



Long Island Rail Road Expansion Project Floral Park to Hicksville

Final Environmental Impact Statement Appendix 22-A Website DEIS Comments

April 2017

Attachment A:
Website Comments on Draft
Environmental Impact
Statement

Name	Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comments (Website)
Brenden Resnick	I would like to know if the bridge over Roslyn Road in Mineola will need to be replaced for the project. This was a relatively recent undertaking, having been completed less than ten years ago. Will this project require the bridge to be widened or replaced?
Nadine Spano	I don't see any renderings of the covert Ave crossing. Is that available for viewing?
Charles Naftal	What grade crossings are to be eliminated on the Main Line? I would like Willis Avenue and Second Street on the Oyster Bay branch to also be included please
Bill Murphy	I live at 84 Earl st in Westbury. The railroad goes directly past my backyard. You say there will be sound walls installed. Where exactly would they be installed and would they be installed in my backyard. Also you say the third line would be fit into existing LIRR property, how exactly would the third line be fit behind my house. Would you center all three tracks or would you fit the third line on one side or the other.
Kathy Grillo	You say you are changing the grade crossings on our mainline but 1/4 mile down NHP Rd & Covert Ave you are leaving the Hempstead line alone without changing those grade crossings. We are not fools, how can this benefit anyone when you will have to wait at those grade crossings. If you truly cared about the crossings you would have changed all of them on all lines years ago. Truly we do not believe a word you say. I lived through the Herricks Road grade crossing change and it took forever and traffic was so bad during that time. Nothing the MTA or NYS does is ever done on time or on budget. Money is better spent on upgrading what we have already by fixing the rails and switches so that there are never any delays. The ridership has not gone up to support this change. No one in this towns wants or needs this. After the train accident crash in October, we do not want to take a chance having that happen to a freight train taking fuel or anything else flammable along our towns. This could be detrimental to our communities if these freight trains cause a fire. We all know you have a deal with Brookhaven labs to transport unidentified things on the freight rail, please do not take us for fools. I am sure none of you live along this line and your lives will not be impacted by this. Let Mr Cuomo have this is his backyard. I think that is a better use of money that you have lying around. Maybe upgrade our schools or lower our taxes since you have a surplus of cash.
Joe Versaggi	The decision to limit access of both Oyster Bay Branch tracks to only the northern-most/normally westbound Main Line track is a decision that will be regretted for the next 100 years. Halting a WB Main Line local for an Oyster Bay train in either direction is totally nuts. The 3rd track is supposed to increase flexibility, and reduce delays, but now you are adding constraints. You have foregone the option of halting an eastbound Oyster Bay train for a minute or two on the EB local track to let westbound traffic pass, which is critical in the AM rush. You have also forgone the option of running Oyster Bay shuttles with cross-platform connections, as is the option in Valley Stream, Hicksville, and Babylon with other Scoots, which permits more frequent service at lower cost. Current service planning may disdain the idea of Scoots, but you should not forego that option for our successors in the next 100 years. So build at least one island platform, and put the switches EAST of the platform, even if the station has to be moved west 100 feet to accommodate.
Thomas Schoenig	The scope and scale of this project will have long term detrimental impact on tens of thousands of residents that live in the immediate vicinity or travel through it on a daily

	<p>basis. The economic and quality of life impact more than outweighs any economic boost that may or may not materialize as a result of the project. How about keeping work trains off the track and fixing platforms so people don't fall through the cracks? Another big government, screw the middle class guy project that ultimately benefits a few and harms many. Don't do it</p>
Jerry Romano	<p>The LIRR lacks the ability to properly maintain its equipment and have adequate back systems to keep trains running on schedule, trains are filthy have ripped and damaged seats, bathrooms at the stations and on the trains are not properly cleaned, on train communications during delays usually don't happen to keep customers informed, on train signage hasn't worked for years, trains often run behind schedule and overall service has significantly deteriorated under current LIRR Management who "Don't need anyone to tell them how to run a rail road" so during the week of November 28, 2016 that 5 of my 10 trips were delayed due to cracked rails, malfunctioning signals, broken trains and broken switches. Please explain to me how the LIRR can manage a larger infrastructure when they can't properly manage what they are responsible for now? How many delays on an annual basis typically occur in this area of the proposed third track and how many of those delays were caused by human error or inadequately maintained equipment?</p>
Johanna Jacaruso	<p>This is being foisted on us by Gov.Cuomo. Ten years ago we said NO to the third rail. This is to increase business for Atlantic RR so they can transport more and dirtier garbage through our towns. Please don't tell us if will benefit us!! More noise, more trains, more vibrations will only diminish our community and lives, not benefit us!! The Democrats will be remembered in all future elections.</p>
Maryanne Sylenko	<p>I have concerns regarding the Floral Park train station and the lack of renovation to the train station in the 3rd track proposal. I am a Floral Park resident and a daily LIRR commuter and feel we are entitled to receive benefits of this upgrade to our station and commuter experience. Currently today the station is not ADA compliant which is baffling in this day especially with the growing population of seniors in the community as well as for the folks in the community that have disabilities. As for service Floral Park should benefit increase service on the main line during rush hour commutes given the number of trains that pass through the community. I am not asking for every train to stop at Floral Park but an extra 2 -3 trains stopping during the morning and evening commute will provide us with more options and ease of congestion. I feel as a resident we should receive some benefits in our community such as an updated ADA compliant station for the toll of living under construction for a few years and disruption of service during the construction.</p>
Teresa Nacdonald	<p>The third rail project MUST have an ADA station for Floral Park residents.</p>
Raif Badr	<p>I support this project and I believe it will help eastern LI as well as the western portion of LI. Are there any plans to extend the LIRR past Ronkonkoma. Adding another track to as east as near riverhead and making the railroad high speed to riverhead would help the eastern area as well as easing congestion on the LIE. I know too many people that drive west from exit 68 (Manorville), exit 63 to go to the Ronkonkoma LIRR train station. Can u please try to expand east of Ronkonkoma?</p>
Adam Silverstone	<p>This project is long overdue for Long Island and the State of New York. The system will work more efficiently by providing added redundancy in case of an emergency by building this third track. Investment in our rail infrastructure with projects like this one is also critical to helping our economy and community grow. This project will benefit all</p>

	of Long Island and will help the environment. Since the project will be built almost entirely within the LIRR's existing right-of-way, the members of the surrounding communities where the third-track will be built should stop their senseless objections which only delay progress for the millions of people who can be helped by this necessary project. I'm a taxpayer and I believe that this project will ultimately save the taxpayer money from lost time and productivity.
Stephanie Giordano	The elimination of a great deal of non-residential parking at the New Hyde Park station MUST be addressed. You state that ridership will eventually increase to 6,000 people a day. Your parking plan is woefully insufficient. Parking is insufficient now! Is there anywhere else non-residential parking could be added? There is just nowhere else for us to all go. Not everyone can take the bus either. THIS IS RIDICULOUS.
Joeleen Tepper	The project and DEIS time line is unfair and the deadline from Jan 31 until at least March 30, 2017 should be created.
Michael Marino	Can you advise what is occurring with the Denton ave and Nassau Blvd overpasses? Do not see them mentioned or depicted on any of the plans.
Steven Buckvar	After the one-track situation at NHP today the LIRR really needs redundant tracks on the main line to mitigate delays and cancellations. All of the eastbound trains at 7 and 8 o clock were cancelled. Please design and finish this project asap
Geraldine Olsen	It is clear that you are the driving force behind the third track for the LIRR here on Long Island. While agree with the improvements for the elimination of the grade crossings and realize that along with that stopping the third track which runs just feet from my home appears to be impossible. Living in my home since 1972 I have had to deal with the LIRR on many occasions. The one thing I know for sure while there are many people to talk to regarding problems there are few if any that can do anything about a situation. You are not the first Governor I have contacted regarding the LIRR. Needless to say the area of this project that I am concerned with is directly across the street from my home. I have attended the meetings and while all the drawings showing what the new overpass will look like are grand and appealing there has been little to no information supplied specifically for the area from Tanners Pond Road through to Nassau Blvd. where there is already a third track. It is as if this area does not exist. Just for a reference, the area I am speaking about, is where the derailment of the LIRR train happened just a month or so ago. The front of that train was the view I had from my picture window. I hope you can understand my concern. This project has already significantly reduced my property value, there are at least four homes on Main Ave. up for sale, but at 75 years old my options are limited as far a moving. I have taken the time to research the area I am concerned with in the most recent thousand page report "Long Island Rail Road Expansion Project" November 2016 and again find what I feel is a contradictory statement. Chapter 5: Visual Resources and Aesthetic Resources, Page 5-22 Village of Garden City Paragraph two-Sound attenuation walls are proposed for the following areas: the south side of the ROW from Tanners Pond Road to East of Whitehall Boulevard etc. Chapter 12:Noise, Page 12-14; Table 12-7 Clearly show Garden City, South Side Track, Tanners Pond Road to east of Whitehall Blvd 4,350 ft. NO Sound Attenuation Wall included. Somewhere with reference to this area the statement is made that there is dense foliage in this area assuming that there is no need for Sound Attenuation Wall. If I had a view from my window of the derailed train I can assure you that there is no dense foliage between my home and the LIRR tracks. I am only one person trying to protect my home, well-being and my quality of life from what I consider to be an ill-conceived and overly expensive way to allow freight to run 24/7

	on these tracks. I cannot imagine the above contradiction is the only one in this report. Since you Governor are the person pushing this and pushing hard I feel it is your responsibility to consider the end result for All parties effected not just the LIRR.
John Murphy	Are the sound barrier walls going to be only 4 feet tall, that is not going to be much help got to go bigger, like the walls built along the LIE they are very effective.
John Michno	I live in Westbury which is currently a struggling town. I think the Main Line as it is right now is woefully antiqued. This project which will add a third track and eliminate the Grade Crossings will go a long way toward more reliable service. I do feel however that some things have been left out. Firstly, I think that more peak direction, rush hour service is needed. Compared to the Babylon Branch, the amount of service at stations like mine as well as others West of Hicksville is completely insufficient. We hardly get any morning rush hour expresses that bypass Jamaica (only one, the 7:29am from Hicksville). In comparison, stations on the Babylon Branch get at least 3 or 4 in each direction. Their trains aren't as overcrowded as ours. More rush hour service beyond just one additional train is needed. Then there's off peak, as of right now, Westbury only sees approximately one train an hour, which is far less than what other stations get along the Babylon Branch, and even the east of Hicksville stations toward Huntington see more weekend trains than Westbury, despite similar ridership numbers. In addition, I would like to see more use of the Central Branch connection to provide service between Hicksville and the Montauk Branch. This would be a good way of getting people to use the train intra-island, instead of driving to get out east. Many Montauk trains already pass through but do not make any stops at Hicksville or Mineola, only just a handful do. I also have concerns about the layout at Mineola. That is a busy station that should have island platforms and having all Oyster Bay trains use the north side is a terrible idea. It is important this modernization is done right or the preference of the Babylon Branch will continue for commuters causing stagnation in Central Nassau's economy. This project has the potential to be a real help to make Westbury more desirable, but service levels need to be vastly improved in both peak and off peak travel for it to have any meaningful positive impact on Westbury's economy.
Matthew Zeidman	Following the release of the draft environmental impact study (DEIS) for the proposed Long Island Rail Road (LIRR) third track project, I wish to express my strong support for the continuance of said project. As an LIRR commuter, I realize that such a project would not only bring greater convenience and reliability to those who utilize the LIRR's main line, but would also improve the quality of life of those living and working in the impacted communities. Not only will trains be able to run more often, which will reduce crowding during peak travel times, but the very existence of the third track will make it much easier for working trains to bypass disabled ones, greatly reducing the number of delays caused by stalled trains, broken rails and accidents. Further, those living or working in close proximity to the LIRR tracks would greatly benefit from elevated crossings, which would eliminate traffic jams, idling car engines and horn noise from trains and idling cars. They would also benefit from the construction of more commuter parking, which would ease demand on municipally owned parking spaces, as well as noise-dampening walls that mute the sounds of passing trains. Since the project was proposed, several local politicians (principally outgoing state senator Jack Martins, incoming state senator Elaine Phillips, Village of New Hyde Park Mayor Robert Lofaro and Village of Floral Park Mayor Thomas J. Tweedy) have strongly opposed this highly beneficial project. Rather than judge the project by its merits, they

	<p>have made it exceptionally clear that they intend to oppose the project under any and all circumstances, regardless of the findings of the DEIS, and claim to be doing so for the benefit of their constituents. In reality, those politicians have chosen to speak on behalf of a very small minority of their constituents - those who live or work in extremely close proximity to the LIRR tracks, who rarely or never utilize the LIRR and feel that the short-term drawbacks of having a construction site nearby their homes or businesses outweighs the long-term benefits to both themselves and their commuter neighbors. These politicians enjoy the optics of being "champions of the people" and angrily reject the thoughts or concerns of any constituents that threaten to dispel that image, repeating baseless rumors about property seizures, increases in freight traffic and the destruction of historic buildings and business districts to justify their myopic vision. Faced with a project in its final stages of approval, those politicians have begun to panic, falsely claiming that they would be more than willing to fairly examine the DEIS if only given a few more months to do so. Now that they realize the project is essentially inevitable, they will do everything they can to delay and hinder the project, so they can preserve their "champions of the people" image. Please do not reward these tactics; I strongly urge you to continue with the project as planned and ignore these baseless and frivolous objections. The third track project is long overdue and will greatly benefit all Nassau County residents, even those who live or work in close proximity to the LIRR tracks. I realize that the estimated cost of approximately \$2 billion is a lot of money, but considering the scope of this project, I think it's a reasonable and necessary expenditure</p>
Colleen McCarthy	<p>I'm writing to express my concern about plans to the new Hyde park train station and rail road crossing at New Hyde Park Road. I have lived on New Hyde Park Road for over 8 years. There already exists a major traffic issue on the road - accidents at least monthly, night time drag racing, trucks driving double the speed limit, running of red lights during hours when my children (age 5 and 7) have to walk to school. I have connected both the town and county several time over the years with these concerns. The road passing through residential neighborhoods needs more monitoring, slower speeds, better cross walks (with walk signals), and more police presence - not more traffic and trucks. My fear is that these issues will all increase if you move forward with your proposed plans resulting in more crashes and pedestrian injuries. The train crossing may slow down flow of traffic from time to time but it actually has a huge benefit as it helps to mitigate speeding. I would love to see some information from the state and county about ways to make the road safer - one suggestion is that you make the road a single lane when it goes through residential neighborhoods and also to have modern walk/do not walk technology installed at crosswalks for school children who are required to walk to school. Mr. Governor, this is the first time I've written to you and would really appreciate a response. I'm motivated only by my children's safety in writing this letter. I hope you and your planning team will keep residents safety a top priority and not sacrifice our safety in order to make the road more truck friendly. Regardless of the third rail plans, I'd would love a response to a request I made to the county to have a better walk/do not walk sign and technology installed at New Hyde Park Road and Stratford Avenue as well as New Hyde Park Road and Stewart Avenue.</p>
Anthony Healy	<p>It is so unbelievable and unfair to expect someone to wade through the huge DEIS document and to comment on it in such a short period of time. I'm a veteran and a homeowner who happens to live on Greenridge Ave. in Garden City. This project will destroy my home and my life. You'll be moving this damn train 15 feet closer to my</p>

	house and I'll be subject to extreme vibration and noise. This is no good reason for this project. I'm sure that the Governor can find some better use of 1.5 Billion dollars than this. And, it's insulting that one of your main reason is for the so called reverse commute. .
Raymond Hart	I'm planning to attend the meeting on January 18, 2017 at the New Hyde Park Inn. Do i need to register? If so, where do I do that?
James Oszlak	I support the third track
Kimberly Huemmer Kane	Kindly mail me a hard copy of the DEIS for LIRR Expansion Project released November 28, 2016. My address as stated above is Kimberly Huemmer Kane 306 S 9th Street New Hyde Park NY 11040 Your timely response is appreciated as per your request you must have my comments by January 31, 2017. I understand it is an extensive statement and I will need time to review it.
Mary McDonagh	I reviewed the proposed height of the retaining walls along the corridor of the project. What is the objective criteria for determining the height of the wall? Also, what criteria will be used to determine the placement of noise attenuation walls? Thank you
Mary McDonagh	A member of my family is physically challenged. She walks to the New Hyde Park station to commute to her job in NYC on a daily basis. She does not drive, cannot walk any distance, and cannot negotiate poor road conditions, construction equipment, etc. What accommodations will be available to her and others during this construction period?
John Fabilli	Let's do it!! We need to eliminate crossings they hurt our way of life trying to cross them. The community needs more trains and service in and out of manhattan. Our future to keep people on Long Island depends on Long Island Rail Road. I'm in! Let's get this project started asap!
Constantin Stanca	Double-deck trains are already shaking the ground many streets from the railroad. Adding a third track will add even more heavy weight trains. Our houses have cracks that we continuously repair. The current railroad is so old, third world quality. We feel that we are expanding something that is already bad to even more of that. There has been so much to do before adding the third track. We could modernize the foundation of the existent rails and replace them with a better system, as such that we will not feel earthquakes when a double-deck or a commercial train passes throughout our towns. Then you could add the third track and implement the current plan. Based on the past projects huge overrun budgets, missed schedules, poor quality many of the NY people have hard time to trust that the tax payers money will be used properly. Why don't we hire Swiss companies to manage the build of this railroad at a fraction of the cost with higher quality? They built 30-miles tunnels and railroads in the mountains with 20% of the cost for adding the Second Ave subway. They must do something better than us getting better quality at lower cost, on time. Being under construction for 5 years is a very long time. That assumes meeting the deadline which would be a first ... A connection between LIRR to Grand Central is continuously postponed and billions of dollars are added every year. You know that project that is now moved for almost 10 years to another 10 years with over 20 billion dollars cost overrun for 1000 ft of tunnel. My family and I appreciate your efforts to make New York a better place for everybody and we wish you good luck! We think that you are an awesome governor!
Ron Troy	I believe that this project is urgently needed for the future of Long Island. I do urge the railroad to find some professional railroad construction management so that this project does not take years and billions more than it should. I'd also appreciate it if the project team could clearly explain how you raise and move tracks, and replace bridges

	without a complete or major shutdown in the railroad. I don't see any room to build new bridges next to ones that need to be removed, or to raise tracks 'several feet' while still moving trains on those same tracks.
Ron Troy	<p>I'd appreciate it if the project team could clearly explain how you raise and move tracks, and replace bridges without a complete or major shutdown in the railroad. I don't see any room to build new bridges next to ones that need to be removed, or to raise tracks 'several feet' while still moving trains on those same tracks. Same thing for aligning tracks, rebuilding switches and the like. The narrow right of way leaves very little 'wiggle' room. So, how do you do it, and what will the affect be on normal daily train traffic?</p> <p>On a related note, I would expect a complete rebuild of the signal system here, plus I'd think that PTC for this segment of the railroad would be deferred to be part of the project. LIRR's recent record of signal system work at the area of Jamaica Station and the many large failures that occurred after that work leave people with a very low level of confidence in such LIRR work. How is this being addressed? Will primary and backup systems be properly segregated and tested?</p>
Anne Ely	Once again service will be affected due to issue in East River Tunnels; your plan increases traffic to and through these tunnels with no plan to improve that infrastructure. This is misguided at best and a prime reason why I cannot support this project.
Charles Naftal	I just want to add to my earlier comment that the Oyster Bay crossings at Willis Avenue and Second Street in Mineola must also be done for noise pollution from the LIRR horns. Whenever a train on the Oyster Bay line is crossing those grade crossings, the gates are down as they should be but also cause the traffic lights on Willis Avenue to turn red until the train passes through the crossings. This causes a major traffic jam on both ends of Willis Avenue. With the changes that you're talking about would mean that the stopped traffic would be also congesting Old Country Road blocking Nassau County government traffic.
Anthony Gullo	I would like to comment and express my continued support of the project and in particular the Draft EIS. Expansion of the LIRR is crucial to expanding and improving LI's infrastructure and essential for a positive future environmental impact. Without such an expansion, mass transit will not be nearly as accessible and reliable, and therefore I urge that this project move forward and state my whole-hearted support of it.
Richard Cohen	This is a project that must be built. The economy of Long Island depends heavily on the LIRR. The efficient movement of people and freight is essential to reduce traffic congestion and improve our environment by reducing car and truck use. People that live near the project will be inconvenienced, but this forward thinking project will benefit a much larger population. By analogy, Robert Moses was not popular and his projects infringed on many - but NYS and NYC could not survive without them today. The needs of the many must outweigh the concerns of a few.
Chelle Muir	No 3rd track. Please it will be devastating to the Floral Park community. It will drop property values, destroy local businesses and it has no valuable function
Sharon Wyse	Why does Floral park get nothing? You claim that Floral park is the only city to hold tough on their complaint, but can you blame us- since you'll be disrupting our village with no incentive? You're giving other city's more parking...at least give us an elevator that works! I am a mother with a small child and I can't even take her on the train because I cannot lift her stroller up and down stairs...not to mention any handicapped

	people not able to use the LIRR...doesn't seem fair. I'm all for this expansion but give FP an elevator it so sorely needs; surely you can find \$ for it in the 2 billion
Jonathan Tepper	I think the addition of a third track is a great idea. There are many, many more people who will benefit from this project than those who will be slightly inconvenienced. I think the lack of a third track is one of the largest bottlenecks on the LIRR.
Julian Lobachewski	As public utilities equipment as in poles and plumbing along the track are relocated or altered to accommodate the Third Track what steps have been taken to minimize utility disruptions to those residents close to the tracks.
Doug Cornell	Your railroad is a joke. Infrastructure is completely antiquated, and basically unsustainable at the current fair levels. Am fed up, this week was the worst ever
Anthony Aiuto	I strongly support the LIRR Expansion Project. I am a lifetime Great Neck resident, and been both an LIRR and highway commuter over the last 35 years. To me, the highlights are improved quality of life and enhanced economic viability. Eliminating crossing grades to increase safety while reducing traffic and pollution should have happened years ago. But even more important is that the plan makes the center of Nassau County a viable destination for young families who desire the space and comfort of suburban life, but work in Manhattan because that is where the jobs are. I see them every day at work. They find it difficult to raise families in the five boroughs, but do not want to devote over 3 hours / day to commuting on the LIRR.
John Dillworth	I think it is a poor idea that a single nickel be spent on this project. The long Island Railroad has seen a significant increase in broken trains, broken signals, broken switches and broken rails. On Time Performance has declined year by year for 10 straight years. The degradation in OTP and the increase in problems would not be helped by a 3rd track as the problems are now measured against the same tracks as they were 10 years ago. The LIRR is currently incapable of running the equipment they have over the existing tracks. More track would mean more rails, more signals and more switches and therefore more problems. Fix what you have and show improvements in reliability and On Time Performance over multiple years and then ask for more.
Joe Joe	It is a shame the LIRR central branch that ran from floral park to Farmingdale so communities like east meadow Levittown island trees could have LIRR service and be used as an alternate during outages. The Hempstead branch actually uses part of this branch before it curves toward country life and Hempstead. There was a short track from Mineola to where the Hempstead branch curves in garden city that actually went to west Hempstead and continued along that present branch. You can see it from a satellite photo. Having this short 1 or two mile Mineola to garden city track would have allowed for all sorts of redundancy and failovers, plus added capacity. Maybe even an oyster bay to Mitchell field light rail, or routing of some peak trains through garden city. I think there are tall garden city office buildings now in the former track right of way. Maybe using A Roosevelt field right of way plus a Roosevelt field LIRR station would be even more cool way to link the main line to that existing freight line near Stewart avenue. There was a Roosevelt raceway LIRR station in the 1950s. Plus A Newsday garden city station, a Clinton Ave and Salisbury station. These abandoned branches and stations are posted on a number of historic LIRR websites. I remember seeing these abandoned tracks when I was little. I saw a 1950s futuristic Roosevelt field LIRR bus heliport station proposal on some historic LIRR website. The kissiena

