any changes in a record of decision (ROD) or as part of an approval for alternate land use. Notwithstanding these processes/procedures, the Applicant believes it prudent for the involved agencies to coordinate their response through an agreement to ensure an efficient and consistent response to the identified environmental conditions during and after development".

James A. Perazzo, Principal, Environmental Resources Management, letter dated July 20, 2009

RESPONSE PD-81 (Project Description):

Comment noted.

COMMENT PD-82 (Project Description):

Section D - Required Approvals (page 1-5). The Table I-I "*Summary of Required Approvals and Involved Agencies*" should include the Nassau County Department of Health as an agency that approves applications for realty subdivision maps to assure satisfactory arrangements

for water supply, sewage disposal and the protection of public health from environmental contamination.

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

RESPONSE PD-82 (Project Description):

Comment noted. The Nassau County Department of Health has been added to the approvals table in FEIS Section I.

COMMENT PD-83 (Project Description):

Section E - Interested and Involved Agencies (page 1-7). The Nassau County Department of Health should be listed as an Involved Agency because it has approval-granting authority.

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

RESPONSE PD-83 (Project Description):

Comment noted. The Nassau County Department of Health has been identified as an Involved Agency.

COMMENT PD-84, (Project Description):

In Section I - Executive Summary, and Section II - Description of Proposed Action of the DEIS, restaurants are planned for this development. Please be informed, as agents for the New York State Health Department under Chapter I, Subpart 14-1 of the New York State Sanitary Code plans are required to be submitted for review and approval to the Nassau County Health Department. In addition, an operational permit must also be acquired prior to the opening of a restaurant.

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

RESPONSE PD-84 (Project Description):

Comment noted.

COMMENT PD-85 (Project Description):

In Section I - Executive Summary, and Section II - Description of Proposed Action of the DEIS, a luxury hotel is planned for this development. Please be informed, as agents for the New York State Health Department under Chapter 1, Subpart 7-1 of the New York State Sanitary Code plans are required to be submitted to the Nassau County Health Department for evaluation. In addition, an operational permit must also be acquired prior to the opening of the hotel.

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

RESPONSE PD-85 (Project Description):

Comment noted.

COMMENT PD-86:

HHPC COMMENT # 17: The DEIS (at p. II-56) states that there will be three new marinas constructed. We are pleased that the applicant states that it will adopt the HHPC's Clean Marinas program. However, while the DEIS describes the components of the program, it does not state whether there will be fueling facilities at the marinas or who will operate and maintain the marinas. At page III.J-6, it states that pump outs would be handled by portable pump out boats, which we understand to mean those operated by the Towns of Oyster Bay and North Hempstead. Because those boats primarily serve Oyster Bay Harbor and Manhasset Bay respectively, this is not the ideal solution. Since we understand that a sewer line will be extended to the area by the proposed relocated Glen Cove Angler's Club marina, it would be ideal to incorporate a pump out at that location.

RECOMMENDATIONS: The FEIS needs to specify whether the marinas will have fueling facilities, provide details including the volumes and their expected impacts, if any. The FEIS should state who will own, operate and maintain them and should address the mechanism for ensuring that the Clean Marinas program will be adopted and carried out by the eventual owners and/or operators of the marinas. The FEIS should address the issue of installing one or more pump out facilities at the marinas.

Eric Swenson, Executive Director, Hempstead Harbor Protection Committee, letter, dated July 13, 2009

RESPONSE PD-86:

The project would involve the creation of two new marinas (a large boat marina and a permanent/transient boat marina). The third marina would be a relocation/replacement of the existing Angler's Club slips.

There are three existing marinas within Glen Cove Creek. The Glen Cove Marina and Brewer Yacht Yard collectively offer two fueling facilities and two pump-out stations. The Harry Tappen Boat Basin, located within Hempstead Harbor approximately 1.5 miles south of the Creek, also provides fuel and a pump-out station.

Given the proximity of other fueling and pump-out facilities, the marinas proposed for the north side of the Creek are not currently conceived to have fueling facilities or stationary pump-out facilities. Pump-out boats would provide another option for vessels visiting the site. Since the project is at the PUD/conceptual site plan review level, it is not yet known who will operate the marinas. Adoption and adherence to the Clean Marinas program can be included as a condition of the Special Permit.