	<p>corridor in flushing had LIRR tracks from floral park to flushing, now it's right of way being re used for lots of city parkland.</p>
Maria Salvaggio	<p>Saw the story on channel 12 and was wondering -- did anyone take into account the growing trend towards telecommuting (work at home)? More and more employers can do this with technology TODAY (never mind tomorrow) which means less need to travel for work. Kids can go to full time college online. On and on. Just a thought. Seems LIRR is doing this in the wrong era. Just my opinion. Thank you.</p>
Carol Braico	<p>I have been commuting to NYC from HICKSVILLE for over 15 years. While this is the largest train HUB, the increasing number of delays, and cancellations has made my commute miserable along with others. It is important to remember that the impact is not only to us but our families and communities. Parents working in the city are spending less and less time with their children, family and friends. It also impacts our productivity - with work hours lost, less time spent on more important activities. Lastly - during the winter - we are sometimes waiting over 20 or more minutes in freezing weather waiting for trains to come in. Feels like we are living in a third world country yet we pay more and more every year for MTA tickets. It is interesting to me that they charge more money every year yet the service gets worse and worse. The infrastructure is poor - with rain, a storm, snow or accidents on the tracks - the system shuts down. This is not Acceptable and also unlawful. I plead you to please add the third track and improve the service and number of trains at HICKSVILLE. The station is old and unsafe for people arriving at night.</p>
Kimberly Coyle	<p>As a New Hyde Park resident of the South side of the tracks and a mother of school age children, I am very concerned about the quality of life for my family during the construction period. I live right next to one of the grade crossings and am dreading the construction to eliminate the grade crossing. I am NOT in favor of the third track installation but do feel that these grade crossings have to go. With 252 trains per day, I am stuck at the grade crossing nearly every time I need to travel north which is frequent throughout my day. As a working family, balancing life, work & school is difficult and the current LIRR situation has made normal travel that much more difficult. So, adding major construction into the mix, I anticipate will be much more of a nightmare. That being said, I would like to focus my question on how residents with children in the school district can get their children to/from school in a safe and</p>

	reasonable way. I do not qualify for the bus (miss it by 1 block). I live less than a mile from the NHP Road school but cannot imagine how I will be able to get them to school without traveling extensive distances. This is a huge concern of this community regarding this project as many families live on the south side of the tracks. I need to hear solutions to this relevant and important concern. Additionally, in the event of an emergency, how will residents of the south side be accessible?? I have studied the document & have not heard any solutions. Governor Cuomo MUST provide us with solutions and plans to address these needs if he wants to be re-elected in 2018.
Bill Murphy	I live on Earl St in Westbury and the train runs directly behind my house. The train runs below my backyard level. I understand that there will be retaining walls built on both sides of the tracks in this area. I would like to request that these walls be built to a height equal to my current 6 foot fence. They did this for the northern state parkway and it helped tremendously. This would help to decrease the sound level of the already extremely busy line that runs along that rail. When the third track goes thru it will be even busier and noisier. I would also like to know if there are any plans to try and decrease the vibrations caused by the trains. My entire house shakes when the freight trains come thru now. When the trains are closer to my house the vibrations will probably be much worse.
Richard Kelly	I am worried about the MTA, in terms of follow through and funding. In Sept. 1973, I worked for Empire City Subway Company, a subsidiary of NY Telephone. I was assigned as an inspector on the Second Avenue Subway on the contract from 99th to 105th Streets. Despite all of the recent hoopla about the Second Avenue Subway, the contract that I was assigned to is still a big hole in the ground. I worry about fire and ambulance services during construction. I don't want to be taken to Franklin General in an emergency. Traffic will be a nightmare. There must be extensive and active police coverage to expedite traffic flow. This must include Nassau County PD in NHP, Garden City PD, Floral Park PD, and possibly even MTA Police. Sound barriers must be sound absorbing. A friend lived a mile from the LIE in Suffolk County. No traffic noise for years, then they put in sound barriers. The sound bounced off the inside of the wall and projected over the top of the opposite wall and he could hear the noise.
Jessica Moloughney	The N25 bus runs along New Hyde Park Road from Great Neck to Lynbrook. How is that bus going to be rerouted during construction period at New Hyde Park Road?
Joseph Sanderson	I strongly support a third track on the LIRR. I urge you to evaluate the project's compatibility with other potential long term capacity expansion projects, including through-running between the LIRR and New Jersey Transit or between the LIRR and Metro-North.
John Breimann	The road to hell is paved with good intentions. Sadly, the MTA/LIRR have a poor track record of completing projects on time and the scale of this project should focus on adding a 3rd rail only. The grade eliminations should be done after the 3rd track is completed. The local towns that fight against any kind of expansion can agree to have the grades eliminated when they are ready. I doubt New Hyde Park residents are going to put up with crossings being closed for years and years.
Eric Robinson	Please do everything you can to complete the third line project. I can't think of any infrastructure project that would do more to improve life for all Long Islanders.
Jeffrey Kraut	I fully support this project. Anyone objecting that is adjacent to tracks must deal with notion of this is necessary improvement, while understanding that the tracks were there before the house was.

James Kearney	I would like to add my name as a supporter of the third track project. Far too often I delays on the line I take (Ronkonkoma) happen that are the result of an inability to reroute around an issue related to a single track. This project will allow trains to reroute around these issues much easier. Also with the upcoming East Side access there is an expectation of increased service on the lines that use the Main Line tracks. By having the third track more traffic and easier reroutes will be possible not to mention the ability at better reverse commuting capability. I understand the concerns of those that will be affected by the construction but the project has done much to alleviate many of these concerns and the benefits far outweigh any minor inconvenience that might be involved. This may be the single biggest infrastructure project on Long Island for quite some time and may well dictate the future of the Island.
Kevin Coyle	As a NHP resident on the south side of the main line, west of Covert Ave, I am concerned about the availability of emergency services as none of our facilities are located on the south side of the tracks. I am also concerned about getting my children to their school which is also on the north side of the tracks. My home is a few houses away from the Covert Ave crossing and am fearful that when it is closed for construction it will be very difficult for me to access anything on the north side which is the bulk of the village and my parks, shopping, school, friends, etc. Also as someone whose home faces the tracks and can see the trains from my front window i am concerned about the issue of raising the tracks approximately 5 feet near the covert crossing and only putting up a 7 foot sound wall. It appears the trains will be more visible and loud than they currently are. I would like to see a higher sound wall for the relatively short stretch of track from the Floral Park pool to the NHP station.
Kevin Mullaney	I'm all in favor of progress, and striving to improve LIRR service, so it is exciting to see proposals for new tracks, and better facilities. What I would suggest/request is before you look at new capital projects, that the LIRR look at the current condition of its trains, and ask what could be done to create a better system of maintenance, especially when it comes to cleanliness. The trains we ride today have torn seats, are often filthy dirty. Honestly, the LIRR should be embarrassed by the current state of the train cars. We need new, clean seats, and the trains to be seriously cleaned. Please let me know if I can provide more details. Thank you.
Stephen P. Hess	As a resident of LI for 73 years and a businessman for 50 years, one thing is for sure - our public transportation has kept us from progressing our economy. We must expand our tax base and make it more affordable to do business and live on LI. I am in full support of the third rail which will help LI. be competitive with NYC.
Nancy J Berg	I am interested in knowing if the Huntington Train Station will receive any improvements or upgrades.
Greg Casamento	This project is long overdue and critical to sustainable growth for those who commute to City jobs. Information sessions should be held at Penn Station and Atlantic Terminal so commuters input can be provided. The correct information sessions seemed design only to be held in those places where the third rail would be laid.
Nathan Kerr	I have been commuting on the LIRR for over 20 years. As a resident and commuter from the Greenlawn/Huntington area, I would like to voice my support for the 3rd track on the main line corridor. The LIRR is one of the most heavily used transportation systems in the country, yet uses tracks and designs constructed in the 1800's. When you consider that Long Island is the home to millions of residents, it is sad to think that several lines are still using diesel equipment on single tracks. That is similar technology to when the US first built a RR from the east coast to the west coast more than 150

	<p>years ago. Long Island is no longer a place where the rich and famous travel on weekends to places such as Oyster Bay, Huntington/Halesite and Centerport/Northport to their mansions and beach bungalows. It is a place where thousands of everyday residents travel back and forth to NYC to work. Two of the heaviest used branches (Huntington/Port Jefferson and Ronkonkoma) converge at Hicksville but are only supported by 2 tracks which causes massive problems anytime something occurs that is not on the schedule. During my commuting history I have spent 18 of those years using main line stations. (Merillon Ave, Huntington and Greenlawn). I would bet my house that the majority of transportation issues away from Penn Station occur on the main line. If it is not a broken down train, it is a faulty switch. If not a faulty switch then it is a signal problem. If not a signal problem then it is a broken rail. If not a broken rail, it is a car stuck/struck on the tracks. If not a car stuck/struck on the tracks, it is a bridge getting hit by a truck. If not a bridge getting hit by a truck, it is a derailment. All of these have happened in the last year. All of these have occurred on the stretch of tracks where this new third rail would be built. One must remember that unlike other parts of the country and tristate area, Long Island is solely reliant on the LIRR to get to and from NYC unless one wants to drive. There is no express bus service similar to NJ, PA and CT. It is time that the LIRR realize for Long Island to grow it needs a more modern, fast, and safe transportation system. To do this a third track must be built. This will allow additional trains to be sent to Penn and eventually Grand Central as well as back home in the evening. It will also allow for additional express trains, especially from stations further out on Long Island. Quicker commuting times attracts people to these communities, especially younger commuters where housing prices are cheaper. If NY is worried about a brain drain, there needs to be an effort allowing families an opportunity to buy cheaper houses in Suffolk while simultaneously providing rides in under an hour to the city. A third track opens the possibility of sending trains back to the Island for reverse commuters. Garden City, Hicksville, Melville and Hauppauge will now have a real opportunity to draw from a wider talent pool which eventually will lead to more companies moving to LI. A better talent pool and more companies raises salaries. That additional money will be spent on local businesses such as deli's and restaurants that provide lunch, gyms where employees can work out and retail stores at malls just to name a few. Obviously a third rail will not prevent all of the above listed incidents from occurring. However an additional track would provide relief from congestion for trains heading toward or home from the city. It would provide an additional outlet for trains to bypass the problem causing less delays and cancellations. Currently all trains must merge to one track. Trains are canceled and combined. Trains heading east in the morning are canceled to accommodate morning rush hour trains and vice versa in the evening. In addition, the plans call for the elimination of grade level track crossings. Many of the issues are caused by cars getting struck or bridge strikes at Merillon Ave. This would eliminate those issues. This project however will cause some problems for businesses and residents on the roughly 10 mile stretch of track. Whether the tracks will move closer to their property or force them to move altogether it will cause some hardship. Those businesses/residents should be compensated fairly. LI has always been a NIMBY community and it is time that for the benefit of the many the few be inconvenienced. This truly in my opinion would fall under eminent domain. The reality is that if you buy property next to highways, airports or RR tracks, you cannot expect that improvements or expansion be halted. It comes with the territory and housing prices and rents are</p>
--	--

	reflected in the proximity to those publicly used facilities. The closer you are to them, the cheaper the value. There is a reason for that and the few should not stop a project that does not benefit a private developer, it would stop the region and state and hundreds of thousands of riders from a better life. The reality is that the LIRR is an antiquated system. Many improvements need to be made including un-bundling Jamaica to allow express trains to go through at more than 5 mph, the addition of a second track and possible electrification of the Port Jefferson branch and the possible expansion of the Belmont facility to allow for a permanent commuting facility and support building of an arena at the racetrack. This is in addition to the already announced improvements to the Ronkonkoma branch. Modernizing the LIRR is the first necessary step to modernizing Long Island and making the transportation system faster, safer and more reliable.
Ian Cohen	New Parking Facilities: While new parking facilities at Hicksville, Mineola and Westbury are a good start, parking capacity at other stations should be considered and implemented in this plan. Specifically, the Syosset station's parking capacity is far too limited for the number of customers served each day. I find myself arriving to the station 30 minutes or more before the train for my daily commute into Manhattan to ensure that I can find a parking spot. This is unacceptable and should be addressed at this time.
Jessica Conti	NO NO NO! More people on LONG ISLAND is NOT how you fix the problem. Stop industrializing the island. Ruining one project at a time.
Ian Cohen	Parking Garages at Hicksville: Please move expeditiously to create parking garages at the Hicksville station and do so at the beginning of the construction schedule.
Jocelyn Jack	As a resident with a family of five including three children, aged eleven, eight and five, I have serious concerns with regard to the environmental impacts to my family. We live directly next to the substation and right off the LIRR tracks. Who can adequately explain the quality of life and more importantly potential health effects to my family, living within this construction zone every day for years? Can anyone guarantee my children will not be exposed to harmful airborne pollutants as they leave their homes each day, play in their yard and attempt to live our lives as normal? And the traffic impacts, who can explain exactly what we can expect traveling across the tracks daily to and from school? Not to mention life with the constant additional noise pollution every day for years. Beyond our significant health concerns, what exactly will take place replacing sub-station equipment directly next store to us? Will there be any easements impacting our family and our property? How can anyone support a project without these details clearly understood? Would Governor Cuomo put his own children living their day to day lives in the path of this construction? Certainly not without a clear understanding of the direct impacts and expectations. Until then, we vehemently oppose this project.
Joe James	I support this project. It must be done to improve the reliability of train service. Trains are currently at capacity, they cannot be made longer and double decker trains will not fit in the tunnels for Atlantic Terminal or East Side Access. The lack of track capacity must be addressed.

Michael Schiffman	Pity you can't dream big, with respect to Mineola Station. I would hide the station inside a mixed-use building, similar to the monorail station at the Contemporary Resort in Disney World in Florida, where the rails go through the 4th floor of the hotel, with the station inside. At Mineola Station you could get a private developer to build a mixed use building -- offices, maybe hotel space, retail stores, maybe some additional parking (the current public parking garage fills up on weekday mornings). If you did this, you could probably also build a grade separation west of the station for tracks to Oyster Bay (at least the eastbound track) and have the station on two levels, to eliminate the need for the east/northbound Oyster Bay track to cross the main line east of the station. With a third main line track, and more rail traffic, this would seem more important than it is now.
Christopher Jack	I am a taxpaying homeowner who will apparently be "inconvenienced" by the scope of this project in what appears to be several instances. The "draft" EIS is less than comprehensive when it pertains to the actual effects of pollutants while the project is underway. Of all the instances that will impact my three small children, wife and myself, I am most concerned with the replacement of the substations, particularly G14, which borders my property to the north. The statement, "With the exception of the recent replacement of LIRR Substation G13 in Floral Park in 2010, the remaining seven LIRR substations are approximately 40 years old, and nearing the end of their expected operating service life. As such, in the Future Without the Proposed Project it is likely that LIRR would have to replace each of the substations;" which was in the DEIS, ends there. It doesn't say what MTA representatives have said, which is "new substations will have to be considerably larger than the existing substations and they will be unlikely to fit on the currently occupied parcels." The construction that accompanies this type of project is extremely invasive on the quality of life on not only my family, but that of my friends and neighbors. It is very difficult to trust what information is being disseminated by the MTA due to past omissions regarding this project that occurred in 2008. I also find it troubling that the MTA has used certain chemicals and pesticides in order to maintain their current right-of-ways without the knowledge of the public that is subjected to its effects. What about an emergency response, whether it be EMS, Fire or Police, to the homes located south of the mainline that depend on their services from the north side? What about traffic, driving my children to school, which is located north of the mainline? These are just some of the questions that have failed to be answered. Would Governor Cuomo, who is so in favor of this project, subject his family and children to the YEARS of construction noise and pollutants, traffic and most of all, the safety risk associated with obstacles for our first responders. Until ALL questions are answered, I, as well as my entire family, are AGAINST this project.
Elisa Hinken	I support the project. Public transportation is the most efficient way to handle the commuting public in areas of dense population. We're losing public parking garages and lots throughout the New York City. In Long Island areas too, which needs to be addressed as there is a considerable parking shortage near LIRR trains on the Babylon Branch in Nassau County. Make the program work by supporting the parking situation as well. You'll see it along the Port Jefferson/Ronkonkoma/Oyster Bay 3rd rail project, which needs to be aligned with this project.
Ron Aryel	I used to live in New York City and still visit to see family and friends. The subway, Metro-North, and LIRR provide me with my transportation and it is important to me, as well as other visitors to the region, that subway and commuter railroad service be well maintained and expanded in the face of constantly increasing demand for

	<p>transportation. I fully support the LIRR Third Track Project as a cost-effective and needed enhancement that will eliminate bottlenecks and provide better "reverse commuting" options. I do have one concern: The ROW is narrow and it is evident that the rebuilding plan will be extensive. If the track alignment is modified so that there are more curves or shifts within the right-of-way, train speeds could be restricted. I want the LIRR to design the expansion so that the tracks will remain straight and the maximum authorized speed of 80 mph can be maintained. This will preserve the railroad's operating efficiency. In future, the new three-track corridor, free of grade crossings, will provide an opportunity to increase the maximum authorized speed to 90 or 100 mph. There is no reason why trains running express between Jamaica and Mineola could not run faster than 80 mph; this would improve the timetable and improve efficiency of service. Without railroad crossings, there would no longer be the danger of automobile or pedestrian accidents (excluding station platforms of course). I encourage the MTA to pursue the Third Track project to its completion.</p>
J Sol	<p>Before we think about expansion, fix the current system! My train is constantly breaking down and is short on cars in the morning. This is no way to start a work day... standing on packed trains. Invest in better trains and/or put the mechanics that fix these trains on a performance step program and give incentives for when trains don't come back to the shop to be fixed. Get these workers to work harder and smarter!</p>
Bennett Catania	<p>The third rail is long overdue. Are you planning to increase the parking capacity at any of the stations for the extra commuters are going to have in the future?</p>
Steven Sherzer	<p>Finally a project to improve both commuting and quality of life. I have been a rider on the main line (Ronkonkoma Branch) for more than 20 years. It's time we had an alternative track. Breakdowns, signal problems, broken rails, sick passengers, all contribute to congestion on a 2 track line. Not to mention broken crossing gates. Elimination of the grade crossings will improve commutes, and traffic will move without waiting for the gates to rise. Hopefully eliminate another source of frustration- those drivers too stupid to wait for the gates to rise, and feel they need to drive around them. Then they get hit by speeding trains. Then we have delays and suspensions. Not fun for anyone.</p> <p>I totally support this project!</p>
Daniel Smith	<p>While I recognize the need for the third mainline track and supportive of the effort to build it, from an operational standpoint there are two major inefficiencies planned in Mineola which will reduce the usefulness of this extra track: 1) Mineola, a major area hub, will only have two side platforms serving two tracks, as opposed to previous proposals which included an island platform in the location of the current southern platform, allowing trains stopping in Mineola to utilize all three tracks; this reduced track access will limit the number of trains that can stop there, and also will reduce the effectiveness of the third track in mitigating delays in case of an incident affecting either of the tracks where trains can platform, as until temporary platforms are set up, which in themselves only provide limited access to trains and lengthen the boarding process, trains will have to bypass Mineola, temporarily stranding passengers. This issue will be further compounded by 2) the reconfiguration of Nassau interlocking to only allow Oyster Bay trains to access track one. Currently, an eastbound train to Oyster Bay normally departs Mineola from track two, temporarily blocking the other track as the train crosses over; however, the potential loss of capacity on the mainline from this crossover is frequently minimized by scheduling a westbound Oyster Bay train to arrive in Mineola as the eastbound train is departing, the two tracks splitting from the</p>

	<p>mainline running next to each other causing no conflict. In the current proposal, an eastbound Oyster Bay train will depart Mineola from track one, after having crossed over to that track west of Mineola; not only will track one be blocked for several seconds while the train is diverging from the mainline, but now as well while the train approaches Mineola, and while it is stopped in Mineola as most Oyster Bay trains do. With only one platform normally accessible to westbound trains stopping in Mineola under the current proposal, no westbound trains will be able to be scheduled for Mineola during that time frame. If every track in Mineola was accessible from a platform, then in this case a westbound train could be sent onto what will be the middle track to platform during this time and minimize lost capacity from the Oyster Bay train. Additionally, if a train becomes disabled on track one at Mineola, no Oyster Bay trains would be able to pass through. These issues could be minimized by either preserving the current two track access to the Oyster Bay branch, or expanding access to three tracks by use of two switches to allow an eastbound train from the future track three to cross over to track two between the station and the current switch which eastbound Oyster Bay trains use to diverge from the mainline. I have compared this distance on satellite imagery and determined that there should be enough space for these switches to be located to where I have stated, but in the event I am mistaken, having platform access to all tracks will allow an eastbound train depart from track two as currently occurs, or in the event that the decision is kept to reconfigure Mineola to only have two side platforms, then if needed these additional two switches could extend part way down the platform from the east; Oyster Bay trains are shorter than the full length of the platform, so this would not restrict the usability of these switches by Oyster Bay trains. Such a configuration of switches part way down platforms already exists in Penn Station, providing track 14 with access to the East River Tunnels lines 3 and 4, and track 17 with lines 1 and 2, not to mention track 9 with access to the Empire Tunnel.</p>
J Sol	<p>Once again, the 605 from Bethpage is short on cars. This time with no announcement at all. Overcrowded train to start the day! Invest in better trains and give the mechanics that fix these trains an incentive to keep these trains out of the shop. We pay too much money to be treated like this. This is not a short subway ride. Fix existing problems including the signals, lack of maintenance on rails (evident by broken rails) and then you can start think about expansion! .</p>
Jay Miller	<p>The LIRR current level of service is poor and degrading over time. They should not enter into any expansion plans whatsoever until they improve the capabilities that are already in place.</p>
Michael Martell JR	<p>I am a little confused about this project, if there is another track added to allow more trains to run from Hicksville to Floral Park, how will that help congestion and delays due to the limited number of tunnels going in Manhattan also shared with Amtrak? Every week night on my 6:08 train home, my train waits about 4-5 minutes, once the doors close for a train to cross in-front so we can leave Penn Station, I do not see how this third track that will add more trains going in/out of Penn will address this. I can only see how it will hurt. I do think grade level crossings should be removed, but combining that with a third track will only cause more delays and congestion with the LIRR I feel and even more switch problems due to more trains.</p>
Dan Speter	<p>I am a resident of New Hyde Park, and commute to Manhattan every day via the LIRR. I have a number of concerns about the proposed third track, and I hope that they will be addressed. 1 - The LIRR often takes on large-scale projects and almost always</p>

delivers them late and over budget. Let's take a look at the long-awaited East Side Access project as an example. The original budget was \$4.3 Billion, it rose to \$6.3 Billion, then \$8.4 Billion and ultimately \$10.8 Billion. So we're looking at a 150% cost increase. The project was also supposed to be completed by 2009. Now we're looking at 2023. So that's at least a 14 year delay. Why are there no repercussions for this? Why are the chosen contractors not fined or fired? Those of us with non-union jobs get fired for cost overruns and delays of this magnitude. Delays and cost overruns such as this point to sheer incompetence or even fraud. Has an independent audit of expenses been performed? How can we be sure that the third track project will come in anywhere close to the proposed budget or anywhere close to the time-frame proposed? Once the project has started we're at the mercy of the LIRR. What will be done, and who will be held accountable? How can I be sure that cost overruns will not translate into an increased monthly fare? 2 - The LIRR has been plagued by fraudulent overtime and employee abuses for decades. A multi-billion dollar capital project such as this is yet another golden opportunity for more of the same. What is being done to ensure this will not happen again? 3 - I chose to move to New Hyde Park 10 years ago due to the proximity to the LIRR station and ease of parking in the commuter lot. The proposed timeline for this project, which we all know is completely unrealistic given the past performance of LIRR construction projects, will cause a major disruption to my daily commute, as the commuter parking lot will be unavailable to me for an extended time during construction. My house is a mile from the train station, and cars are frequently parked near my house during the day as it is. I have no desire to walk a mile each way to the train station for however many years it will take this project to complete. Where will village residents be able to park during the construction? 4 - The construction will undoubtedly cause a significant disruption/financial loss to local businesses. Covert Ave, 12th Street and New Hyde Park Road will need to be closed for periods of time during this construction. What will happen to the local businesses during this time? Will they be compensated for lost revenue? 5 - Similar to the above - the construction will cause a bottleneck for emergency services. Covert Ave, 12th Street and New Hyde Park Road are major arteries of the community and need to be available to emergency services. How is this being addressed? 6 - It seems that the MTA is trying to tackle too many infrastructure projects at once. Why doesn't the MTA concentrate its resources on a fewer projects, complete them, and move on? It would seem that projects could actually complete on time and even on budget if the MTA stopped spreading its resources so thinly and worked on fewer large projects at a time. 7 - The trains themselves have gotten completely disgusting. They are dirty, the seats are held together with duct tape, and they often smell like they haven't been cleaned in weeks. I've been employed in the Manhattan for 22 years, and many of the trains are older than I am. When are they going to retire the original old trains from the 60's, '70's and 80's and give us some more modern trains? Even the M7's are now 15 years old. 8 - As a resident of New Hyde Park, it's quite frustrating that every train that stops at New Hyde Park is completely packed, and standing room only. This seems to be that during rush hour, the only trains that stop at New Hyde Park leave Penn Station at 5:33, 6:08, 6:35, 6:56, and 7:54. These trains all seem to almost empty out at New Hyde Park. Every train on the main line passes through, yet they all seem to run express. Why not a few more trains have stop at New Hyde Park and lessen the load? The schedules have not changed in decades. What needs to be done to have some trains added? There does not seem to be a forum for this. I've tried to reach out to

	customer service, but only receive an automated reply after two weeks with a link back to the LIRR website. Will the third track enable more trains to stop at New Hyde Park?
Matt Kampar	I'm in support for this project. The Main Line has always had issues for a long time and it has affected millions of people who rely on the Main Line to get to and from Penn Station. This will help lots of people in the future and help bring jobs to Long Island as a effect of this project. This should have been done a long time ago. You should also look into possibly working on also having longer platforms at Kew Gardens and Forest Hills. Especially at Forest Hills now that lots of people come from Long Island for concerts at Forest Hills Stadium. Please consider looking into this!
Ismael Santos	Good Afternoon, I live in Coram, and use the LIRR from Ronkonkoma station. It seems that there is always a delay because a car got hit by a train, or breakdowns on the main line, and it causes extreme frustration. Often times I arrive late to work in the city. If I want to go to the city on my day off. I have to take the 4:48pm train if I don't then I am stuck until about 7pm to go to the city. By this time I'm so tired, I just turn around and go home and cancel my plans. I really think the third track would help greatly especially for people that use the service in the afternoons. I thank you so much for considering this proposal and look forward to using the LIRR more especially in the evening.
Marybeth Ruscica	The Draft EIS fails to offer a believable reason for the Third Track. By all means, grade crossings should be eliminated; stations (including the Floral Park station) should be modernized. However, those improvements do not require another track. Eliminating congestion and delays on the LIRR requires upgrading the switches and signals, even, perhaps, upgrading the tunnel. It does not require another track. Neither freight nor reverse commuters will increase, so there is no justification for the budget-busting public work. The Second Avenue subway is one-quarter completed and already \$500 million over budget. DO NOT WASTE TAXPAYERS' MONEY ON THIS BOONDOGGLE, LEGACY, GIVE-AWAY TO THE CONSTRUCTION UNIONS. Cancel the Third Track and make the needed upgrades.
Michael Costabile	It's time to move forward with the third track. I understand that people that live next to the tracks are concerned. But the benefits outweigh the negatives.
Jason Barone	Related to this, there was mention of potentially designating the crossing at New Hyde Park road along the main line as a 'Quiet Zone' meaning the train would not need to sound its horn 12 times every time it passed the station without stopping. I know the elimination of the grade crossing will eliminate the horn need but in the short term until this is addressed will the Quiet Zone option be explored for 2017?
Victoria Roger	Someone needs to address the lack of parking at every train station. This must be addressed in connection with the expansion. We are in desperate need of additional parking at most of these train stations.
Ethan Falkove	I am very supportive of the project. I believe it will significantly improve the train service to Syosset (where I live). Hopefully, it will allow increased service, reduce overcrowding on trains, and should speed up the express trains.
Aida Gomez	I formally request that we don't raise the rates. Why is it that NJ Transit and others have Wi-Fi and the LIRR still doesn't? We need to know why LIRR knew about safety concerns about Atlantic Terminal and hasn't acted on it. As a monthly ticket purchaser I can honestly say that, the trains could use a makeover. The trains can come on time, we are always delayed because of a single problem. With what we pay for Zone 10, it shouldn't happen. Please advise?

Susan Goldstein	Although I haven't seen the Draft EIS, I have the hope that service improvements would include consistent clearer voice announcements of the approaching and next railroad stops as well as announcements regarding tracks for Jamaica changes (there is not always enough time to find the electronic signs). And one more hope....that adjustments can be made to control the temperature of AC in cars during the summer...I often need a scarf and jacket, and even then it is a challenge.
Adam Winnick	As a resident of Birchwood Court with a garage it would be my hope that during the destruction of the garages it would be the most expedient timeframe, that the most geographically appropriate (close!) temporary parking will be provided, and that the rebuild of the garages would provide automatic door openings for all as many have invested in that during prior years. Your attention to these concerns is truly appreciated. The most crucial piece is the securing of very close temporary parking as there are multiple large lots extremely close to the development. It would be a terrible hardship and inconvenience to have to walk back and forth to the court lots down Washington Avenue as has been provided with projects in the past. Thank you!
Michael Betts	As part of the proposed project, the garages at my development, Birchwood Court, are meant to be demolished and rebuilt after the rail is complete. This will be a huge inconvenience to everyone with a garage as their only means of parking. While I understand temporary parking is being supplied, we cannot get a firm commitment about where this parking will be. I would like to strongly suggest the lot south of Old Country Rd on the east side. This is the closest, most convenient lot. Also, I would request that the work be started only after everything is in place so that the time we are without our garages is kept to a minimum. Lastly, i would expect that the new building is of comparable quality and that those of us with garage door openers would have the same accommodation once complete. Thanks!
Jason Martin	I would just like to add my voice in support of this vital transportation project. More and better mass transit is very important to the greater New York area!
Lawrence Capici	Very much against more waste and fraud for the MTA. We shouldn't be expanding the system but examining means to dismantle repeat lines and useless service. There's plenty of service that shouldn't exist and we should be eliminating completely. This is a massive waste of money we don't have on a system we disrespect and find useless. If anyone should do this, it should be a private undertaking.
Susan Barnes	As a rider of the LIRR for 27 years I believe this project is critical to our ridership, Increasingly, track problems in critical areas of the main line have caused frequent and extensive timeliness issues, and various other inconveniences such as cancellations and schedule changes. We need to increase the capacity and flexibility of the track system which the new line will bring to our system.
Theresa Coen	The 3rd track is not necessary and will not add to the quality of life for commuters on the LIRR and Will not add to the quality of life for residents in surrounding towns. Here are a few reasons: Focus on Environmental Issues and Quality of life in a small community Noise Pollution/ Air Pollution/ sight pollution During years of construction the heavy equipment and supplies will line the streets in town During years of construction the noise of equipment, and the air pollution We do not need more trains running thru towns, especially freight full of chemicals. Focus on Land view and community character. Will we still have a suburban look and feel? A lot will start to happen to the suburban look of Long Island. Traffic Conditions /traffic patterns onto smaller streets Construction Impact- Water levels high on Long Island (underpasses 14 feet deep) More Freight Trains thru Long Island Without crossings, speed and content

	of freight trains is a concern. The 3rd track is going thru our towns, (Freight) it is not helping our towns Economic Impact is negative Time factor, project will never be done in 3 years. (Herricks took 10Years)
Julia Dorato	Focus on Environmental Issues and Quality of life in a small community Noise Pollution/ Air Pollution/ sight pollution During years of construction the heavy equipment and supplies will line the streets in town During years of construction the noise of equipment, and the air pollution We do not need more trains running thru towns, especially freight full of chemicals. Focus on Land view and community character. Will we still have a suburban look and feel? A lot will start to happen to the suburban look of Long Island. Traffic Conditions /traffic patterns onto smaller streets Construction Impact- Water levels high on Long Island (underpasses 14 feet deep) More Freight Trains thru Long Island Without crossings, speed and content of freight trains is a concern. The 3rd track is going thru our towns, (Freight) it is not helping our towns Economic Impact is negative Time factor, project will never be done in 3 years. (Herricks took 10Years)
Norma McFarlane	At 2:47 into the video, the spelling of neighborhoods is incorrect: "...Impact Neighbourhoods..."?
Fatima DeMarco	I am a resident of Carle Place living on Mallard Road, which is directly south of the Main line. I have reviewed the DEIS plan and have questions. According to the DEIS plan, there will only be a retaining wall only on the north side of track in Carle Place. That is an issue because the South side has direct access to the LIRR tracks and the noise carries far into the South side as the track is elevated higher than land. I believe it is necessary to also have the retaining wall built on the South Side of the track from Meadowbrook to Cherry Lane as this is a residential neighborhood with housing directly in front. Without this retaining wall we will have increased Noise pollution and other unwanted environmental issues. Below is the retaining wall information from the DEIS plan for Carle Place: # Location Cut/Fill Approx. Length (ft) Average Height (ft) 12 North Side Glen Cove Road to Meadowbrook State Parkway (Carle Place) Fill 13 North Side Meadowbrook State Parkway to Cherry Lane (Carle Place) Fill Please review my request and let me know how the LIRR will address it with this new LIRR plan. I appreciate a response to this message ASAP.
Ronald Hipschman	Here are some reasons I have decided to oppose this project: - This sounds more like a 10 year project than a 2 year project. When has projected construction by the LIRR and NYS ever been on time? 1. I'm concerned about the safety of the residents of Floral Park and Garden City, as this will turn our villages into large construction sites. I'm especially concerned about the safety of our elderly and children due to the movement of heavy equipment in and out of the village. 2. The noise pollution will negatively affect our villages. 3. The potential of hazardous waste passing through our villages is frightening. Unfortunately, no one can guarantee that the trains will safely pass through our communities without any accidents. 4. I can see why there are people in favor of this project but they do not live in the affected areas of Floral Park and Garden City. 5. It is absolutely shameful that any politicians are in favor of this project. I hope they will never be reelected.
Haroon Chohan	The Draft EIS mentions a retaining wall and sound wall. The DEIS states on page 20 in Table 12-7 that the sound attenuation walls were evaluated at a height of 4 feet above top-of-rail. Sound attenuation walls on retaining walls in fill sections will most likely be

	<p>4 feet above top of rail. Stand-alone sound attenuation walls will likely be between 6-8 feet high. How many feet are the retaining walls where the sound attenuation walls will be 4 feet above the rail? For the standalone sound attenuation walls, 6-8 feet is not enough. Some of the trains, especially freight, that pass by my home are 20 feet high with debris. The sound walls need to not only block track noise but also visually block out the unsightly trains that will be closer to my home. The sound walls need to be a minimum of 20 feet above the top of the rail.</p>
Joan Romagoli	<p>I am not in favor of the third rail project related to the impact on the surrounding community and the negative environmental impact throughout the construction. I am in favor of the grade crossing eliminations. During the public hearing I learned there will not be sound walls on both sides of the railroad tracks. After speaking with an engineer I was told there are commercial buildings on the north side of the tracks. I am a resident on South 18th St. north of the tracks and want you to know that the noise and vibrations from the current trains are loud and disruptive and my China and crystal move consistently every day. I hope you will reconsider and put a sound barrier wall on the North side of the tracks. Also I believe Federal funding should be sought to support this project.</p>
Susan Hoffmann	<p>I'll start by admitting I'm not MTAs biggest fan. I lived at 310 East 70th Street in a ground floor 1BR co-op from Aug 1999 to May of 2014 so I was greatly affected by the building of the Second Ave subway. I have a dog that still shakes uncontrollably every time she hears any kind of loud whistle or rumbling noise. Thunderstorms are especially fun now, thank you. I watched many of my favorite businesses go under and friends move away. I swore I was going to stick it out until the end, but the end just kept moving farther and farther away. When my father passed away, leaving my childhood home in RVC to my brother and me, it just seemed like a sign that it was time to go. So I'm now a daily LIRR commuter. I've become very familiar with the antiquated system you refer to and I agree something needs to be done. But I can't help but feel this expansions improved reliability, fewer delays and better service will only be to the "Main line". What about the problems endured by the other lines? What about the failing equipment, the deteriorating switches and the crumbling East River tunnels? How does this expansion project address those inadequacies? And are my fares going to increase so the MTA can pay for this expansion project that's only going to (maybe) improve the quality of commuting for one line of passengers? And what affect does this project have on the timing, completion and funding of the Eastside Access project? That project's estimated cost has increased from \$4.3 billion when first proposed to \$10.8 billion! Yikes! The completion date for the project has been continually pushed back. It was supposed to be operational in 2009 and now were talking 2023!!!! At this rate many of the passengers that helped pay for that project will be retired before they ever get the benefit of using it. I guess what I want to know is what reassurances do we have that this expansion project won't run into the same stumbling blocks every other MTA project seems to run into? And why is expansion a higher priority than repair? It's a switch problem, its equipment trouble, its track work, it's a broken rail.....It's something, every day! I'd be very grateful if you could provide some info that would calm my fears.</p>
Kim Coyle	<p>I am a resident of New Hyde Park village & live directly in the soon to be construction zone. I feel it is unnecessary and unfair for a family to have their lives disrupted & the quality of life her in NHP suffer immensely during the long construction period. Having</p>

	to live with dust, dirt, and other environmental impacts should be financially compensated in some way if this project is pushed through. Additionally, the residents living in this area, should be provided with some kind of tax relief through the construction period. Getting to work, school and around town will add time and stress to our everyday lives. We will also have to endure weekend & night construction which will negatively impact our health & well-being. To live in this community is very expensive & costs nearly \$12k per year! This is wrong & Governor Cuomo should make it his business to provide some kind of financial compensation to myself & my neighbors. Lastly, I notice on the plans that a small portion of our driveway will be re-graded. This should include the ENTIRE driveway & sidewalk. Please consider this suggestions which will no doubt allow the residents of this community to feel slightly better about this project.
Jessica Moloughney	Chapter 13 of the DEIS says that a parking garage will be built on South 12th Street in New Hyde Park to create more parking because the existing lot will be used for construction vehicles. Where is this parking garage going to be located?
K T	Not going ahead with this expansion would be a disservice to those of us who live in Suffolk county and rely on the LIRR to get to work every day. Residents in Nassau need to understand that there are in fact people who need a third track so we too can get home at reasonable hours to our families. A few years of "extra noise" from construction will be nothing compared to the benefits once grade crossings are removed and there is less congestion on the tracks. I commute from Ronkonkoma. It would be nice to have trains that can get through the bottleneck of Nassau on a regular basis using the 3rd track, and the 3rd track can benefit all users in the case one track is out of service.
Elizabeth Falcone	I think the project is vital to help improve the service and ridership. If the service were better, perhaps less workers would drive into NYC. Although I know there is some opposition and the impact will be inconvenient for some neighborhoods while the project is underway, I do believe the long term benefits outweigh the short term headaches. And I hope this will also grow the economy on Long Island as reverse commuters will benefit as well.
Jocelyn Jack	My residence is located at 301 South 9th Street, directly next to the LIRR sub-station. Based on the DEIS, there will be plans to replace the existing sub-station with new equipment, either as part of the proposed LIRR project, or, independently at some point in the future as the equipment has aged considerably. Of course, this has significant impact to our young family and our home, and we have a vested interest in understanding and influencing how this project may progress. The expectation is that the replacement sub-stations would be placed on existing parcels. In an ideal situation, the sub-station would be re-located elsewhere as part of the project. Perhaps if commercial property is being acquired for parking or other purpose, it may be re-located to one of those locations. This would be the preference especially if for some reason the new equipment wasn't to fit within existing parcels and additional property acquisition be required. In all honesty, we are not confident this won't somehow impact us in a significantly negative way and are looking to ensure we are protected from this. We're no strangers to the poor maintenance track record of the LIRR. We've called and written letters to the LIRR on the condition of the landscaping surrounding the sub-station, as well as the fence surrounding it. We were pleased when our letters were met with the poor, un-maintained landscaping being removed and new fence slats put in. Our hope would include a clear expectation to ensure the construction is

	<p>done in such a way to minimize the impact to our home and property, the fencing would be done in an aesthetically pleasing manner, similar to efforts made in Garden City around their sub-station. Fencing should be tall and as opaque as possible in order to block the view of the equipment from our home. Any landscaping would need to be maintained, and not by LIRR personnel. We had personally invested in a number of Arborvitae bushes in our yard alongside the fence of the sub-station in order to help mask the appearance of the facility. We would prefer to have similar, 12 foot Arborvitae bushes placed on our property (for us to maintain) to help cover the facility prior to the construction even beginning. This would provide a means of shielding the construction somewhat, as well as have a longer term impact on camouflaging the area. These small investments would make tremendous difference for our family and the impact of living next to 6 months construction just feet away, compounding the much larger impact affecting many of us in the vicinity of the tracks for years. On the topic of investments, we invest a tremendous amount in our home. We maintain our property and landscape and utilize our outdoor space as often as possible. What sort of stipends or tax relief will residents directly within the construction zone receive? Living for any length of time, especially several years, in a dusty, loud construction zone will adversely affect our quality of life, and the condition of our property. We have invested in our homes and community, whether it be purchasing & enhancing our homes, property and cars, in addition to our very high taxes to live here. Due to circumstances beyond our control, we are not going to be able to live in the manner in which we've invested so much to obtain. This project will cost us money and time within the construction zone in a very real way. Be it the cleaning of dust from property and cars ongoing, the noise pollution every day, not being able to comfortably use our outdoor spaces, traffic headaches and so on, this project will cost me, my family and my fellow residents within the construction zone, and we should be compensated for this in some way.</p>
Bob McNulty	<p>Three issues concern me. Issue 1. I have 8 trucks that need to get cross the rr tracks every morning about 6:30 and returning again between 3-3:30 We park at 806 Third Ave in the industrial zone of the village How are we to get across the tracks safely and legally once the Covert Ave crossing is closed for construction? It is not legal for us to use the residential streets to cut up to Stewart. If I go east on Fifth avenue it is difficult and dangerous to make a left onto New Hyde Park road and will be worse after it is free flowing. 12th St crossing will be gridlock, too dangerous to send my trucks over now which brings me to my second point Issue 2. The existing 12th street crossing is very dangerous in the mornings right now. There are 6 stop signs controlling this intersection and to cross the tracks from south to north means you need to drive uphill, even more dangerous in a truck. This intersection needs to have some dead ends installed during the Covert Ave construction phase so it becomes more free flowing. Think about it, you will instantly multiply by 5-10x the amount of cars using this intersection and you will still have a six way intersection over RR tracks? You need to increase the capacity of this crossing in the short term so it's not gridlock or worse. Oh did I mention all the commuters running across the tracks to make their train? Without a lot of help this will be a disaster the day after you close Covert Ave for construction Issue 3. How do I get across the tracks once the Covert Avenue crossing is eliminated and reopened to traffic? Will third avenue now dead end at Covert? Do I need to cut up 8th st to Fifth avenue?</p>

Peter Bilardello	Is The Working this 24/7 if so where is are Quality of Life. The Sound barrier Wall when installing what effect will that have on my Property Are you going to be using are Property well making way for the wall
Frank Cocozzello	Even though MTA lets our government use the railroad tracks to move construction debris out of L.I. I don't think they know there poisoning everyone living up and down these lines! Trains with uncovered construction debris which I guarantee has asbestos in it will be killing all of us in the years to come! The cancer causing diesel after burn wasn't enough!
Jessica Saca	My house on Mallard road in Carle Place is right along the railroad. As it appears this project will be approved, I am concerned for the safety of my 2 young children living on this block as well as our quality of life while the new tracks are being built and the noise of more trains going by once complete. Although it will not look appealing, I have spoken to many concerned neighbors who have suggested a wall be built to keep out the noise. I of course do not want this project to be approved, but do hope that those in charge take the family's concerns and well-being into consideration. Thank you for your time.
Ann Mare Cartwright	I am a resident of Floral Park & I would like object to the third track project. I feel it will be place a hardship on the residents of Floral Park for 2 + yrs. Our community will be disrupted. I have concerns about the chemicals that are in the earth being disturbed, noise pollution & the flow of traffic.
Janice Harnett	I have a few concerns. How are you considering this project when the 'big dig' from queens to Grand Central isn't completed? The ETA on that project was pushed off decades - and is way over budget. Truly, this just seems like another ploy for unions - who are well represented but have no business in the project. Folks out east are not interested in increasing their travel into NYC. Additionally, there won't be any possible reverse traffic. Fortunoff...? Additionally, the Floral Park station is currently unappealing. Floral Park is a historic, traditional town and the RR station needs to look like something from 'Thomas the Train'. I'm serious. Other parts of the country are proud of their RR systems. Most of LIRR including the 'modern' stations you are suggesting look out of place and typically don't weather well. I would like to volunteer to be on a task committee to oversee the suggestions - especially the overhead rails you are placing on Covert.
Elizabeth Carroll	I am strongly opposed to the third rail project particularly the drop off circle being proposed for GreenRidge Avenue. This GreenRidge drop off is a huge concern for the residence in this neighborhood. We anticipate that it will bring an influx of traffic onto Hathaway Dr and GreenRidge Ave. Hathaway Dr and GreenRidge are very narrow, windy blocks with blind curves and no sidewalks that is not conducive to two way traffic. There are many young children who play in the circle/street on this block. There is a park and school one block away. Children walk freely in this neighborhood to the bus stops, the park and school. Having the drop off on GreenRidge can be very dangerous for all the residence in the neighborhood ESP the children. It is imperative that this particular drop off be eliminated from the plans.
Thayra Castillo-Hinck	I am very upset and in strong disagreement with the 3rd rail plans. This will cost not just money but more traffics and accidents to an already contested New Hyde Park road! WE DOBT WANT A THIRD RAIL IN GARDEN CITY, NEW HYDE PARK OR FLORAL PARK!!!!!!
Ms. Stujenske	I am a Senior Citizen and "recent" widow who has never had a driver's license, thus the reason this house was purchased thirty one years ago, where we raised our family. If

	<p>this third rail project in Floral Park becomes a reality, I will have to put the house up for sale because I will be unable to walk around town for a long period of time. This lack of mobility would severely impact my health because my daily walks to OLV, which often include getting to my appointments at the Landmark Building on South Tyson and Tulip Avenues, or Quest Laboratories, Office Supply store and restaurants on Jericho Turnpike off of Plainfield Avenue. MY CROSS STREET IS PLAINFIELD AVENUE between the Hicksville and Hempstead Lines. The recent sudden loss of my spouse of forty years has been difficult but I have been able to get through the year with problematic health by slowly and carefully WALKING through our safe Village to be independent and self-sufficient. In inclement weather I take a local taxi for the flat rate of \$4 + 1 tip and that will not be possible with construction. We would have to go through New Hyde Park or Stewart Manor via Covert Avenue and that would cost me by taxi and too far to walk. I have already figured out how to avoid Plainfield Ave to get to OLV but can NOT do so to get to the North end and feel this would isolate me. I really don't want to give up my home but won't feel safe if this project goes through. The LIRR has NOT been good neighbors to me. The Presidents retired secretary Clare Persigo and I spoke REGULARLY. Just a couple of weeks ago, I walked into my back room when I heard footsteps and talking down my driveway. I was frightened and picked up phone to call police (and was just about to hit one of the alarm system panic buttons), when I looked out the backyard window to see two men with orange vests by the back of my garage. I vigorously knocked/banged on my back window and some badge was held up ---and since I was not in basement, I opened the top of window to speak to him (YELL at them to be more truthful). He insisted he knocked on front door which was a blatant LIE.....I, was JUST sitting by the front door and then got up to walk into the back room to get something. I HEAR EVERYTHING and footsteps on my front steps and especially PORCH would have been heard. Also, why didn't he ring bell and he said because many don't work. MY family said it was because of no car in my driveway so LIRR assume nobody was home and this was not the first time. Also, I DO NOT about the track as Ms. Martinez on TUNNEL street back of her yard connects to mine. They were full of bologna that I, have LIRR power lines in my yard!!!!!!! I was very angry and now no longer feel comfortable with any shades up EVER and never felt this uncomfortable before....an invasion of privacy and the guys off handed and not sincere apology was not appreciated. WTH is all I can say!!!!!! Also, when they redid the tracks here, they caused damage to my home and we had to put braces on basement ceiling as the trains are heavier. Also, much damage to our garage the way they would drop heavy items and shake it off the foundation -- and subsequently had to be replaced!!!! Furthermore, most important, I have found out that AGENT ORANGE was used to clean the tracks and Five men within three hundred feet of our home INCLUDING my husband DIED of various cancers within three years!! At present two of my neighbors have cancer and being treated! I have no doubt that living along the tracks and the ENVIRONMENT from the track replacement within the past decade added to these diagnoses. Also, so many trains that pass the Floral Park pool and recreation center are EMPTY.....we watched and talked about it for three months!!!! With the construction we won't be comfortable allowing our children or grandchildren walk to school as it would, be too much responsibility for the crossing guards. My suggestion is to use the money to repair what you have - raise the crossings all over Long Island, make the train stations handicap accessible. I have to take a taxi to New Hyde Park instead of walking to the Floral Park train station to get into Penn Station. A</p>
--	---

	<p>one direction escalator that is often not working does not mean handicap accessible. I can still slowly do one step at a time after the crowd passes BUT many friends have walkers and canes and just can't manage safely at Floral Park so need to go to next town for train -- not fair since we purchase our homes due to quick accessibility into the city for a non-driver. Also, please be advised and I did telephone and left a message. If the LIRR is caught trespassing again, I will take pictures - regret not doing the last time - and WILL file a TRESPASSING suit!!!!!! You have already taken away my peace of mind and if this goes through OUR quality of life In this close knit Village. Many seniors in the apartment buildings do not drive!!!</p>
Barry Parker	<p>I am a commuter on the Oyster Bay branch, and would welcome the third track. Construction contractors should have extreme penalties for missing milestones and PERT chart of milestones and compliance with them (or not) should be published with wide availability.</p>
Antonia Pisani	<p>I own a home that is located right next to the Carle Place train tracks. You would think that I would be opposed to this project but in fact I am not! I was happy to read you will be installing Sound Barriers to lessen the noise because that is a huge concern for me. My other major concern is the parking. My home does not have a driveway and we are constantly battling for parking from the current commuters. I have small children and I have had to park around my block on cold days because of the commuter parking situation. We just recently purchased our home so a driveway is not in the budget in our near future. I hope that you address this issue prior to starting your project. Moving the station would be ideal since renovating will lose 3 of the 6 spots there and cause the parking situation to be worse. Other than these 2 issues I wish you luck on your project.</p>
Shari Licitra	<p>I am very concerned about this project being that my property shares a boundary with the LIRR ROW. Since the Governor first spoke about this project last year the value of my house has significantly decreased. I cannot sell my house for the full value based on future construction in my neighborhood that will be lasting for probably around two years, if not longer. I have been very distressed about this since the day that Andrew Cuomo started talking about building the third track. At one of the information meetings an MTA official started telling me all the time and energy he has put into this project. He stated that he has put in nights and weekends. I have this looming over my head 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The reality for me is that I cannot sell my house for what it was worth the day before Governor Cuomo spoke about this project. Also, he is being paid to work on the project. I am just losing value!! We are also very concerned that once this project starts the Cross Harbor Freight Movement Project will be funded and then we will see a significant increase in freight traffic. The scoping document makes no mention of the funding for this project. The cost of a train ticket is very expensive now. Our taxes are very expensive, especially since my house is now worth half of what it was prior to this project being announced. I am paying taxes based on the full value and I am looking at two years of sleepless nights. Increasing my taxes to pay for this is not an option! I am also concerned that money is being spent on many projects and the most important thing is safety. There are over 100 subway stations with only one exit. In the event of a fire, or God forbid a terrorist attack many people could potentially be hurt. Why is the MTA so concerned with everything else instead of fixing this very important issue? Adding artwork to subway stations does no good if there is only one way out in an emergency. Also, the switches at Jamaica are usually the reason a train is delayed. Building this project</p>

	without addressing this problem changes nothing. Instead of throwing other people's money around randomly, why not address the egress issues on the NYC subway, and the switches at Jamaica. This will provide many jobs.
Shari Licitra	My property abuts the LIRR ROW. We are requesting a sound barrier be placed along the ROW that is two feet about the top of the train. We are not sure if the height of the tracks will be changing. We cannot estimate how high the wall should be, but when the design is in place, we feel that two feet above the top of a double-decker train should give us adequate protection and not be too high.
Concetta Karen	My home is located in Carle Place next to the train tracks. My two concerns regarding your project are the major parking issues and the noise. I have read you will put up sound barrier walls so that is encouraging. However the parking issue is a MAJOR concern here. We do not have a lot at our train station and our blocks are filled with commuter cars from morning till late at night. Renovating the station will not alleviate this problem especially since 3 of the 6 parking spots will be eliminated. Something needs to be done, we cannot drive down our blocks because there are so many cars parked on both sides of the street. Please take into consideration relocating the train station, I am aware that this may disrupt some commuters however most people do not walk to the train station in Carle Place they park in front of our houses. Thank you for taking the time to read my concerns. I hope they are properly addressed.
Ron Eniclerico	I attended the public hearing on the Long Island Rail Road Expansion Project in Westbury this week and wanted to again register my support for the plan. The MTA has done a commendable job of outreach in making itself available for information and comment about this project. Long Island has grown increasingly congested in recent years, and the area's infrastructure, built largely to accommodate cars, has had a difficult time keeping up with increasing demands on the land. It has been apparent for years that expanding the LIRR would be one of the best ways to adapt to this growth by alleviating traffic and making it easier in general to get around. Increasing the availability and reliability of the LIRR will not only improve the commute for the thousands of people who currently rely on the service each day but can also make the area a more attractive destination for young people, who have been increasingly drawn toward Manhattan, Brooklyn, and elsewhere. Fostering a thriving Long Island where young people can develop arts and business communities should be an essential goal for New York, and the LIRR can be a critical part of that. For these reasons and many others I hope the MTA and LIRR proceed with the expansion project, and I would be happy to assist if possible.
William Carroll	I am very concerned with the drop off point on Greenridge Ave. in Garden City. The surrounding blocks of Greenridge, Hathaway Drive and Colvin are also extremely narrow and some do not even have sidewalks. This makes it extremely dangerous for children and parents walking to a nearby Homestead school or to nearby Nassau haven park. The blocks are also tree lined and curvy with many blind spots for motorists. The roads and area are not designed for increased traffic. Please Do not make this area a drop off point. This would create a very dangerous situation. Again please do not include Greenridge as a drop off area.
Thomas D'Ambrosio	I support the third track proposal because it will be a great benefit to the Long Island economy. More jobs, tax revenue, faster and more reliable trains, less pollution and traffic, and it will bring new vibrancy to our downtowns adjacent to rail stations. The faster this project gets started, the better.

Glory Wang	I fully support the expansion project, trains are always congested. Much Need more efficient to travel across LI and into city!!
Phillip Gribbins	I am opposed to the Third Track Plan because the residents of Floral Park have everything to lose and nothing to gain. Your plan calls for the elimination of some parking spaces, closing of some roads or making some roads one way. IN addition to those hardships there are plans for one or more staging areas in the village. We the residents of the village will have to endure these hardships for multiple years while receiving no benefits from the project. If a staging area is established in the Belmont Race Track area at the end of Mayfair Avenue it will be a nightmare. There is a grade school 3 blocks away and during school days they are numerous school buses picking up and dropping off children in the West End area of the village. Having construction vehicles traversing the West End to get access to the work areas will be dangerous and the cause of major traffic congestion. Your plan states that there will be minimal impact on the Floral Park station, if this is true why we should have to put up with the inconvenience caused by this project.
Anthony Chiofolo	As a thirty-one year resident of the Incorporated Village of New Hyde Park that stands to be impacted by the third rail project, I would like to request the governor consider the alternate plans proposed by village representatives to achieve the results proposed by the third rail project. In the event the third rail project continues according to the governor's plan, I would like to request there be adequate funds made available to: 1) remediate any environmental issues that may arise 2) compensate families and businesses that are adversely impacted by the project 3) compensate the villages on an ongoing basis for properties removed from the tax rolls as a result of the project
Mary Harkins Conway	My concern with the Third Track Project is the potential for an increase in freight train traffic traveling through the Village of Floral Park. In 2005, when I first heard about the proposed Third Track Project, the LIRR cited the reverse commute as the reason for the project. As the eastbound trains coming through the Floral Park station were practically empty, I didn't believe the reverse commute was the real reason for the project. I along with many other Floral Park residents thought the real reason for the project was freight. The most recent push for the a Third Track Project promotes an increased capacity for passenger trains and a bypass lane, in the event a LIRR train breaks down or is involved in an incident, on the nine mile stretch of the Main Line that runs between Floral Park and Hicksville. Again, I along with many other Floral Park residents, think the real reason for the project is freight. Moreover, I am concerned that the driving force behind the project is not the LIRR concerned about their passengers but rather corporate interests seeking to increase rail freight traffic on Long Island. At the May 2016 hearing on the Scoping Document for the Third Track Project, I expressed my concerns regarding the negative effect an increase in freight train traffic would have on the Village of Floral Park. I was disappointed to see that the DEIS chapter on freight operations does not say much more than the Scoping Document did on this issue. The DEIS reiterates that the NY&A Railway typically operates three round trips along the project corridor during the week and one round trip on the weekend. The DEIS further states that the LIRR currently restricts the operation of freight trains to non-peak periods and is committed to keeping this restriction in place. The use of the word currently has me concerned, as it's subject to change. Last year, the Transfer Agreement between the MTA and the NY&A Railway for freight operations on the LIRR, was renewed for another ten years. This was done despite the NY&A Railways safety record that included three derailments on the LIRR tracks within the past two

	<p>years and a 2015 train crash in which an uncertified locomotive engineer fled the scene. In addition to my obvious concerns regarding safety, I also wonder whether there is language in the recently executed agreement limiting the NY&A Railway round trips on the Main Line to three a day during the week and one round trip on the weekend. As the MTA was a party to the agreement, why not reference the terms of the agreement pertaining to track usage by the NY&A Railway for freight operations, in the body of the DEIS or at least in a footnote? I certainly hope this information will be included in the Final EIS. In the Rail Freight Service/Operations section of the DEIS, it states in the 2020 and 2040 Build Conditions, that the LIRR is committed to using this peak period capacity increase only for the operation of its own passenger trains, and is equally committed in the future to not scheduling freight trains during peak periods. Although this would be reassuring to a commuter who travels through the Village of Floral Park on the Main Line, it does not reassure the residents of Floral Park who live along the Main Line, during peak and off peak hours. The children of Floral Park are being educated in grammar schools situated along the Main Line during peak and off peak hours. Residents, especially many of our seniors, seek a quiet place to read, during peak and off peak hours, at our library, which is located along the Main Line. Residents of all ages enjoy the Floral Park Swimming Pool and/or the fields of the Floral Park Recreation Center, which are both located adjacent to the Main Line tracks, during peak and off peak hours. The 2020 and 2040 No Build Conditions section of the DEIS, states that the demand for freight service on Long Island is not expected to grow beyond current service of three round trip freight trains through the Project Corridor and that at current growth rates for freight, the existing three round trips could accommodate the modest increase in the carloads through 2020, as well as 2040. Incremental increases in demand for freight service in the future could be accommodated by adding freight cars to the existing trains. The 2020 and 2040 Build Conditions section of the DEIS, states that since freight operations are not currently capacity constrained during non-peak hours and since the Main Line peak hour capacity increase will not be used for freight trains, the additional Main Line track proposed would not have any impact on freight traffic through the corridor. The use of the term, not currently capacity constrained has me concerned, as conditions can and do change. In fact, the New York Metropolitan Transportation Council, hereinafter referred to as NYMTC, a regional council of government that is the metropolitan planning organization for New York City, Long Island, and the Lower Hudson Valley, of which the MTA is a voting council member, discusses in its NYMTC Regional Freight Plan Update 2015-2040 Interim Plan, the forecast for an increase in freight traffic and the challenge of capacity constraints. The NYMTC Region Rail Network for rail lines handling freight is typically described as consisting of two parts: east of the Hudson, which includes Long Island and west of the Hudson. Section 3.0 of the Regional Freight Plan states, where freight was once a major element of rail service in the region, the massive decline in rail freight demand and volumes over the years, and the shift to public ownership with a primary emphasis on passenger train operations, have resulted in the cessation of freight services on many parts of the network. However, even though some of these lines may be handling little or no freight at present, the potential exists for some key routes to handle freight service again, if it was expanded in the region. In Section 3.9 of the Regional Freight Plan, the Main Line is described and it is noted that the volume of freight is expected to increase on the Main Line, as the Brookhaven Rail Terminal is built out with warehousing to accommodate a more</p>
--	--

	<p>diverse array of commodities. In Section 4.1, the Regional Freight Plan states that a Commodity Flow analysis shows that rail freight in the NYMTC region, which includes Long Island, is expected to grow by 47% between 2007 and 2040, from 10.2 million tons to 15.1 million tons. The plan states that a variety of capacity constraints affect the ability of the NYMTC region rail network to absorb this potential growth in rail freight traffic. With all of the major freight access routes being primary passenger routes as well, expected growth in passenger train volumes make it more difficult to handle increased freight volumes. These constraints are particularly evident on the east of the Hudson River route, and the New Haven route, where freight operation are generally permitted only during night time hours. As the Main Line is east of the Hudson, and is primarily a passenger route, the NYMTC does appear to find that there are current capacity constraints on freight train traffic on the Main Line. The recommendations set forth in Section 4.5 of the Regional Freight Plan, titled Potential Actions, state that as for capacity, as rail line owners develop capital plans for improvements to the physical plant, the capacity needs of current and potential freight and passenger operations at the corridor level should be specifically be taken into consideration through comprehensive corridor planning that includes the involvement of all rail service providers operating in the corridor. I believe the Third Track Project was developed to address the capacity needs of current and potential freight and passenger operations on the Main Line. I also believe the project is being pushed through for the benefit of rail freight but is being sold as a passenger operation improvement, which the public would be more likely to embrace. The Long Island Regional Economic Development Council, in its 2011 Strategic Economic Development Plan for the Long Island Region, lists generate new freight opportunities as a goal. The Development Plan states that Long Island needs to improve the physical infrastructure of the transportation system for freight related transport between shipping and receiving points. One of the strategies listed to increase freight access and options, was rail freight inter-modal terminals to link the nations rail freight system and relieve truck congestion. The same year that the Development Plan was submitted, the Brookhaven Rail (inter-modal) Terminal opened for business on the Main Line and continues to grow and expand. I am concerned that the capacity for freight train traffic on the Main Line will grow significantly after the Third Track is put into place, particularly, as major corporate players and associations are looking to expand the volume of freight transported on and off Long Island by rail car. My personal concern about a potential in the increase in the number of freight trains traveling through the Village of Floral Park is with what's being transported on the freight cars and the cumulative effect of the noise, which the additional trains will bring. When I spoke at the Scoping Document hearings, I expressed my concern about the cumulative effect of the noise caused by an increase in freight trains traveling through the Village of Floral Park. In our village, helicopters fly over the Main Line in their route out to the Hampton's. The helicopters are required to fly low, to accommodate the planes beginning their descent to Kennedy Airport and over to LaGuardia Airport. As a result, the helicopters are often flying only a few hundred feet over our houses. This is in addition to the airplane traffic noise from the planes heading to Kennedy and LaGuardia Airports. I was disappointed that Chapter 12 of the DEIS, which addresses noise, makes no mention of the cumulative effect of the noise of the third track construction and the eventual day to day operations of the Main Line with a Third track, in addition to the noise that we already endure. I could not find one mention of airplanes or helicopters in the chapter of the DEIS on noise. If</p>
--	---

	<p>you were building a third track on a rail line located in the middle of a cornfield, the cumulative effect of the increase in noise would not be an issue, but the Main Line runs through the center of Floral Park and other densely populated villages. Where we live, the planes, helicopters, and trains, form a perfect storm of transportation noise, the cumulative effect of which should not and cannot be ignored in the Final EIS.</p>
Stephen Petrrillo	<p>Provided similar e-feedback during Scoping Phase of this project My concern was not overtly addressed in the DEIS. I own a house at the SW corner of the intersection of Premier Blvd and Stewart Ave. This intersection is one block west of Covert Ave, south of the main line grade crossing within the Village of New Hyde Park. There are several east-west streets parallel to Stewart Avenue (north and south of Stewart Ave) between the main Line & the Hempstead Branch of the LIRR. **Only Stewart Ave is not a dead end. Stewart Ave continues West from Covert Ave "across Premiere Blvd - and continues eastward into Floral Park (to Plainfield Ave). Whenever LIRR service is disrupted / delayed etc "grade crossing gates are down for prolonged periods at the Covert grade crossing. When this occurs, cars traveling north on Covert toward the grade crossing, turn west down Stewart to Plainfield / Floral Park. The main line tracks are elevated above Plainfield Ave in Floral Park. Cars diverting themselves this way avoid the LIRR blockage to travel north. Situation includes the reverse direction as well: Southbound cars bypass the Covert grade crossing by traveling south through Floral Park (Plainfield Ave) then east along Stewart Ave to Covert. On Stewart Ave, due to the very high volume of cars, it is very difficult for homeowners (me and my neighbors) to back-out of their driveways when this happens. Also quite hazardous to pedestrians etc. THE DEIS DOES NOT ACCOUNT "OR OTHERWISE ACKNOWLEDGE "THIS EXISTING CONDITION WHEN EVALUATING THE IMPACTS TO THE COMMUNITY. Specifically When the NHP Road grade crossing is being eliminated, additional Northbound traffic will be find its way "or otherwise be diverted - to Covert Ave. LIRR slow speed conditions or other disruptions are inevitable during NHP Road grade eliminations. That will then cause the condition I described earlier at the Covert Grade crossing (prolonged gates down). **But during NHP Road grade crossing elimination, this effect will be exacerbated by the additional NB vehicles from NHP Road. The fear is that excessive thru traffic will divert down Stewart Ave toward Plainfield Blvd / Floral park. Reverse SB flow would also occur. Simply stated, a much worse version of the condition I described above for the homeowners would likely result from the NHP Road grade crossing elimination work. A similar situation would also likely follow when the Covert Avenue crossing elimination occurs. Further note that the Village of NHP public works uses the portion of Stewart Ave I am describing to access the rest of the village to the East. The adverse traffic condition I am describing will also negatively affect Village operations as well. The EIS must acknowledge this condition, and offer mitigation's as needed.</p>
Michela Kubovic	<p>I have a number of questions. The tracks are in my backyard so I have numerous questions regarding the addition of the third rail. 1. Train traffic-Will trains run through at higher speeds? 2. Freight trains-Will there be an increase in freight traffic? I barely notice commuter trains but two freight trains run past my house at 1015pm and 3AM and are incredibly loud and the trains are long. I am also concerned about hazardous materials, etc. being carted by freight through residential areas. Also freight trains are not run by LIRR, are not driven by trained LIRR employees. I understand freight is run by a private company. Is it possible for legislation to be passed limiting the amount of freight trains LIRR can allow to run down the tracks? 3. Construction of Wall- Will</p>

	<p>access to my yard be necessary during construction? -What are construction hours? Will we be given notice as to dates/hours of construction? -Will property be taken from my yard? -Will vibrations from any drilling, etc. affect my house? Are studies being done regarding the effect of construction on the structures on my block? Also any affects from increased train traffic? 4. Utility poles Will all utility poles be replaced? Utility poles in my yard are in terrible condition and dangerous. National Grid has been contacted by my neighbors in the past and nothing done. 5. Entrance at end of Earl Street/Carle Road - I am opposed to this entrance due to concerns about loitering issues and proximity to residential homes.</p>
Matthew Sexton	<p>On November 28, 2016, the Metropolitan Transit Agency (MTA) released the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) to the general public. Though this document divulges a lot of information about the project, due to the project moving forward as a design build, many questions still remain. Overall, I am well aware that the Long Island Railroad Expansion is a part of a larger more comprehensive plan for Long Island. Unfortunately this plan is being broken up into segments. Furthermore much of this process is being driven by the elites such as the Long Island Regional Planning Council, whose membership stand to benefit in both their financial profits and regional influence. If Long Island is to be modernized, the following must be considered. First there is no point in expanding railroad access if there is no comprehensive plan to move individuals north and south along Long Island. Both Nassau and Suffolk Counties lack the infrastructure to move people from the railroad stations north and south due to inadequate bussing. In Nassau County, the Nassau Inter County Express (NICE) is a quasi-public private partnership that is constantly discussing cutting services in order to remain financially solvent. NICE cannot meet the demand of current ridership and will be unable to meet any assumed future demand. The MTA needs to return to Nassau County and provide the north south infrastructure that will be needed to justify any rail expansion. Long Island, our villages and hamlets, have unique and distinct history and traditions. For many residents they want to maintain the culture and traditions of their hamlets and villages and this may come in conflict with the modernization of Long Island. Specifically related to the Long Island Railroad Expansion Project, outreach to residents, civics and government has been professional and informative. Lisa Black and John McCarthy have done a very good job of empowering local residents, civics and factions by addressing concerns through outreach and discussed in the DEIS. Middle class communities along the mainline have had the opportunity to provide input and constructive criticism into the project. In order to continue to allow all middle class neighborhoods a voice in the modernization of Long Island local community boards should be established in order to provide a voice for our middle class communities balancing the needs of modernization with the traditions of our communities. Many residents have expressed numerous concerns pertaining to an increase in freight train traffic along the proposed 3rd track expansion. In order to address the increase in freight the Governor's Office, the MTA, state and federal elected officials need to work together in order to address freight travel through high-density residential neighborhoods. Concerns include but are not limited to the speed of freight trains, how communities are notified about freight schedule and contents, how freight trains are covered, and what kind of waste is being moved by freight. Residents are well aware that freight is covered by interstate commerce, and the most progressive state in the union needs to advocate for improved rail freight rules and regulations especially pertaining to urban and suburban areas. If possible</p>

	<p>these concerns should be addressed through local laws and regulations while advocating for improvements at the federal level. My final point in regards to the modernization of Long Island, many homeowners may be concerned with how their quality of life will be impacted through the various segmented projects designed to improve Long Island. Though it is applauded that the current 3rd track expansion proposal drastically minimizes the use of eminent domain, New York State should develop an optional program where by homeowners who will be impacted by modernization can sell their homes and have the property converted to green space, offsetting the increase in pollution caused by increased railroad traffic. As a resident of the Village of Floral Park, I have quite a few concerns about the implementation of the LIRR 3rd Rail Expansion. Due to the Governor's Office and MTAs outreach, residents of Charles Street in Floral Park were able to successfully advocate for the implementation of sound walls, to be installed during the early stages of the project in order to minimize sound pollution during the project. The DEIS states that there will be future increases in both commuter and freight rail activity. Sound walls have the ability to minimize railroad noise pollution. In order to improve the quality of life for Floral Park residents, sound walls must be implemented the length of the village along the main line corridor. The Floral Park LIRR Station was rebuilt in 1960. As seen within the DEIS, the Floral Park LIRR Station has seen much better days. I will paraphrase Floral Parks Mayor Tweedy's statement when interviewed by TV55, the Floral Park Train Station is the gateway to Nassau County. In its current state, the Floral Park Train Station looks more like the gates of Rome after the Huns finished sacking it. The station is also not ADA compliant, forcing many residents to travel outside of Floral Park if they wish to use the LIRR. The Floral Park LIRR Station needs to be repaired, updated to ADA compliance, and beautified. Furthermore our platforms need to be fitted for main line service. Floral Park has Tier/Level Two status due to a high volume of ridership. Main line service and station improvements will allow Floral Park resident's improved commuting access as ridership justifies twice hourly service. Increasing the number of trains stopping at Floral Park through main line service will also help residents continue the tradition of being a family oriented as increased service will allow residents more commuter flexibility to spend time with their families. In 2011, New York State implemented the Property Tax Cap. The tax cap has made it difficult for local municipalities to maintain their infrastructure let alone improve their business districts. The Village of Floral Park would benefit if Governor Cuomo, the MTA and our elected officials at the state and local levels worked together to infuse upwards of \$300 million for Floral Park to repave roads in or village and beautify the business districts located on Tulip Ave, Covert Ave. and Jericho Tpke. With New York States involvement and financial backing Floral Park can improve these areas, by improving parking, repaving roads, rebuilding sidewalks as well as by making grants available for building owners to rebuild their facades. This will create union jobs, as well as improve Floral Parks ability to attract unique small businesses and corporations. Finally, I ask that the MTA and Governor Cuomos office please continue to work with Floral Parks residents, school boards, civics, government and other organizations to address the needs and concerns of the proposed expansion and beautification of Floral Park.</p>
Joanne Zeller	<p>I would like a project expert to visit our home as we have numerous concerns regarding environmental impact (noise, pollution, land erosion and vibration, radiation) on our property and the community.</p>

Donald Barbieri	<p>1. On the submitted Plans, when the 12th Street grade crossing in the Village of New Hyde Park is closed, an overpass will be built with elevator access on both the North and South sides. I want to make sure that the elevators will stop at the platform level and allow wheelchairs and people with mobility problems easy access to the LIRR platform.</p> <p>2. The New Hyde Park Station House is climate controlled and when there is inclement weather, people with disabilities and those with wheelchairs want to wait inside for the train. Currently, the handicap ramps which access the platform are at the East end, a long way from the Station House. I would propose that a platform be constructed around the Station House making it easier to access the platform for people with disabilities.</p>
Stephanie Shaw	<p>My comments are in regards to improvements proposed for Westbury. Siting of the parking garage proposed for the south side of the Westbury train station as far as practicable to the east side of the existing parking lot would preserve the view of the trees and other greenery in the Cemetery of the Holy Rood for the residences at the Horizon condo complex located at 130 Post Avenue, and therefore help maintain property values especially for the units that face Union Avenue and more generally for the entire complex. Design of and fade materials chosen for the proposed parking garages for Westbury are an opportunity for noise reduction for the areas surrounding these structures. With the exception of the Holy Rood cemetery south of the station, most of the properties around the Westbury train station currently have only small amounts of vegetation and other soft surfaces that are sound absorbing. The preponderance of concrete and hard surfaces in the area just north of the train station, including the north parking lot for the Westbury train station, permits the transmission of the noise coming from the train. Currently sounds from the trains are reflected off these hard surfaces surrounding the north Westbury train station parking lot and echo around in this area. In designing the parking garage proposed for the north parking lot, opportunities to utilize this new structure to mitigate this sound transmission should be considered. The addition of plants along the north side of the Westbury train station would aid in preventing erosion of soil from these sloping areas, help to absorb sound and air pollution, and beautify the area. Evergreen vegetation with low maximum growth heights could be chosen in order to prevent deposition of leaves onto the tracks. The choice of native plants or other low maintenance plant species would be expected to minimize upkeep costs.</p>
David Pennetta	<p>Long Island needs to stay on the path of retaining our youth, updating our infrastructure and working more synergistically with NYC. Multifamily Apartment proximate to a TOD is in critical demand and the rapid lease-up of any new development is proof of the upside-down supply/demand curve. The benefits of East side access and realizing the above goals would be greatly augmented by the addition of triple-track and the more eastern double-track.</p>
Kathleen Deegan Dickson	<p>Adding the third track to the LIRR main line is crucial for the growth and long-term survival of Long Island as a region. Short-term concerns such as construction timeframes and temporary inconvenience should not be permitted to overshadow the far-reaching benefits of the project. In order for Long Island to be competitive, it must provide reliable and frequent public transportation options to the people who live and work here. The third track is an essential part of those options in order to mitigate the bottleneck that is caused by the increasingly frequent problems on this already congested part of the LIRR system. It will also serve to reduce automobile traffic congestion and delays (and the danger) of the existing at-grade crossings which will be</p>

	<p>eliminated. It is important that the mitigation measures and promises of the LIRR are included, however. Measures such as additional parking at certain stations and sound attenuation walls must be included to protect the residents of the areas to be most affected during construction.</p>
Daniel Baggott	<p>Floral Park Station currently has platforms that service both the Hempstead Line and the Main Line; however the Main Line platforms are infrequently utilized. While the Main Line Expansion will result in significant construction through Floral Park and will require modifications to Floral Station, the DEIS states that not a single train added as part of this project will stop at Floral Park Station. Floral Park should derive at least some benefit in terms of train service as a result of this project being constructed. The DEIS proposes utilizing the current westbound Hempstead Line track between Queens Interlocking and Floral Park Station for eastbound Main Line service. The DEIS states that any impacts to Hempstead Line service will be mitigated through the construction of improvements within Queens Interlocking and the construction of new track work on the Hempstead line east of Floral Park Station. The DEIS is not clear as to how these modifications will change service patterns along the Hempstead line. Will the Hempstead Line run as a single track along this segment? Will service be modified for reverse running over this segment? Please clarify how Hempstead Line service will operate over the segment between Queens Interlocking and Floral Park Station. The DEIS is vague in regards to any required modifications to Floral Park Station. It is clear that structural modifications will be required to the viaduct at the east end of the station. Construction of these structural modifications should include improvements to Floral Park Station, such as ADA accessibility, which is currently lacking. The DEIS promotes the project primarily as a means of increasing system redundancy along the Main Line corridor and providing an expanded reverse-peak commute. How will the third track be utilized as a redundant system when any added capacity is occupied by reverse-peak service? In the event one of the three tracks is taken out of service due to an event such as a broken rail or disabled train, will the service pattern prioritize the peak service direction with complete cancellation of the newly added reverse-peak services? The DEIS proposes two side platforms as the final configuration at Mineola Station. Mineola currently receives peak-direction trains from both platforms - Will Mineola see a reduction in peak direction trains servicing the station as a result of the third track being inaccessible? The Oyster Bay Line is shown in the DEIS as solely connecting to the westbound mainline track. It is clear that there will be service changes to the Oyster Bay Line as a result of these modifications. What will these changes be and how will they impact service to the Oyster Bay Line? The DEIS is vague in regards to its alternative analysis. The \$2,000,000,000 cost estimate adds benefit of 1 peak direction train and 8 reverse-peak direction trains - a value which could closely be matched at a lower cost by running longer trains, streamlined scheduling, and minor system wide infrastructure improvements. A cost benefit analysis should also include alternatives such as the Central Branch reactivation or a Long Island Expressway contraflow lane which would provide added benefit for similar costs.</p>
Virginia Tartaglione	<p>I am strongly opposed to the third track project. It would DESTROY the quality of life of residents of New Hyde Park on the south side of the railroad. Furthermore, elimination of the crossing would have a devastating effect on all of us who live on Covert Ave. There are times of the day when it is impossible to get out of our driveways unless the railroad gate stops traffic. While this affects a relatively small number of people, we are nonetheless citizens and taxpayers who have always</p>

	<p>supported the businesses and churches of our village. UNLESS A TRAFFIC LIGHT IS INSTALLED AT THE CURRENT LOCATION OF THE TRACKS to regulate the southbound traffic, our lives would be RUINED. This is no way to treat a part of our community which includes active volunteers and U.S. veterans. In addition, our property values would plummet - assuming anyone would be willing to buy a house here. As a resident of New Hyde Park for 35 years, I feel that ignoring the catastrophic effects of the proposed actions would be political suicide for all who allow it to happen.</p>
Kevin Flood	<p>On May 24, 2016 I had an opportunity to come before you to address some concerns during the scoping hearing. What I specifically addressed were the following: Future of the Hempstead Line (how will the LIRR third track project impact the Hempstead line) Existing infrastructure and the plan to relocate it within the LIRR "Right of Way" Close Proximity of the construction & new track to our Recreation Facility & Pool. Although some of these topics have been further addressed in the DEIS, I am not satisfied with the impact statements provided due mainly to lack of details. I also have additional questions and concerns that I would like to bring to your attention after reading the DEIS. ONCE AGAIN - What Impact will the LIRR Third Track expansion have on the operation of the Hempstead Line The DEIS briefly states that the Hempstead line will have an Interlocking Plant, Signals and a universal crossover installed East of the Floral Park Station in order to take one of the existing Hempstead line's tracks and turn it into the new "third track" just east of Floral Park Station. This surely will impact the operations of the Hempstead line, west of Stewart Manor station, and we deserve to know how. If you take one track from the existing two track Hempstead line, that leaves a remaining one track operation. I find it ironic the LIRR is pushing for a third track on the main line, but choosing to turn the Hempstead line into a one track operation. The DEIS states that in the 2040 Build Condition, four trains currently routed to Atlantic Terminal will no longer be accessible on the Hempstead Branch, but rather route directly to Manhattan. It touts the additional service to Manhattan for the Floral Park/Queens Village / Hollis stations but specifically leaves out the Bellerose station. Does the Third Track project and 2040 Build Condition intend to terminate the use of the Bellerose Train station? I find it ironic the LIRR is pushing for a third track on the main line and providing new stations and upgrades for impacted areas, while ignoring the deteriorating conditions of the Floral Park station and hint at limiting or terminating service at the Bellerose station. The DEIS states the number of trains running on the Hempstead line is currently 70 per 24 hour period. It projects the number of trains running on the Hempstead Line's future is 58 per 24 hour period. Please explain in detail why there is a reduction in the number of trains servicing the communities on the Hempstead line. I find it ironic the LIRR is pushing for a third track on the main line in order to provide more train service, but decreasing the number of projected trains on the Hempstead Branch. Impacts of displaced Existing Infrastructure, and additions of new infrastructure The DEIS dedicates an entire chapter to Utilities and infrastructure, which implies its importance for such a large scale project that impacts so many communities, residents, and business owners. While appreciative of the material provided (approximately 13 pages), the Chapter on Utilities and Infrastructure pales in comparison to other chapters in the DEIS which are made up of 3 to 4 times more information. I find this lack of information disturbing, considering the amount of infrastructure that is going to be displaced, modified, added and/or eliminated during this proposed project. I have a few specific questions related to utilities and infrastructure: Power Lines: How tall are the new utility poles going to be?</p>

	<p>What is the diameter of the poles? What is the material used, how will it wear over the years? How large are the footprints of these poles and will they fit within the Right of Way? How will they be grounded to prevent lightning strikes close to residences, Floral Parks recreation Center and pool? How many power lines are intended to be strung from these utility poles? Will there be frequent power outages associated with the installation & reconnection of these utilities? Drainage: The DEIS states that the ground under the new track will be compacted and unable to drain appropriately during rain storms. It looks as if any land that was available to absorb these rains will be used to support the new track, utilities, switches, retaining walls, etc. This raises a serious problem of potential rain run-off into resident's homes, and potentially our Village pool. This run-off could contain toxic chemicals and we need to be assured this water will not enter our homes and public areas. Has the LIRR been granted access by Nassau County to tap into existing recharge basins? If so, will connecting to the Nassau County Recharge basins contribute to the further spreading of toxic chemicals into our ground water? Grass lined Ditches have been proposed to capture a rain run-off. Where along the Right of Way in Floral Park do you intend to place grass lined ditches? Also, the DEIS states these ditches will need to be maintained periodically to ensure their effectiveness. Do you actually think the LIRR will maintain grass? Retaining & Sound Attenuation Walls: Although the term "sound attenuation walls" sounds pleasing to the areas affected by the proposed third Track project, I have some concerns. It is stated that many of these walls in Floral Park will be 16 feet tall. That is over have the height of an average home in the Village and will surly impact the look and feel of the village. How large will the foundations of these walls be and will they extend into residences yards? Will the sound attenuation walls deflect the sound of the railroad and amplify it towards the opposite direction? How much space will be left between the walls and the running trains? I'm concerned about teenagers or LIRR employees walking the tracks and having nowhere to escape an oncoming train. What is securing these new 16 foot walls? What happens in minor event where a train jumps the tracks and bumps into these walls? Will they topple over into residences yards, our ball fields or our village pool property? What happens in a catastrophic event where rescue personnel is needed on the track? How will they scale a 16 foot wall? Children's Safety & Well Being- Village Recreation Center & Pool Our most precious resource in the Village of Floral Park is our children and we work hard every day to provide them with the safest environment possible for them to grow, learn and become our next generation of leaders. As you can imagine, the proposal to potentially invade our Village and turn it on its head is very concerning and we must act responsibly to preserve the environment that our children are so lucky to be growing up in. Immediately bordering this LIRR third track project is the Village Recreation Center and Pool. 7 days a week; 365 days a year, these facilities are bustling with the laughter and energy of our Village's Children. It is an epicenter for our Village and we cherish it. We must be told how these facilities will be impacted by this project. This project could determine the course of many children's lives. A 3-5 year project that could shut down many of these facilities for extended periods of time could be detrimental to the many sports and activities we provide our children. No Little League, Hockey, Swim Lessons, Football, Soccer, etc. But most of all, no memories. That impact is not quantifiable in a 2,000+ page DEIS. The DEIS must provide more details on how it intends to keep our children safe in these public areas during this potential project and the intended future use of this LIRR corridor. In closing, I would also like to point out a concern that ALL</p>
--	--

	<p>New Yorkers should be made aware of. How will this \$2,000,000,000+ project be paid for if not covered under Federal Funds? It will surely be paid for by LIRR riders through increased fares, but increased fares will not be sufficient to cover the cost, which leads us to increase in taxes statewide. Does the increase in fares and taxes support the supposed benefits this Third Track Project will have? The DEIS should disclose more information on the source of the funds and how and who will ultimately pay for the 2 billion+ dollar megaproject.</p>
Stephanie Kunkel-Giglio	<p>The people that are most in favor of this project seem to be the people whose communities will undergo the least turmoil, noise, disruption, environmental issues and inconvenience. We all know these projects are never finished on time and I see extremely limited benefit to my community. In the event that this project is shoved down our throats, as I imagine it will be, I would like to see a covered walkway and art similar to what has been done on over half of the NYC subway stations. Landscaping is also essential as well as additional parking. The waiting room is unmanned and frequently locked making late travel unsafe and unpleasant during inclement weather. Better lighting would also help. Separating elevated crossings from the proposal is callous. The crossings need to be elevated regardless of whether or not this proposal goes forward. I see no need for a third track. I believe that it is a foolish premise to assume that people will travel from the west to Long Island for jobs. My entire family relocated to Brooklyn and Manhattan because the salaries are more than double what they could earn on Long Island. They have far more disposable income even after paying higher rents.</p>
Anthony Gullo	<p>As I have written in the past, I would like to express my continued support for the LIRR Expansion Project. Despite vocal local opposition, as a resident of Garden City as well, I believe that this project is crucial to our regional infrastructure and fully approve of the plan proposed by both you and Governor Cuomo. I look forward to seeing it implemented and the further investment in our crucial infrastructure.</p>
Martin Hartmann	<p>Parking At Merillon Avenue Station Appendix A, Section 3.17, pg 3-51 states that the Merillon station north parking lot will lose 13 spaces. However Table 10-38, in Section 10, Transportation notes 14 spaces. This is unacceptable! It also states that the south side, Merillon Ave will not lose any spaces. Not true! This is an erroneous statement given that the platforms are lengthening and therefore need to add two more access points. Each access point removes at least one or two spots. It is also not clear if the existing 4 parking spaces on the south side, where the proposed elevator / overpass is proposed, can remain. The LIRR needs to accurately examine and clarify these statement.</p> <p>Secondly it is noted that there will be a 152 spot parking shortage with the coming of East Side Access, table 10-39, and an increase of almost 200 commuters, Table 3-9 Appendix A. This is huge. The report indicates that MTA will evaluate these predications moving forward and address as needed. This does not make sense to wait. One of the main reasons to build a third track is not just to provide capacity for trains but to also have supporting facilities for local commuters (commuters being impacted by this project) to use the extra trains for the future East Side Access project. Here is a suggestion on how to increase parking. The Merillon north parking lot slopes up from Atlantic Avenue to the tracks. One could cut into the slope toward the tracks and then construct a second level on top, which would be almost at platform level, to create a two level garage without it appearing as a large structure and keep it in context with the surrounding community. Commuter / Pedestrians at Merillon Ave Station It is</p>

	<p>disappointing that Section 10 Transportation does not evaluate pedestrian / commuter access at Merillon Ave. Just because it currently is grade separated does not mean that there are and will not be potential issues. Particularly if the MTA is anticipating increase in commuter traffic (i.e. 200 more commuters). Some analysis should have been considered. The conflicting moves as evening commuters disembark a train and either walk to their park cars, try to cross over Merillon / Main Street to walk home or to get picked up by waiting cars can get rather intense with respect to car / pedestrian dancing between each other. Particularly during winter months with reduced day light, it becomes even worse. Even in the morning rush, the kiss and ride cars sit, clogging up the north parking lot, waiting for the train to arrive. The level of service of the Nassau Blvd / Merillon Avenue intersection can be not be acceptable based on the existing very long vehicle queues. Commuters living on the east side of Nassau Blvd must also navigate this very busy intersection. Suggestion - In addition to constructing the third track over Nassau Blvd included a pedestrian bridge to allow these easterly commuters safe crossing over Nassau Blvd. It will also minimize the vehicle pedestrian conflict and possibly improve the level of service of that busy intersection. It is being provided at Nassau Blvd why not here also.</p>
Kevin Lawrence	<p>The disreputable village of Floral Park deserves nothing, no enhancement whatsoever from this project. They are entitled to nothing. This is solely attributable to actions of the leaders of Floral Park: William "Bill" and Ann Corbett, Archie T. Cheng, Timothy Dalton and Mayor Thomas J. Tweedy, among others, and their outrageous opposition to any meaningful mitigation efforts and their utter lack of common courtesy shown to the Governor and the project team. There should be no station improvement/enhancement construction performed within the Floral Park station environs, outside what is needed for the function of the third track, as to not disturb their delicate sensibilities. As the leaders of Floral Park have gone at great lengths to spout outright lies, propagate misinformation and spread mass hysteria regarding the "life threatening dangers" that this project poses to their community's children. Any improvement to the Floral Park station would be a senseless waste of scarce capital resources that could be better spent anywhere else in the Great State of New York. Their efforts are best observed in The Island Now article titled "Village uses 2-prong tactic on 3rd track; others wait for info" http://theislandnow.com/new_hyde_park-108/news/village-uses-2-prong-tactic-on-3rd-track-others-wait-for-info/ "Speaking of mitigation at this point is signing the terms of your surrender before you've fired the first shot, Floral Park Mayor Thomas Tweedy said." Nothing should be given to this village as its leaders have fought this project tooth and nail, despite the best efforts engagement on the part of the Governor's team to have a respectful and productive dialog as to the possible impacts of this project in the Floral Park community and any mitigation efforts that may be implemented to lessen those impacts. The leaders of Floral Park went so far as to ridicule the Governor in large offensive pictures outside their offices and in gross caricatures on the internet. They are truly despicable individuals indeed, with no sense of common decency or respect. The representatives of the Floral Park local government should be ashamed of themselves for their immature and juvenile actions.</p>
Matthew Sexton	<p>The Executive Board of the Village of Floral Park Southside Civic Association opposes the current LIRR 3rd Track Plan as an unnecessary costly project that diverts the LIRR attention from critical improvements to service and safety. These other necessary improvements include completion of East Side Access, Reconstruction and</p>

	<p>improvement in Penn Station Tunnels, updating of switches, 2nd track between Hicksville and Ronkonkoma, total electrification of Suffolk County etc. The Third Track proposal dramatically impacts the Village of Floral Park (VFP) with little benefit to the community. Although this is a bad idea for the state, county and village we recognize that opposition may not stop our village from being disrupted for a long period of time and possibly split in two. Timing, structure and management of the project can mitigate some but not all of the impact. Therefore a Community Benefit Agreement (CBA) must be considered to mitigate the unavoidable impact. Some examples of what we would want in the CBA are as follows: 1. Construction within VFP must be done in small sections - completion then procession. No FP construction phase should be over 30 days. Therefore FP section should have 6-8 sections. After 8th month from commencement to completion VFP will receive a daily sum certain fee - \$5 K daily. 2. Construction must take place behind rec center/pool from Labor Day thru April 14th only - to coincide with pool closed and little league season. A \$1 million bond must be held if project phase impacts either season in anyway or damages VFP property. 3. Paving of Plainfield Ave, Atlantic Ave, Charles St, South Tyson, Tulip and Stewart Street. 4. Sound barrier walls along main line through FP including FP-Bell school section. 5. FP station must be included in stops from main branch lines with the ability to travel throughout LI and NYC directly from Floral Park. 6. No track construction West of the eastern end of FP Station 7. All FP residents have free travel on LIRR using NYS picture ID during FP phase construction. 8. A set percentage of all trade construction workers must be from FP area and must be given preference on all jobs. 9. Machinery, vehicles and workers cars cannot be parked on VFP streets without being subject to VFP parking rules. 10. All construction must be completed within LIRR right of way. Fines will be set for violations by VFP. 11. Hempstead Line grade crossings must be in capital plan within next ten years. 12. 3 tier parking garage at current LIRR station lot where VFP residents stickers can be used with sticker fee going directly to VFP. 13. Payment of all VFP Police and VFP Public Works OT during construction phase including pension impacts. 14. Prohibit commercial traffic on Plainfield and Tulip Ave during construction phase of Plainfield trestle and FP station except for such traffic delivering directly into VFP proper. 15. Public weekly meetings with construction project manager and Governor liaison during VFP construction phase</p>
Nicholas Mirro	<p>I am all in favor of the 3rd track. This project must go forward for our community redevelopment. The two parking lots proposed by the LIRR must be part of this project. To relieve additional traffic in Hicksville the Syosset station with parking should be opened and also large trucks bared from South Oyster Bay Road must be permitted to reuse that roadway again to relieve some of the burden on routes 107 and 106.</p>
Glynn Ellen Fisichell	<p>As a longtime resident of Floral Park, I have noticed the increasing urbanization of the Island. The characteristics that mark us as suburban are fast disappearing, giving way to congested roads, overcrowded parking areas, shopping, medical, and educational facilities. Any project that contributes to noise and pollution, already at the breaking point with overhead air traffic, will not enhance the economic development of the region. My point is simple. People will begin to leave the Island. This will not happen overnight, but it will happen, as they seek a suburban environment for their families. If the budget can support infrastructure repair to the rail lines and switches and other means can be found to dispose of waste in a safe way, why not work to develop this? The commuter experience would be improved, if not perfect, but commuters are often living in our towns and may not realize the full impact of this project. The railroad</p>

	which allows us access to Manhattan should not be the means by which we transform the suburb into the city.
Sammy Chu	On behalf of the United States Green Building Council-Long Island Chapter (USGBC-LI), I would like to lend our full support to the LIRR Third Track Project. Not only will this have a huge positive economic impact on our region, the project will help to decrease our regions carbon imprint. Highway congestion is a major contributor to air pollution and with the expansion of the LIRR we will have fewer cars on our roadways, significantly improving our air quality. The LIRR expansion will also reduce the amount of gas we use and decrease noise pollution. These changes and many more will result in a better quality of life for all of Long Island. Sustainable development requires the fulfilment of several conditions including preserving our natural resources and implementing building practices that are socially and environmentally responsible. The LIRR Third Track Project is Long Island's opportunity to do just that.
Manuel Velez	I spoke at one of the Public Scoping session, and submitted inquiries (using the computer stations provided at the session for comments and questions) regarding data which would be required to support the need for the project. Especially considering the use of funding of billions of dollars for the overall project (but specifically including \$2Billion+ for the Main Line Corridor Third Track addition). I asked that the MTA/LIRR provide documentation and detail of each delay, accident, derailment, and other cause for service disruption. In order for the data to be meaningful, it must include time, exact location, type of issue, length of disruption, resolution of disruption and which service-direction was impeded. I never received a response. When I asked the same question at a local community presentation, the answer was that the data was not readily available but that it would be provided at a later date. I do not see the information in the DEIS documents, nor was the question answered or data provided at the DEIS public sessions. Additionally, I asked the MTA/LIRR representatives to kindly provide data about alternate solutions for delays, derailments, accidents, and other service disruptions (rather than adding a Third Track), along with their cost and estimated resolve to such issues. That information again was unavailable and not provided in the DEIS document. I believe that this information must be made available in order for the MTA/LIRR to be compliant with the Public Process currently underway. This data should be provided before proceeding further.
Catherine Muscente	I support the efforts to build a third track and keep Long Island one of the best places to live.
Annette Sequino	This comment is regarding the Proposed third Rail. Firstly, Mario Cuomo does NOT live here in New Hyde Park, nor does he travel the Long Island Railroad. I am GREATLY OPPOSED TO HIS PROPOSAL TO ADD A THIRD TRACK! I commuted for several years to Manhattan and never found it a hardship to get a train to and fro Manhattan. Instead of wasting taxpayer's money by adding a third track, he can solve the situation very easily by investing in more DOUBLE DECKER CARS! This will send more people to Manhattan and more people back to the Island. It will NOT destroy our SUBURBAN living, and it will solve travel problems! South 12th Street is a very busy street and this closing of the street will cause many, many problems both via auto, trucks and by foot. We don't want our town looking like a "CITY STREET"! PLEASE CONSIDER THIS SUGGESTION AND PROPOSE THIS TO THE GOVERNOR. WE LOVE NEW HYDE PARK JUST THE WAY IT IS QUIET, PEACEFUL, FRIENDLY, SUBURBAN AND INDEPENDENT!
Robert Lofaro	New Hyde Park is a community bisected by the main line of the Long Island Rail Road and has three (3) at-grade crossings. Traffic flow, development and the overall

	<p>functionality of the community have been greatly affected by this fact, not to mention the compromise to safety that is created with all at-grade crossings. While the Village recognizes the potential benefits and significance of a project which includes the elimination of these grade crossings, it is extremely cautious about the overall cumulative impacts to our community resulting from such an undertaking and questions whether the benefits, if any, will outweigh such impacts. It would seem that the Long Island Rail Road could achieve the Governors transportation infrastructure initiatives□ and comprehensive plan to transform and expand New York's vital regional transportation infrastructure in several less impactful ways than the construction of this project. The Village of New Hyde Park will submit full written comments to the MTA LIRR concerning the DEIS. However, at this time, I offer the following for your consideration: The DEIS, Chapter 18, entitled Alternatives enumerates the projects goals and objectives as follows: Goal: Reduce delays to commuters from Main Line congestion and rippling effects In response, I offer the following: The installation of a third track will do little to relieve congestion on the Main Line without first updating and addressing signals and switching problems. The replacement of signals and switches should be studied and proposed. By addressing the signals and switching problems, the Long Island Rail Road will be able to achieve a purported goal of this project at a fraction of the cost. Please identify why switches and signals cannot be addressed as a separate alternative to this project. The DEIS provides statistics on train delays and cancellations occurring on the main line over the last 2 years. The DEIS summarizes that the addition of a third track would significantly increase on time reliability of the system. However, the term significant is not quantified. Exactly how much of a reliability improvement will be achieved for the cost and inconvenience that is proposed? Is the cost and inconvenience justified? An independent panel should be set up to review the impact a third track will have and measure that against the investment. Goal: Add operational flexibility eastbound and westbound and Provide additional track capacity to accommodate projected system-wide service growth In response, I offer the following: The LIRR should identify what system growth is expected and from where new ridership is coming. A detailed analysis is required to compare the forecasted population growth in Eastern Long Island with the forecasted job growth/travel demands. How many of these new individuals will move to Suffolk County and not work in Suffolk? With these new individuals, how many workers will still travel by train from the City limits to work in Suffolk County? Freight still remains a valid concern. Especially based upon the comments in the NEC Future Tier 1 Final Environmental Impact Statement. It provides that the FRA recognizes that freight rail service is critical to the continued vitality and competitiveness of the Northeast economy. Please address how the LIRR will respond to this concept. What assurances can the LIRR provide that it will keep its current restrictions for the operation of freight trains in place? Goal: Improve public safety and roadway conditions In response, I offer the following: The Village is in favor of eliminating grade crossings. However, the Village has consistently emphasized that it should be done in such a way that is least harmful to the character of the Village. It remains unclear why this has not been a priority. Why has the LIRR failed to identify the elimination of grade crossings as a standalone alternatives in light of the fact that this appears to be a large part of the benefits being sought from the overall project? In New Hyde Park, the proposed grade cross elimination project at Covert Avenue will have significant impacts on the quality life of the community both during and after construction. The proposed pedestrian</p>
--	--

	<p>crossing will make traversing the railroad much more difficult. The grade crossing elimination underpass can be accomplished with a more gradual grade, improving the line of sight. Or, the tracks could be raised and the road lowered less than proposed such as was done at the Herricks Road crossing. Further study and analysis is needed. At South 12th Street, the closing of the street and proposed overhead pedestrian walkway will directly impact the residents of the Village. South 12th Street is used primarily for access to the South 12th Street resident commuter parking lot. Closing South 12th Street will divert traffic through the residential streets from Covert Avenue and New Hyde Park Road. The LIRR must find a parking solution north of the tracks, preferably on Jericho Turnpike where such a structure would be more in context with the commercial zone. Further, the proposed pedestrian bridge makes accessing the station much more difficult and certainly not in keeping with the residential character of the Village. At New Hyde Park Road, the proposed two alternatives will bring more vehicles into and through the Village, again making traffic more of an issue than currently exists in the Village. Further, the Village is extremely concerned with the limited sight distance in this underpass as well as the vehicular traffic to and from Clinch Avenue. The alleged reduction of traffic at the crossing gates will be relocated to the proposed traffic lights. Simply put, the project is exchanging one traffic congestion problem for another. Goal: Reduce noise and improve neighborhood quality-of-life. In response, I offer the following: Please identify how the project can purport to improve the quality life when proper studies and mitigation measures have not been reviewed regarding: soil contaminants (identifying the amounts, source and procedures to remove them); timing of construction (impossible to believe that everything will occur at the same time); start date for each phase of the project; completion date for each phase of the project; funding source for each phase of the project; staging area before and during each phase of the construction; relocation of utilities during and after each phase of the construction; drainage during and after construction of each phase of the project; and traffic study disseminated to all interested villages showing proposed traffic flow and impacts during each phase of the project. Two final issues that require further examination are as follows: 1. A careful analysis of projected impacts upon businesses must be made and a plan for preserving business operations during construction and thereafter must be formulated; and 2. If advancement of the proposed project will result in any loss of assessed valuation by the Village, a method to compensate New Hyde Park on a permanent basis for such loss must be devised.</p>
David Levine	<p>I write this message in support of the LIRR Enhancement Project. I believe in adding this additional track will be extremely beneficial to Long Island and allow it to thrive and grow. It is essential in order to keep young people on Long Island and will support both jobs and economic growth.</p>
Richard Caputo	<p>I just want to express my extreme concern about the Carle Place Station and it's current and future lack of parking for commuters. It has been a terrible imposition to residents around the station for some time. The station currently has only 12 parking spaces which is a community joke. Under the new plans they want to eliminate the 12 spaces down to maybe 4 spaces. This is a ridiculous scenario. This shows no planning and disregard for Carle Place/Westbury residents. North Hempstead Town has saturated the area around the Carle Place Station with restricted parking signs that aggravate the situation more. Lack of parking and signs just drive commuters to park bumper to bumper on residential streets in the western end of Westbury Village and Carle Place.</p>

	<p>We are looking into putting up signs in Westbury near the Carle Place Station also, which we do not want, but may be our only protection. Then where will these commuters go to park? The idea of Carle Place being a total walk to station is totally false. Who plans a station with the idea of 100 people walking to it? That's a waste of money with no insight. Do not take away our 12 spaces, but expand them. Also work with the Town of North Hempstead for better planning on what signage is needed and where to place them. It would be nice to have parking for 20-30 at the station and some open unrestricted street spaces in the industrial area next to the station. For most here, it's all about parking!</p>
Jeffrey Kraut	<p>As the largest employer and largest provider of health care on Long Island and in New York State, we at Northwell Health are writing to express our strong support for the LIRR Expansion Project, and to ask that it continue to be a priority for the MTA and the State of New York. As healthcare professionals we care deeply about the safety and well-being of our employees, our families and our neighbors. There is no question that the LIRRs outdated at-grade street crossings are a serious danger to all those who drive, walk or live around them. The proposal, which now includes the elimination of seven of these crossings, will enable our fellow community members to travel locally with considerably more ease, efficiency, and security. Additionally, the elimination of these crossings will allow ambulances and emergency vehicles to reach residents in distress in a faster and more efficient manner, and without ever stopping for passing trains. In emergency care, every minute saved is valued. A downed crossing gate can change a patient outcome, the most extreme examples of which manifests itself between life and death. Further, as a primary healthcare and medical resource for the Long Island community, it is critical that we continue to attract the top doctors, nurses and healthcare professionals to our network. The elimination of the LIRRs bottleneck between Hicksville and Floral Park, and subsequent enhancement of service to LIRR commuters, will allow us to recruit more successfully from outside job markets. Enabling our employees to reverse commute is important to our continued growth, as is attracting them to live on Long Island by providing easy access to New York City's entertainment, professional and educational resources. Finally, Northwell Health prides itself on being at the forefront of medicine in the 21st century. The Long Island community has enabled us to thrive, just as we have contributed to the collective health and wellness of those that rely on us. Updating the surrounding public transit system and improving local infrastructure will support Long Island's residents as well as its businesses and we look forward to its eventual completion.</p>
Matt Green	<p>I live two blocks from the Carle Place station that will be torn down and rebuilt as part of this project. I am a daily commuter to Manhattan and I am generally supportive of this project. I would like the rebuilt Carle Place station to be truly handicapped accessible and ADA-compliant. It should have two crossings (overhead or underground) between the platforms and at least one of the crossings should be a gentle ramp that allows those pushing baby strollers or wheelchairs or people with mobility impairments to easily cross from one side to the other. One of the crossings should be at the east side of the platform, at or by Carle Road. Also, there should be ticket machines on each platform, and each platform should have at least one machine that sells monthly tickets.</p>
Patrick O'Hara	<p>Hi, I have several questions about the Third Main Line Track project from the DEIS. A response to these before the end of the public comment period would be preferred, so comments could account for all information about the project. These questions were</p>

	<p>sent through the MTA Press Office on November 28, 2016, however, no responses have been received. What was the reasoning behind reconfiguring NASSAU 2 Interlocking so that the Oyster Bay Branch can only be accessed from the westbound local track? Will requiring eastbound Oyster Bay Branch trains to switch to the opposite track before Mineola have more of an impact on westbound local Main Line service than the current setup? Will the reconfiguration of the Oyster Bay Branch's connection to the Main Line prevent the LIRR from making meaningful service improvements down the road if service demand on the branch changes? Was constructing an island platform considered for Mineola Station, that way trains from all three tracks can stop at the station without having to switch tracks? Will having no platform at Mineola limit the potential for intra-Island service improvements (as Mineola is a significant employment center)? Figure S-7 in the Executive Summary seems to indicate that platforms at several locations (westbound platforms at New Hyde Park, GC-Merillon Avenue, and Mineola, eastbound platform at Carle Place, and the westbound platform at Westbury) would not need to be moved, yet the project description states all platforms will be demolished and replaced. The platforms at Mineola, Carle Place, and Westbury are already 12 cars long what is the purpose of removing them to replace them with practically the same thing? How does the LIRR expect the Third Main Line Track to meaningfully reduce delays due to unplanned service disruptions? If one track is out of service, wont two tracks worth of peak trains have to merge down into one, just like they have to do today? Or wouldn't reverse-peak service have to be suspended completely? Table 1-3 shows the number of trains the LIRR expects to operate under different scenarios. It appears that the Third Main Line Track will only allow one additional peak-direction train in each of the AM and PM peak periods. Will that be sufficient to alleviate peak-direction crowding experienced now (even before ESA)? The Ellison Avenue Bridge replacement project was just completed within the last year, however the DEIS states the existing tracks would have to be realigned slightly to the south to enable all three tracks to be centered underneath the Ellison Avenue Bridge. Why was this not accounted for in the design of the new Ellison Avenue Bridge so shifting tracks would not be needed? The platforms at New Hyde Park and GC-Merillon Avenue would need to be extended by 2 cars to be a full 12-cars long. The DEIS does not indicate where these platform extensions would be built, would they be added on the east or west ends of the existing platforms? The DEIS mentions constructing a second overpass at Westbury primarily to provide a means of egress at the east end of the platform. Why was it impossible to obtain a small slither of property or an easement to provide this egress from the platform directly to the ground so the cost of constructing a second overpass could be avoided? What is the purpose of the pedestrian overpass shown in the Mineola Parking Garage (between Main Street and Willis Avenue, figure 1-53)? Is saving people from having to use a crosswalk to cross one access street really worth the expense of a whole overpass, additional elevator, and enclosed staircase? In some previous eminent domain acquisitions, like in Flushing recently, the property owners sued and won an amount substantially more than what was originally offered, negatively impacting the project budget and schedule. Is anything being done to mitigate this in advance for this project? To replace six substations in less than four years (to meet the project timeline), they have to be replaced at a rate of one every eight months. Previous substation replacement programs have taken much longer. Is cutting down the schedule to this extent practical? Chapter 10 indicates that increased demand [for bus service] would be</p>
--	--

	<p>accommodated with adjustments to NICE bus service to complement the changes in LIRR ridership. Who will fund those service improvements? NICE is talking about cutting bus service again because they won't be able to make ends meet next year. How many jobs are within a reasonable walking distance of stations vs. how many would need a bus connection to reach? What would be the impact on reverse-peak ridership potential if there's no improvement in bus service? Why does the proposed project include so few provisions for increased parking at stations? According to table 10-7, AM rush ridership is expected to increase by 3,670 people by 2040. Parking is already insufficient for riders at several stations on the Main Line corridor, even before the project will leave a shortfall of hundreds of spaces. How are these riders expected to get to the station? Table 10-6 projects a total AM Peak ridership of 76,240 riders for both the 2040 Build and No-Build scenarios for 57 and 58 trains. That would be an average of 1,315 people per train if riders spread out exactly evenly (which they don't). 12-car M7 trains have 1,272 seats, meaning there would be at least 43 standees on every train, and riders don't spread out exactly even on every train. The forecasts indicate there will be more riders than the LIRR will be able to provide seats for. Is anything being planned to offset this? The DEIS does not address what will happen with other branches that feed into and operate through the study area. What's going to happen with service patterns east of Hicksville? Will there still be through diesel service on the Main Line to Jamaica and points west? Will Port Jefferson or Huntington service be reduced to add Ronkonkoma trains? Table 10-14 indicates that New Hyde Park will see 365 more boarding in the AM peak period, yet page 10-52 indicates there will be 0 new drive and park trips, 3 new drop-off trips, and 0 new taxi trips for the AM peak period. Where are the other 362 riders coming from? Similar shortfalls are there for the Mineola and Westbury sections. The descriptions about the parking garages in chapter 10 do not say if there will be any resident restrictions at the garages, or how they will be operated. Will they be restricted to town residents only? Will it be open to everyone but people will have to pay a daily or monthly fee? Is there any expected change in bike traffic to stations? If ridership is going to increase by 3,670 people but there will be far fewer new parking spots, lots of people may have to bike to stations. The project website (http://www.amodernli.com/environment/) stresses how the project will improve air quality in part by reducing congestion on the LIE, but Chapter 11 of the DEIS doesn't go into that at all, is that still the case? The noise chapter of the DEIS uses default FTA reference noise level[s] in the noise analysis. What noise levels do the LIRRs MUs and diesels actually produce and how do the levels compare to the defaults? Chapter 13 indicates that the Denton Avenue, Nassau Boulevard, Glen Cove Road, and Cherry Lane structures would be modified to accommodate the third track but does not specify what those modifications will be. What work will be needed for these structures? Vertical road clearances at the Denton Avenue (12' 9") and Nassau Boulevard (11' 6") structures are less than the typical 14' clearance. Will any additional measures be taken to reduce bridge strikes at these locations? How will the work be done to platforms that are being demolished and rebuilt in the same place (w/b at NHP, MAV, MIN, WBY; e/b at CPL)? Will the platforms be demolished and rebuilt half at a time in two phases? Will any long-term track outages or full weekend closures be required on the Main Line to shift tracks? Is shifting a segment of track something that can be done in a single overnight or weekend outage? Were costs estimated for the alternatives analyzed? How much would moving to a movable block system cost?</p>
--	---

Richard Alvy	I would like to know if there is a plan to provide alternate parking at lots slated to be closed to build parking garages. Currently there is VERY limited parking at all stations along this stretch. For example: When the southern lot at Westbury is closed to put up a parking garage, where are we supposed to park? Are there any plans to change parking rules on surrounding streets? Or open up village lots to other commuters? Or are there any plans to accommodate these commuters at other stations?
James Hershler	<p>In its Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) at page S-20, the LIRR admits that after spending billions of taxpayer dollars and damaging Long Island communities and their residents quality of life, the end result of the Third Track project will be to add just one more morning westbound train and one more afternoon eastbound train each day. Is this really worth it? The LIRRs own statistics show that commutation into NYC declined over most of the past 30 years. The DEIS tries to justify this huge expenditure of public money and burden on communities like Floral Park Village by claiming that it will allow more reverse commuter trains. But do we really need them? As a rider, I have personally seen the reverse commuter trains each day over the past 20 years. They have always been largely empty. Must we spend billions of dollars and damage Long Island communities to add more, even emptier reverse commuter trains? The LIRR predicts there will be a great need for trains going against the rush hour traffic years, or decades, from now. But based on what? Who will pay high, ever increasing fares to get to LIRR stations, then to go from NYC to Long Island, then take a taxi or bus (or bicycle), just to arrive at a low paying job? And do the DEIS projections even consider that in the future more and more high paying jobs will be relying on e-commuting, not trains? The DEIS also claims there is a need to bypass trains that are disabled or have other problems. But the LIRRs own reports show that these incidents are happening all over the system, generally not on the ten mile stretch of track involved in this project. In just the past few weeks there have been major system wide interruptions because of derailments at both Atlantic Avenue and Jamaica Station. And there are delays just about every other week because of failures in the East River tunnels. The plain and obvious question not being answered by the DEIS is: Why not maintain their equipment better and actually try solving the problems caused by a deteriorating and neglected system, rather than spending vast sums of money looking for a way around them? That makes about as much sense as widening the NYC streets so that people can drive around the potholes. The most remarkable thing about this project is that the DEIS relies so heavily on other things beside the Third Track to justify it such as eliminating grade crossings, upgrading stations and modernizing switches and signals. The LIRR obviously does not have to build another track in order to make all these improvements. And their benefits are undeniable, not just based on nebulous predictions. Eliminating key grade crossings will definitely reduce traffic congestion and pollution, eliminate blaring train horns and prevent deadly collisions between trains and vehicles. Upgrading and modernizing stations, switches and signals will plainly avoid many of the service breakdowns that continually plague the LIRR. But the DEIS refused even to seriously consider the alternative of first making these improvements before disrupting communities and spending billions of dollars on the Third Track. Out of thousands of pages, the DEIS rejected these sound alternatives in only a few sentences. This clearly was a predetermined result, not a genuine analysis of how to solve the LIRRs problems. The LIRR should do right thing and use the public's money for purposes that clearly make sense, not rely on baseless projections that may, or may not, happen over the next 10, 20 or 30 years: (1) Eliminate grade crossings</p>

	<p>which tie up rush hour traffic and where people occasionally get killed, (2) replace the systems existing rails on a regular basis before they break and cause derailments, (3) fix and modernize the switches and signals that seem to be constantly failing, (4) maintain the trains so that riders can use the bathrooms without being disgusted, see out the windows, do not have sit on advertising posters used for seat coverings, etc. and (5) spare the commuters constant fare increases. Then, after this is done, re-evaluate the situation and determine if a significant increase in the sparse reverse commute is really going to happen, and, if so, whether other, less destructive solutions have become more viable with advancements in technology. The underlying question is, where are the MTA/LIRRs priorities? Shouldn't they be in adequately maintaining the efficiency and safety of their existing facilities before requesting billions of dollars to expand, based on vague projections that may never come to pass? If they continue on this course and keep misallocating the public's resources, one day there may well be a real catastrophe. And if many people are killed and seriously injured as a result, a third track is not going to make the slightest bit of difference for them and their families.</p>
Kathleen Gaida	<p>I'm a New Hyde Park homeowner, and I'm writing to express my deep concerns with both the proposed Third Track initiative and with the timing and design of the proposed at-grade crossing configurations. I emphatically do NOT believe that the installation of a Third Track will benefit me as a commuter, as a homeowner, or as a taxpaying citizen. I voiced my concerns orally and in writing last May and am doing so again during this current comment period. While I know that what I've said and written has been/will be received and duly recorded, I am not confident that it will be seriously considered because I am merely an impacted citizen, rather than a powerful entity with the political clout to ensure that my voice is heard. How unfortunate! Ramming a controversial, ill-advised, and extremely expensive project through while attempting to convince both me and the larger community that it's what we've asked for, and that it's what we need, is nothing short of shameful. The expression throwing good money after bad comes easily to mind. Adding complexity to a system that's already proven itself unable to cope with current demand levels simply makes no sense. The underlying infrastructure of the LIRR system is broken, and increasing train volume by adding a third track will only exacerbate the problem. I can't tell you how many times I've waited with varying degrees of patience as trains attempt to make it to my destination. We've been stuck at stations and in-between stations. We've been subjected to train delays and cancellations and re-routing as LIRR personnel mumble through a frequently-broken public address system and thank us for our [sometimes limited] patience. Adding volume to this system can't realistically be considered an acceptable solution. What would be an acceptable solution is a commitment to repairing and properly maintaining the foundation. Fix what's broken before doing anything else. We hear about problems with the equipment and the switches and the tracks, and about unsafe and non-accommodating conditions at various stations. Make that better before you throw more miles of track and more switches and more heavy trains and more volume on top of it. Improve safety and soundness to improve the commute for your riders for whom you are ostensibly running the railroad. That's how the money should best be spent. Don't waste my tax dollars on an expensive third-track project that's not necessary. I'm not convinced that a reasonable case for the underlying need for an additional track has been made: Peak traffic. Of course there is additional volume at peak times which is why they are so named. Try making</p>

the trains you have work more efficiently and effectively. Ensure proper maintenance of existing tracks and equipment. Arrive and depart on time. Don't make traveling through Jamaica a torturous experience. These are the steps that will ease the congestion that characterizes many of our rides and make traveling more palatable. Reverse commute. The author of this argument obviously doesn't travel via railroad. I've been on eastbound trains during the peak morning period that are virtually empty. In fact, on one occasion I actually walked through two cars in an attempt to find another passenger, since I was afraid that I had somehow entered an empty car that wouldn't platform at one or more stations. And what will these reverse commuters do when they arrive at their train station? What transportation alternatives will take them from the railroad to their final destination? In the absence of connecting infrastructure throughout the system which simply doesn't exist this argument falls apart. Commuter-only transportation. If you've ever been awakened in the middle of the night by a freight train thundering over the tracks and through your neighborhood, you'd agree that any assertion that the rails will only be used for commuter traffic is inconsistent with reality. It wouldn't take long for politicians or unscrupulous businesspersons to figure out how to monetize the availability of increased rail capacity by stepping up freight shipments. And what types of materials would these trains carry? Who would ensure that the cargo is non-toxic and non-flammable? What of the health and safety of those who live in impacted neighborhoods? Unfortunately for us, the designers are not our neighbors. If they were, I'm sure that they'd find themselves squarely in our court in objecting to the creation of a third track that can ferry dangerous and potentially poisonous materials through residential neighborhoods. Structural integrity. A subset of my serious objection to the third track as a commuter-only line is a result of personal losses that I have sustained. As reported last May, the curio cabinet in my dining room literally fell to pieces as a freight train sped across the tracks in the middle of the night. I lost a significant collection of Swarovski, Lenox, and other collectible items. I did not receive financial compensation for my losses, which were significant. More importantly, I can't regain the precious memories that were lost. Who cares about that? To whom can I turn to ask for compensation? In my opinion, installing a third track will only increase the frequency with which such behemoths pass through my neighborhood unchecked and unaccountable leaving nothing good in their wake. Health concerns. It has come to my attention that hazardous chemicals have been used for years to defoliate on and around the tracks. All of that material has sunk into the soil, with potentially dangerous and life-impairing results. Stirring up all of that contamination to install a third track seems a high price to pay for something that we don't need. Will additional health care be available to those who will be exposed to the hazardous chemicals? Somehow, I don't believe that this is contemplated in the plan. We who live in the impacted area are citizens, and we matter. Our lives and our health and our possessions and our safety and our security matter, and should be an integral part of any development plan. We are significant. We deserve to have a voice. With regard to the elimination of at-grade crossings, I am in support as long as the designs make sense and the work is done sequentially, rather than concurrently. I live one block west of Covert Avenue, and have concerns with the proposed design for that intersection both as a pedestrian and as a driver. The journey from my house to Jericho Turnpike or anywhere north of the main line tracks would become perilous. I would have to risk life and limb simply to get to the proposed walkway on the east side of the street, since I live on the west side. I'd then be forced to travel down under the

	<p>tracks and back up with cars and trucks whizzing past. After enduring that, I'd be forced to make my way back to the west side of the street so that I could reach my home again with cars and trucks traveling at increased rates of speed as they head through or emerge from the underpass with limited line of sight. At the very least, we need walkways on both sides of the proposed underpass at Covert Avenue. Has anyone considered the impact of the proposed design to clearing the snow or maintaining the roadway or responding to accidents? It's frightening just to think about it. I can't believe that this design is the best option for pedestrians or for drivers. Please, please don't complete all phases of the at-grade crossing elimination project simultaneously. That is certainly a recipe for disaster, and will impose serious safety and security threats during the construction period. Since New Hyde Park Road is considered unsafe with good reason, given the convergence of streets just south of the railroad crossing perhaps it would make more sense to complete that project first. Again, I question the advisability of spending so much money for an outcome that seems destined to make a residential street look like a section of the congested and confusing highways in the Bronx with crisscrossing routes that invite disaster without even the visibility that the Bronx highway system offers. I believe this design should only be completed if the designers are forced to navigate through the resulting configuration each day as those of us who live here will be required to do. I'm sure that these expert planners could come up with something safer and more palatable to the people whose lives will be disrupted. What about potential disruptions in the event of an emergency? Will it take ambulance, police, and/or fire vehicles longer to reach my home, if required? Years of construction and disturbance and disruption would accompany the implementation of this project, despite rosy estimates concerning short timelines for completion of all phases of this project. That puts me and my neighbors in jeopardy, and that is not an acceptable outcome. I would like to believe that we who reside within the impacted community are more than collateral damage for a grandiose expansion plan. We have invested our lives and our futures and our finances in this community, and we want to be proud to call it our home. If we wanted to live in a place with multi-lane roads, parking garages, and a railroad station that looks like it belongs in the heart of a commercial rather than residential neighborhood, we could easily have settled elsewhere. Instead, we want to be part of a vital community that supports its residents and looks out for our best interests. Like those of you who are in power, we deserve to be treated with respect, and to have our voices heard. For me, that means that you will consider logical and more economical alternatives to a third track that I do NOT believe will best serve the interests of me or my community. Thank you for allowing me to provide my comments. I sincerely hope that they will be read, carefully considered, and acted upon before one more penny of my tax dollars is allocated to this project.</p>
Peter Gaffney	<p>I want to thank Governor Cuomo and the MTA Long Island Railroad for fostering transparency with the affected communities. It seems that the Carle Place train station and hamlet was an afterthought in the scoping documents and Draft Environmental Impact Statements (DEIS). These documents have raised serious concerns and issues and should be answered. How will emergency service response routes during construction, be conveyed to the first responders and the general public? What is the impact on property adjacent to the LIRR right of way? Will LIRR assess these properties and provide the homeowners with difference if their assessment is lowered? Closure of the Carle Place train station for up to one year is unacceptable. It needs to complete</p>

	<p>within 6 months. It would cause financial hardships to local merchants. Many riders buy their breakfast, lunch, and dinner near the train station. Small business along the train station would lose their employees. How many valued employees would continue to work at "Nassau hub" due to their extended travel time during construction? While the CP train station is closed, LIRR proposes providing shuttle bus service to the Westbury train station. There is no mention of a return ride back to the Carle Place station.</p> <p>Although, I was told verbally at one of the DEIS meetings, that the LIRR would provide this return service. Is this correct? Also, for the employees along the "Nassau hub" LIRR should provide shuttle service to the hub for them. Another issue that is not addressed is the traffic and parking in/around the Carle Place train station. As it stands now on any given day, about 75 cars park on the local streets. The majority of the cars are not local. They park for 10 to 12 hours per day creating problems for residents and some merchants around the train station. Perhaps the town can change parking regulations to a 2 hour parking limit and provide exempt status to residents that live on all blocks affected. Out of town residents in Westbury pay \$600.00 annually to park. Recommend that LIRR provide Carle Place residents, with a no charge pass to park at the Westbury train station parking lot during construction. Once the 3rd rail project is completed, Carle Place station will lose all of the 14 LIRR head on parking spaces. They will be reduced to 5 parallel spaces next to the station. This creates another issue. The parking lot on Mineola Avenue -Dr. Apuzzos office and other businesses have one driveway. In an emergency situation. If that driveway is blocked will the back driveway near the station be wide enough for a fire truck? Utilities EIS document states that utilities will to be relocated. Includes power, signal and communications, as well as (LIPA)/PSEG transmission lines, distribution units and water/sewer lines. Who will pay for all the utilities that are moved? Will there be an increase to consumers? If Utilities are asking for a rate increase due to the 3rd rail main line project will the Governor and Legislature deny this increase to consumers and protect us? BTW- There is no mention of the Carle Place water district. DEIS indicates they are part of the village of Mineola. See DEIS Appendix 1-A Please See Utilities-Water & Sewer (Section 3 pg 3-34). There are water/sewer lines on Carle Road, Cherry Lane, Glen Cove Road that cross north and south of the railroad. There is also a culvert between Cherry Lane & Meadowbrook Parkway- near Atlantic Avenue. A few water/sewer lines that LIRR only proposes to protect and maintain. Only Glen Cove Road-water/sewer lines will be relocated. What is the age of all water/sewer lines and culvert? If they are near end of life expectancy, they should be replaced with new. Carle Place Construction When LIRR starts construction it is anticipated that there will be 10 to 15 trucks per day. The truck route is anticipated to be from Jericho Turnpike to Carle Road. Due to the fact that Carle Place schools are located on Cherry Lane, construction vehicles need to be kept off Cherry Lane. The construction site must be clearly pointed to Carle Road. A better truck route would be to stage construction materials south, and have the construction vehicles travel Old Country Road and turn onto Cherry Lane to the site. It is a much shorter and less obtrusive route. I'm also concerned about the school buses, many of them pick up and drop off children using Carle Road. LIRR states that they will notify the schools, neighbors and first responders. Since the railroad runs through the middle of our town, LIRR should give at least 15 days' notice of construction to the above mention and the entire community and Carle Place Civic Association. The notice of construction should be communicated in writing, visual signage throughout the community, and have residents sign up for notifications via email. As well as a hot line</p>
--	---

	<p>which is noted in DEIS. Also, there is a church nearby on Mineola Blvd. All construction work and workers need to be aware that church services are on Sundays thru 1PM and on religious holidays. Cars do exit on Mineola Ave. During construction the number of workers will be anywhere from 15 to 75 workers. All construction workers, including utility workers and daily supervisors will need to be provided satellite parking, since there is virtually no parking in/around the station. Drive-by supervisors who park need to be cognizant of resident's property. Whenever possible, construction refuse should be removed via rail. The area roads are designed as residential. They are not designed to take heavy truck abuse. The majority of the construction work will be done at night. DEIS states LIRR plans to do the majority of construction at night and will use baffles to lower the noise level (dB) at night. Why not use these baffles during the day? During construction when using loud noise generating equipment such as a jackhammer, chain saw, etc., a noise attenuation wall to reduce dB levels for residents. What is the LIRR remediation, if noise levels exceed 80 dB? Sound attenuation walls and retaining walls in Carle Place The sound attenuation and retaining walls in Carle Place needs to be explained in detail further to the community. Information provided in the DEIS is limited and confusing. LIRR proposed sound attenuation walls indicated in the DEIS page 12-14 has sound walls on the north-side from Meadowbrook Parkway to Cherry Lane and on the south-side from Rushmore Avenue to Burt Avenue. The north-side from Rushmore Avenue to Burt Avenue should have a sound attenuation wall as well. The north-side from Rushmore Avenue to Burt Avenue may need to have a retaining wall. Sound attenuation wall needs to be widened. Keep in mind for 1 inch increase will create a +3 db reduction. Reflective sound must be considered, not just direct sound. Increasing the wall will substantially reduce the direct sound and minimize the reflective. Along Atlantic Avenue will trees be cut down? If so, suitable replacement trees and shrubbery will aid in sound reduction and provide scenic views. Examples of suitable plants are: Norway spruce, giant arborvitae, upright juniper, Canadian cherry, leyland cypress, western cypress, douglas fir, white pine, red cedar and American holly. Forsythia, juniper, privet, sumac, dogwood, weigelia, lilac, spirea, holly and abelia. These types of plants should be considered along the south as well. Once the retaining wall is built, the concern is will emergency vehicles such as a firetruck be able to get down the narrow two-way street? When Cherry Lane bridge is replaced and the road is closed on the weekend, there needs to be remote fire, ambulance and police responders on the south side of Carle Place. Otherwise, in the event of an emergency lives could be lost. With regards to Glen Cove bridge replacement work, any partial closure of Glen Cove Road will create a traffic nightmare. Please give serious thought on bridge support structure work. Bridge replacement weekend closure of Glen Cove Road is unacceptable. Glen Cove Road is one of the busiest roads, especially on weekends, due to over 3.5 million square ft. of retailers in the area. It should be done on multiple Sunday nights after 9 PM. Carle Place station completion and additional enhancements Once CP station is complete, will the platform eliminate the gap? What is the train speed through the north/south new switches? Covered and heated platform shelters should have seats available especially for senior citizens and ADA patrons. Will CCTV be monitored in real-time for safety? Emergency call boxes should be added to platforms and enclosed walkways. Example is southeast walkway. Commuters are fenced in by the railroad and the park. This a serious safety concern. Having the CP train station ADA compliant is good, but not having seats on the eastern platform makes no sense. LIRR needs to change their policy. Freight Operations DEIS states that</p>
--	--

	<p>in future it does not anticipate an increase in freight trains. With all of the construction planned in Suffolk county, how can this be true? Will the freight train speed through the new north/south switches in Carle Place be reduced below the 45 mph? Winthrop Hospital LIRR plans to eliminate the Willis Avenue crossing (9 to 12 months?). Willis Avenue needs to be a two-way underpass, not a one-way underpass. LIRR is not planning to eliminate the Second Street crossing. This makes no sense because it is less than 50 yards away from Willis Avenue. Additionally, Winthrop Hospital is expanding and increasing the number of employees. Second Street is a direct road to Winthrop Hospital. When railroad gates are down Second Street gate crossing, traffic will back up onto Willis Avenue, creating a traffic nightmare, especially during rush hour. How will it affect the emergency responders when the gates are down? Construction noise, vibration and EM How will it affect the daily operation of Winthrop? Surgeries? Will construction affect the electromagnetic field (EMF) of medical equipment during lifesaving surgeries? Is there a structure concern, regarding the Winthrop tiered parking lot during construction? The Future Nassau County continues do nothing about getting cars off the road via the "Nassau hub". This may not be LIRR's problem, but needs to be factored into future success of the railroad and the county. Not only apartments should be built along the railroad, but need to attract new vibrant businesses. Industries such as financial services, health, information technology and energy. Many of these industries are on Long Island, but not near the railroad. Commuters want to be able to take public transportation and reach their destination nearby. They will not change to a different type of transportation or walk a mile or so for work. As a resident of Westbury in the Carle Place school district, I am neither for nor against the 3rd rail project. I am concerned for the future of my community.</p>
Anne Fabiano	<p>My concern is the effects of this project on the health and wellbeing of the people in our communities. The environmental dust and hazardous waste products with all of this construction is a major concern. All health hazards should be seriously addressed prior to any initiation of this project.</p>
Magdalena Archibold	<p>I live in the Village of New Hyde Park; two blocks from the railroad station. I commute to NYC daily for work. Please tell me how this renovation will benefit me. I can only imagine the disruption this project will create during its construction. There are many businesses alongside the railroad, some have recently built warehouses within 5yrs. These businesses keep our property taxes down. I expect noise, traffic, parking complications, railroad disruptions, road closures, and too many non-residents in our community. So please explain how this track expansion will benefit me. Pondering on two years of construction makes me feel like moving. This construction is a major interference to the quality of my home life. The village has a tranquil suburban setting that residents enjoy. This will be no longer exist when the construction is underway. This will be a nightmare, similar to what residents in NYC had to endure for the construction of the 2nd avenue subway.</p>
Michael Englezos	<p>I am concerned about the construction that will be going on as I reside at 50 New Hyde Park Road, all the vibration, dust and noise will be a detriment effect on my property as well as my family which includes two young children and a few pets. I'm worried about the ongoing construction vibration as the vibration from the LIRR trains now currently have caused damage to some of my property. I notice in the projected plan that a traffic light will be placed at the corner of Plaza Avenue and New Hype Park Road, I believe this will cause added traffic causing the blockage of my driveway and</p>

	the added chemical fumes of stationary automobiles. I also notice that a retaining wall is to be built, my property already has a retaining wall. I would like to know the dimensions of this new retaining wall. Will my existing sidewalk be jeopardized? How will I be able to access the road from my existing driveway if the street level is to go down about 1.5'?
Bernadette Verdu	Please stop the funding of Gov. Cuomo's proposal of the Third Track. Floral Park, a long established community, has no room for expansion of the railroad. The expansion will cause a disastrous situation in this community and all Long Islanders who pass through our community. The effect will be deleterious during construction and after.
Lorraine Munder	I have been a resident in the Incorporated Village of New Hyde Park for the past 55 years. I was educated in the NHP school system and my son has been educated here as well. Over the years there has been many improvements to this village for everyone. The parks have many recreational activities for our children, as well as many programs in the local library. Our seniors have many activities through the library and the FISH program that helps them get around. Our "Beautification Committee" has created a beautiful downtown. Our shopkeepers are our neighbors and friends. We now face MASS DESTRUCTION in the name of the "almighty dollar". I have read in the last newsletter that construction will only be at night-(to be of less inconvenience); so what.....that we will be deprived of sleep as we need to go to work the next day, or that during the day there will be no interruptions for service-(or for the railroad to keep making more money). So we just reroute traffic-(which is already too much). The NOISE and DUST Pollution will be incredible.....and NO environmental impact study will be sufficient or reassuring, due to the FACT that 911 will always be in everyone's mind - (especially to those family members whose loved ones died of respiratory illness years after being involved in 911). Then when all is said and done, and THE STATE has their beautiful 3rd track, New Hyde Park has become filled with MORE NOISE and traffic, a constant HUB with FREIGHT TRAINS, (yes I know, only a few, as we need this mostly for commuters but usually we know how this goes. MORE & MORE FREIGHT TRAINS!! Who loses their homes and businesses? Oh yes, the people that worked hard to make this town a nice place to live and work, and NO they will probably not be compensated full value for any of what they had to give up. Worse yet, there is no compensation for what many of these people have done for this village.NO, I DO NOT SUPPORT THE DESTRUCTION OF MY COMMUNITY WITH A THIRD RAIL! Note: Some of us who live in the Incorporated Village also pay a "Village Tax". We DO NOT NEED ANY MORE TAXES BECAUSE OF THIS DESTRUCTIVE PROJECT!
Paula Juliano	This project will negatively impact our community: road closures traffic patterns noise air pollution property acquisition loss of resident business and commuter parking decrease to property tax roll from loss of business increase for freight and cargo transport including hazardous material this will change the quality of life and health and community forever don't do it - please - listen to Mayor Lofaro
Lawrence Montreuil	Would improve service reliability and make transit more attractive, with the further goal of getting travelers out of cars, reducing traffic congestion, and reducing adverse environmental impacts. Although the project would create severe local traffic congestion in and around the village of New Hyde Park, during and long after the project is built out as planned. Improves service and reduces delays for more than half a million passengers per week " given 40 percent of LIRRs daily passengers pass through the Main Line corridor; The addition of a third track will do little to relieve congestion when there are signal problems or rail work that needs to be done;

	<p>seemingly the predominant causes for delays. All train traffic will be delayed, even traffic on a 3rd track. Reduces road congestion and pollution from cars idling at crossing gates; eliminates noise from train horns, crossing bells and honking cars at grade crossings; and greatly improves safety by removing areas where vehicles and pedestrians can collide with trains by eliminating all seven grade crossings; The elimination of cars stopped at the NHP Road crossing will be stopped instead at the new traffic light that will be added at Plaza on NHP Road. Provides an additional 2,490 net new parking spaces at the New Hyde Park, Mineola, Westbury, and Hicksville stations to help address future ridership growth; NHP will lose over 30 parking spaces. Provides major station upgrades like new, longer platforms to accommodate full-length trains, removing delays and safety issues associated with passengers needing to move among cars on shorter platforms, as well as making stations fully ADA-compliant; and The plans will add an obnoxious pedestrian over pass with elevators on both sides that is incongruous with the suburban setting of the village. Upgrades and modernizes track infrastructure such as switches, signals, and power equipment. The LIRR is laying the same technology track that it laid when the track was first installed in the 1800s. The needed improvements to switches and signals would greatly improve reliability and are sorely needed. What is not needed is to wait for a mega-project such as this that is so intrusive and disruptive to the communities that it passes through to accomplish. The LIRR could have accomplished these improvements at any time if they were truly interested in reliability or service improvements. The truth is that the project is driven by political imperative (to get votes) and not a transportation imperative. These and other proposed components of the Proposed Project are the result of months of direct consultation with local elected officials and community members, as well as analysis by experienced transit engineers. The LIRR and the Governor Office met with the LIRR Task Force throughout the process. The nature of these meetings was for NYS to provide their concepts and ideas and get initial feedback form the Task Force on how such plans might be received. The representatives from NYS did not solicit ideas or concepts from the Village. When such ideas were offered that differed from the States plan, they were largely dismissed. The State essentially wanted to find the path of least resistance that are most likely to be built out. Because of the current two-track configuration, LIRR has very few options to route service around a disabled train or track outage. The LIRR has not produced statistical information as to the degree the service reliability will be improved by the addition of a third track. The taxpayers have a right to know what the return on their investment is. How much will service reliability improve for the \$2 B investment? From 2020 to 2023, LIRR has estimated an increase of 22.2 percent, primarily as a result from the opening of the new East Side Access terminal. Ridership is projected to increase by 65.4 percent westbound and 76.2 percent eastbound by 2040.¹ Without the third track, the existing bottleneck, coupled with the additional ridership and additional train service to Manhattan terminals, will result in increased congestion, delays, and passenger crowding, as well as additional gate-down time at Main Line grade crossings in the future. It is incredulous to expect the increases to westbound LIRR traffic projected by the LIRR due to the opening of East Side Access. This portends that there will be a similar increase in the number of jobs offered on the east side of Manhattan coupled with a similar increase in the number of people who live on Long Island employed in those new jobs. LIRR anticipates increasing demand for intra-island travel and reverse peak travel "consistent with New York Metropolitan Transportation Council (NYMTC) projections for</p>
--	--

	<p>employment in Nassau and Suffolk counties. The Governor and the President of the LIRR have looked us in the eye and told us there is no demand for reverse commute and this project is not intended to address that issue. At Covert Avenue, a two-way underpass with sidewalk would be constructed. To avoid taking residential properties, the LIRR tracks would be raised several feet to reduce the depth of Covert Avenue and to accommodate the vehicular clearance under the tracks. The Village of New Hyde Park has long supported grade crossing eliminations but we have consistently emphasized that it should be done in such a way that did the least harm to the character of the village. The overarching desire to accomplish this project without the acquisition of property may in the end, result in a more devastating impact to the village. For example, the Covert Avenue underpass could be accomplished with a more gradual grade, improving the line of sight. Or, the tracks could be raised and the road lowered less than proposed such as was done at the Herricks Road crossing. At South 12th Street, two options are being considered: permanent closure of the grade crossing with construction of a new pedestrian overpass; or construction of a one-way underpass with sidewalk and pedestrian overpass. The elimination of the South 12th Street crossing is only impactful the residents of the Village of New Hyde Park. This is used primarily for access to the S12th Street resident commuter parking lot. Closing South 12th Street will divert traffic through the residential streets from Covert Avenue and New Hyde Park Road. The LIRR Task Force has urged the LIRR to find a parking solution north of the tracks, preferably on Jericho Turnpike where such a structure would be more in context with the commercial zone At New Hyde Park Road, two options are being considered: a five-lane underpass with a kiss and-ride northwest of the railroad tracks with a new 95-space surface parking lot; or a four-lane underpass with a kiss-and-ride located southwest of the railroad tracks. Once again, the Village is concerned with the limited sight distance in this underpass. We are also concerned with the confluence of Clinch Avenue in the depth of the pit. The total net new parking spaces resulting from the Proposed Project would be 2,257. The impact to New Hyde Park would be a net loss of over 30 parking spaces. We have been urging LIRR to find a site for a commuter parking facility north of the tracks to accommodate the loss of and the access to the South 12th Street resident commuter lot. I o Under the Proposed Project, community character would not change within the 2020 or 2040 analysis year timeframes. This is perhaps the most disturbing and false statement in the entire 800 pages of the DEIS and the accompanying charts and tables. The truth remains that the proposed change will have tremendous adverse impacts on the character of the New Hyde Park community. This includes the greatly increased vehicular traffic through residential streets. The increase in trains and the concomitant noise and vibrations. This includes the purposely understated potential for the increase in freight trains. We are also greatly concerned with the potential for a decrease in property values that the project is likely to cause. Future air quality conditions would be improved in the Study Area, as compared to existing conditions. Future air quality is likely to get worse with more traffic coming through the area with the perception that the elimination of grade crossings will increase traffic flow. However, the addition of new traffic signals on New Hyde Park Road will stop traffic and cars will continue to idle on New Hyde Park. Additionally, the countless number of diesel powered constructions vehicles including heavy dump trucks delivering gravel to lift the track by five feet will add to the air pollution in the neighborhood. Under the Proposed Project, noise and vibration conditions would be significantly improved over existing conditions and in the Future</p>
--	---

	<p>Without the Proposed Project due to the inclusion in the Proposed Project of the grade crossing eliminations and installation of sound attenuation walls. It is feared that noise and vibration will increase substantially for New Hyde Park residents living near the tracks. While the train horns would be eliminated at the crossings, they would still have to be sounded as they come through the station.</p> <p>Moreover, the noise from the trains themselves are extremely loud and disturbing. The plan calls for a great increase in the number of trains that will come through New Hyde Park. We remain skeptical that the low noise abatement walls will provide sufficient relief. It is also noted that these walls are only offered on the south side of the tracks and no relief is planned for the residents living directly north of the railroad tracks.</p> <p>Each train generates a substantial amount of vibration that can be felt by nearby homeowners. The freight trains generate a severe amount of vibrations and residents feel their homes shake with each tremor each freight car produces. The increase in freight traffic is purposely understated in this report. This remains one of the most egregious adverse and insidious threats to the village form this project. Construction of the Proposed Project would result in some temporary disruptions in the surrounding area. We consider this to be an artful understatement at best. The impacts during the construction period will be immense and long lasting. We have yet to see a construction plan that balances the length of the project with the number of days per week or the number of hours per day. We anticipate countless heavy construction vehicles traversing village roads and staging in areas close to private homes. We are greatly concerned with the market values of the homes in the impacted areas should anyone be wanting or needing to sell their homes during the construction period. We are concerned with the probable increase in pests that disturbed from the construction area and look to escape to and inhabit nearby homes. The additional parking provided by the Proposed Project would reduce a projected parking deficit within the Study Area associated with East Side Access. The LIRR describes a situation where they create a self-imposed hardship in that their projects will generate more demand for parking. The Village of New Hyde Park is not interested in becoming a feeder for more LIRR customers. It is not consistent with our character to become an intermodal facility for commuters to drive into our neighborhood, park their cars so they can generate more revenue for the railroad. In fact, under the proposed plan, New Hyde Park stands to lose parking for our residents. A number of other alternatives to the Proposed Project were considered in the Alternatives Chapter of the DEIS (Chapter 18) but eliminated from further analysis or consideration because they were found to require a greater number of property acquisitions, including the acquisition of residential property, or were otherwise determined to be unreasonable. The overarching principal of the project to avoid residential property acquisitions may impose restrictions on the project that results in a greater adverse impact to New Hyde Park than we might otherwise have to endure. There may be property owners who live so close to the project areas that will see their homes values and their quality of life diminish so much that selling their property to the State may be preferable. The State does not seem to be willing to explore this realty. Governor Andrew M. Cuomo has directed MTA, LIRR, and NYSDOT to engage in an unprecedented level of public outreach for the Proposed Project. The LIRR Task Force has met with the representatives of the Governor's Office and the LIRR to provide feedback on design elements they have offered. This input has been used to shape the plans presented in the DEIS. However, it does not reflect the endorsement of the LIRR Task Force or the Village of New Hyde Park. More</p>
--	---

	<p>importantly, the Village of New Hyde Park disputes the notion that there has been adequate level of public participation in this project. The Mayor has repeatedly asked for a longer comment period for both the Scoping Document and the DEIS. Both requests have been ignored. In fact, the Governor is racing this project through without the benefit of federal funds to achieve a political objective; to win votes from Suffolk County. To improve reliability and reduce delays, operational flexibility must be incorporated into the rail system The DEIS provides statistics on train delays and cancellations occurring on the main line over the last 2 years. The DEIS summaries that the addition of a third track would significantly increase on time reliability of the system. However, the term significant is not quantified. Exactly how much of a reliability improvement will be achieved for the cost and inconvenience that is proposed? Is the cost and inconvenience justified? An independent panel should be set up review the impact a third track will have and measure that against the investment. There is also robust growth projected for reverse commute travel from the outer boroughs of NYC to Long Island (+22%), with projected employment growth in Suffolk County generating the heaviest travel increase (+31%). Compare the forecasted population growth in Suffolk county with the forecasted job growth and the forecasted travel demand. How many of these new people will move to Suffolk County and not work in Suffolk? With these new people, Suffolk will still need to import workers from the boroughs? In areas where retaining walls are required and where noise impacts may occur, a sound wall would be provided on top of the retaining wall (see Figure 1-13). In segments of the ROW that do not require retaining walls, but where noise impacts may occur, sound attenuation walls would be installed. Sound walls in NHP are planned to be 2 feet high and only exist on the South side. Proposal: make sound walls high enough on both sides of the tracks to completely obscure the trains. Replacement of PSEG-LI poles with taller steel poles will provide additional resiliency during any future high wind events as the poles would be stronger and power lines hung above tree height. High utility poles further deteriorate the aesthetics of our skyline and erodes the character of our suburban neighborhood. 1-34 1401 Fourth Ave., New Hyde Park S/B/L: 33/556/14-15 Commercial property (no impact to building) Retaining wall for new third track / station platform This property, Deluxe Car Storage is identified for a possible taking. Does the LIRR plan to take the entire property? The construction cost estimate for the LIRR Expansion Project is approximately \$2 billion, with funding to come from the MTA and other State sources. The DEIS dedicates one sentence to the \$2B cost of the project and does not include funding in the list of required approvals. Land Use, Community Character and Public Policy Because the Proposed Project would occur mostly within LIRR right-of-way (ROW) or within the footprint of existing roadways, potential impacts primarily would be short-term and occur during the construction phase rather than the operational phase (see Chapter 13,Construction□). While there is a devastating impact on the community character during construction, there may well also be a lasting impact to the character of the community and specific neighborhoods within the immediate area. This is caused the change in traffic patterns and the volume of that traffic. Community is as much a feeling as it is a collection of structures and the people who live and work there. So true, and it can only be felt by those who have invested their lives in the area; and who raise their families, work, play and live in the collection of structures. Defining community character may require the expansion or contraction of this Study Area depending upon the nature of each community considered. The Smart Growth Public</p>
--	---

	<p>Infrastructure Criteria are: To advance projects for the use, maintenance or improvement of existing infrastructure; To advance projects located in municipal centers [defined as areas of concentrated and mixed land uses that serve as centers for various activities]; C. To advance projects in developed areas or areas designated for concentrated infill development in a municipally approved comprehensive land use plan, local waterfront revitalization plan and/or brownfield opportunity area plan; D. To protect, preserve and enhance the States resources, including agricultural land, forests, surface and groundwater, air quality, recreation and open space, scenic areas, and significant historic and archaeological resources; E. To foster mixed land uses and compact development, downtown revitalization, brownfield redevelopment, the enhancement of beauty in public spaces, the diversity and affordability of housing in proximity to places of employment, recreation and commercial development and the integration of all income and age groups; F. To provide mobility through transportation choices including improved public transportation and reduced automobile dependency; G. To coordinate between State and local government and internuncial and regional planning; H. To participate in community based planning and collaboration; I. To ensure predictability in building and land use codes; and J. To promote sustainability by strengthening existing and creating new communities which reduce greenhouse gas emissions and do not compromise the needs of future generations, by among other means encouraging broad based public involvement in developing and implementing a community plan and ensuring the governance structure is adequate to sustain its implementation. Regional Planners are big thinkers who consider large areas in a macro sense and lay out what they believe is best for the people who live in this region to satisfy the values they feel are important to a region. This is often at odds with the people who live in the area and are most affected. I contend that the residents are best suited to know for themselves, what is best for them. Regional Planners accuse people of NYMB-ism. It's become an effective strategy, to tag someone with an opposing point of view with an ugly label. It puts someone on the defensive and challenges their motives. But the people who live in a community live there because they sought out this area. They selected this area for the quality of life it offers; the homes, the schools, the life style, etc. In our community, they made their single largest investment and bought a home. These people "you and me in this case "have every right to raise concern over what may be a negative impact to our community, to the resale values of our homes, etc. That's why we have local governments. This is the concept of home rule and self- determination. It is why we have local school districts, so our kids are getting the kind of education that we the residents want them to get. So, if we don't like the quality of education or the content of the text books that our children are being taught from, we have direct recourse to our locally elected school board members, and those trustees are accountable to us, not people in Buffalo, Rochester or Albany. The same holds true for local fire districts and municipalities. It is the concept of subsidiarity - the principle of devolving decisions to the lowest practical level that our country was built on. Government closest to the people is most responsive and effective. Municipalities; counties, cities, towns and villages are set up to control the use of land in their boundaries in a way that is acceptable to the residents of those municipalities. Regulation of the use of the land determines the character of our community. This portends that the locally elected officials, closest to the voters in each community know best the minds of those people; they share their values and act accordingly. When we cede the control of our land use</p>
--	---

to a higher level of government, with macro views, the character of our community is left to the control of people without a vested interest in our community. But we've heard our Governor talk of consolidating local school districts, municipalities, fire districts, etc. We've been put under tax increases for needed services under 2%. This is designed to put these small municipalities out of business and rely on the higher level of government, diluting the voice of the people. But this is precisely why eliminating these troublesome little municipalities that are looking out for their respective communities. It is much easier to rail road regional mega-projects, like this one. Without these troublesome local governments, who would speak for the people who are most impacted? In the Future without the Proposed Project, land use and community character in the Study Area are not expected to change substantially. This conclusion is supported by existing public policy as set forth in the planning documents listed above. These documents call for maintaining community character, invigorating the Long Island economy by attracting businesses and workers, and improving the transportation network in general and transit in particular We don't want the community character to change. In the operational phase, the installation of the third track and related railroad infrastructure improvements within the existing LIRR ROW would have no impact, adverse or beneficial, on community character within the Study Area. The operation of trains on a third track would be entirely consistent with the railroad use that currently characterizes the LIRR ROW. There will be increases in traffic through the area, not only on NHP Road and Covert Avenue, but in the surrounding residential streets as established traffic patterns are disrupted, and more vehicles use the area sensing higher capacity roads without gates. 2-17 The construction of pedestrian walkways over the existing and proposed tracks at South 12th Street in New Hyde Park, Main Street in Mineola, and Willis Avenue in Mineola, and at the LIRR Merillon Avenue and Carle Place stations potentially would constitute a change in visual character in the immediate proximity of those walkways. These new features would present visual changes but would not be considered significant adverse impacts to land use and community character, particularly because they involve transportation features appurtenant to transportation facilities (e.g., roads, railroad ROW) in a transportation corridor. The network of neighborhoods and the general landscape upon which community character is based would not incur significant adverse impacts from the addition of a pedestrian crossing. The proposed pedestrian bridge is completely out of character with the neighborhoods suburban setting. Accordingly, closure of these two streets at the rail crossing would not bisect any existing neighborhood, and therefore community character would not bear any adverse impacts as a result of these possible closures Closing S 12th Street would absolutely bisect the neighborhood. Because the Proposed Project would not result in any significant long-term adverse impacts in terms of land use, no mitigation is necessary Nonsense. There would be an adverse impact to the use of land in the residential districts near the tracks. Likewise, the Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse impacts to community character, or run counter to public policy. The community character would suffer an extreme negative impact due to increased traffic flow, depressed home values, and a greater urban feel than we enjoy today or would enjoy without the project. Noise This is taken into account in the FTA criteria by distinguishing between projects with frequent, occasional, and infrequent events, where the frequent events category is defined as more than 70 events per day. Similarly, the occasional events category is defined as between 30 and 70 events per

	<p>day, while the infrequent events category is defined as less than 30 events per day. To be conservative, the FTA occasional criteria were used to assess ground-borne vibration impacts along the Project Study Area. Projected vibration levels under the Future Without the Proposed Project Alternative are expected to be similar to those currently experienced under existing conditions. How can this be true when there will be a marked increase in the number and speed of trains through NHP? Since several design features are proposed as part of the Proposed Project to eliminate noise and vibration impacts at residential communities, no impacts are predicted. As a result of the following noise and vibration-reducing design features, no mitigation is required. An aesthetically pleasing sound wall tall enough to totally obscure the trains should be built on both sides of the ROW. 14-1 The proposed Cross Harbor Freight Movement Project (CHFP) also was assessed under a Tier 1 EIS that included an alternative that would increase freight traffic throughout the LIRR system. However, there currently is no Tier 2 EIS funding for either the NEC FUTURE project or the Cross Harbor project. Because of the lack of funding, neither project may be considered reasonably foreseeable for the purpose of cumulative impacts analysis. Following the logic that the CHFP should not be considered for a lack funding, the LIRR Expansion Project should be similarly dismissed until funding is allocated. Presently, there are no funds set aside for this mega-project. Construction The Proposed Project is expected to cost approximately \$2 billion in 2019 dollars, which includes construction, design, contingency, force account, and agency cost. The total effect on the local economy, expressed as economic output or demand for local industries, is estimated at approximately \$3.18 billion for Nassau County, \$47.14 million for Suffolk County, and approximately \$3.33 billion for the New York State economy overall. Does the \$2 B include all interest payments made on bonds to finance the project? If this calculation is accurate, why not rebuild the entire state? We would all be rich. Or at least a select few who benefit from the work will be rich. Table 13-1 Covert Avenue and Sixth Avenue There is no mention of the impact or a remedy to this problematic intersection which will be impossible to traverse from Sixth Avenue. NYDDOT should consider a traffic circle to move traffic through this intersection. 13-8 In consultation with the community, employ rodent control measures What is the level of infestation that is forecasted? How will homeowners be able to make a claim if they incur costs to eradicate pests dislodged due to construction? The primary truck access route to construction areas in this subsection is anticipated to be from Jericho Turnpike to New Hyde Park Road. Many of those trucks will be forced through residential streets contrary to village code. Although not applicable to New York State projects, construction of the track component of the Proposed Project would generally be carried out within the work hours specified in local noise ordinances except where not feasible. This is consistent with existing LIRR maintenance practices which include overnight work in the LIRR ROW to minimize disruption to LIRR customers, Accordingly, activities affecting rail operations, such as work relating to bridge replacement, construction of retaining and noise attenuation walls , and grade alteration of track, may be carried out on nights and weekends or other LIRR off-peak hours. Noisy activities adjacent to residential properties would be avoided in overnight hours to the maximum extent Long Island Rail Road Expansion Project November 2016 13-24 practicable We need to work closely with the MTA LIRR in the RFP process and with the Design Build firm to ensure that residents are not besieged with construction noise around the clock. it is anticipated that work at the grade crossings would take</p>
--	--

	<p>place outside specified local noise ordinance work hours The MTA LIRR seems ambivalent to village code and seems to have a complete lack of consideration for residents in the affected area. Construction of the project is estimated to create 1,297 FTE direct construction employment opportunities in Nassau County Where would these 1,297 people work if not on this job, than other jobs? There is also the opportunity cost to consider of the projects that these people will not work on because they are tied up on the LIRR Expansion Project. The total effect on the local economy, expressed as economic output or demand for local industries, is estimated at approximately \$3.18 billion for Nassau County, \$47.14 million for Suffolk County, and approximately \$3.33 billion for the New York State economy overall. How much for the homeowners of NHP and other main line communities that will see their property values erode along with the character of their suburban communities. The Project has a negative impact on New Hyde Park that is disproportionate to the rest of the region and the State. Homeowners and business owners should be directly compensated with the bulk of the \$3.33 B for the loss in home value. For example, a compensatory payment of \$100,000 can be made to 33,000 homes in the impacted areas. The Proposed Project would not result in disproportionate construction impacts to environmental justice communities Would it would be a problem if there we were an EJ community? Contaminated Materials "Soil disturbance LIRR ROW 100 to 200 feet either side causing exposure to contaminated materials. When will we see comments and findings from contaminated materials regulating agencies "NYS DOH, NYS DEC, US DOT, NYS DOT, US EPA. 8b Principal conclusions and impacts "creosote, petroleum products, solvents, volatile and semi-volatile organic compounds, heavy metals, PCBs, pesticides and herbicides, and fill materials. Category B sites "reasonable potential to have been impacted by the presence of contaminated materials and thus additional analysis is prudent "subsurface investigation. When will this take place? Methodology- Environmental history of the Study Area Provide details of what was found. Existing conditions "Substation remediation for mercury, PCBs, dielectric fluids, acids and asbestos. 3rd Avenue & South 9th Street substation. Provide entire list of potential contaminants. Pesticides, herbicides, and rodenticides sprayed in LIRR ROW once a year. Records only available from 2011 to 2015. Provide timing and notifications made for spraying. Specific Category B sites mentioned: 115 NHP Road "metal works, 1403 4th Avenue "closed spills, 124 Covert Avenue "leaking underground storage tanks. Provide specifics of remediation for each site. Transport of hazardous materials by identified by compliance requirements. What materials are moving through the corridor by freight train? Future without the proposed project without this project there would still be soil disturbance with less oversight and less proper environmental health and safety protocols. Provide specifics of this planned soil disturbance independent of the project</p>
George Littman	<p>Mrs. Littman and I have attended the various meetings held in the New Hyde Park area. We have been residents since 1969. We endorse the concerns expressed by many of our neighbors regarding noise and vibrations of 80 mph trains traveling close to private property, increased transport of hazardous materials, creation of narrow service roads and the decrease of north/south access in our village, construction noise and air pollution, and decreased property values among other concerns. While we agree that elimination of grade crossings is desirable, there is no doubt that there will be lasting damage to the quality of life in New Hyde Park with commencement of the Third Track Project. The project is poorly planned and does not address station access for local</p>

	<p>commuter pedestrians from either south or north of the New Hyde Park station who want to board a train on the opposite side of the tracks. We understand that an overpass available by elevator will be built near South 12th Street, but this will add additional commutation time. Waiting in line can be anticipated and there will be times when the elevator is out of order. A pedestrian underpass similar to the one at the Stewart Manor station should be added even if the 12th Street grade crossing is eliminated. I also recall using a pedestrian underpass at the Hollis station way back in the 1950's. New Hyde Park residents have expressed concerns regarding the high speed trains which pass through our community at a top speed of 80mph. A change in the speed limit is not anticipated by the Third Track project. We have all seen photos of train cars spread over wide areas after railroad accidents. The railroad speed limit ought to be reduced with or without the Third Track project.</p>
Stephen Quigley	<p>On Friday, 2/10/2017, a train broke down in New Hyde Park heading west at approximately 4:30 PM. Since there are only 2 tracks in this area, trains headed west were stopped at several locations including a crowded train in Mineola. There was one westbound train that I saw that waited 30 minutes in Mineola. The train that I take headed east was delayed due to the breakdown. When the 3rd track is built, the delays should not occur as trains should be able to be rerouted around the stuck train! The time is now to build the 3rd track especially since most commuters are in favor of it. When completed, people from Floral Park to Hicksville will not hear train horns nor will they be stuck at rail road crossings. There will be less delays for drivers in this area, no more accidents at the train crossings between Floral Park and Hicksville as well as less train delays due to breakdowns. Apparently, some people do not realize the benefits of the 3rd track! Build the 3rd track and build it now; it will be a benefit to all!</p>
Anonymous	<p>The Long Island Rail Road has been running on two tracks for many years, with spare tracks running alongside them. This has been working well and efficiently. Having been doing work on Long Island for many years I have never heard complaints that would require a new track. Rather than benefit LIRR passengers, I believe the creation of a third track would only cause complications. The road crossings that will be effected are fine and I have never heard any complaints. I understand the importance of tax dollars going towards infrastructure, however only if it will greatly benefit the whole. I am sure in the state of New York tax money would be better placed in other infrastructure projects. This is an unneeded expense that is wasting money rather than helping the community. My iron works shop is bordering the Long Island Rail Road. The proposed construction of a third track will affect my business operation. Due to construction dust and vibrations my daily work environment will be greatly affected. Also, the road work performed at the crossing of New Hyde Park Road and Covert Avenue will disrupt my delivery routes.</p>
Franco Arnoldo	<p>I am writing regarding the LIRR third track project. It will turn the quiet railway through closed residential neighborhoods into a soaring, commercial looking railway with huge overpasses. The quiet residential neighborhood that we all love will disappear. This project should be scraped, and leave everything as is. The taxpayer money should be used to fix existing bridges and roads throughout the state.</p>
Martin Hartmann	<p>The Willis Avenue proposed underpass appears to be very long, approximately 300 feet. I am concerned that this may not be classified as an underpass but as a tunnel. Tunnels will require much more consideration for life safety, proper ventilation, and supplemental emergency egress. Also given the added 9/11 safety risks, will you need to band trucks from using this long (tunnel) underpass? A Willis Overpass structure was</p>

	<p>considered but dropped from further consideration due to aesthetics and increased property impacts. This segment of Willis Avenue is totally within a commercial zone. Mineola has also changed their zoning to allow 6 to 7 story buildings to be constructed. This section of Mineola has a very URBAN feel. I do not see how an elevated structure would be an aesthetic issue. Regarding property impacts, maybe allow the design build contractors /designers the option to design an overpass structure that does not increase property impacts. Please also consider the cost benefits of an overpass. In addition please have LIRR comment in particular on maintaining railroad operations to maintain service during construction on not only one but two branch lines for an underpass vs. Overpass structures.</p>
Dennis McEnery	<p>As an initial matter, it was requested and consented to without objection at the evening session at the New Hyde Park Inn on May 24, 2016, that all the comments and submissions previously made in response to the May of 2005 Federal Register notification for the MTA LIRR Third Track Project submitted to the FTA are made part of the current record as if fully set forth herein, and are hereby incorporated by reference, with the MTA LIRR to fully respond as is needed. The actual DEIS and its attachments, however, did not include those documents which the MTA LIRR has in its own files. Please correct and update the public record to reflect the inclusion of those documents as part of the record for this DEIS. Top ten main line station mile markers for the MTA LIRR Third Track Megaproject, which were made part of the record on May 24, 2016, but apparently ignored in the DEIS: I. MTA LIRR must provide hosting communities mitigation first and foremost before any destruction and construction It is an obligation for the MTA LIRR to fulfill rather than just a luxury. The hosting communities' mitigation needs have to be fulfilled prospectively prior to any adverse impacts taking place rather than retrospectively when the damage is already done. The Floral Park and Bellerose LIRR train stations must be updated to become state of the art, including fully ADA compliant accessibility, with no elimination of any current platforms in either size or location being permitted. The DEIS, however, is fatally flawed by continuing to ignore and refusing to address the upgrading of the Floral Park and Bellerose LIRR train stations, owned and controlled by the MTA LIRR. Even more outrageous has been the alternative facts□ being presented by the MTA LIRR that the condition and ADA failures at the Floral Park and Bellerose stations were NOT raised during the Scoping process, which is a complete LIE, as has been clearly demonstrated by the rebuttal by Floral Park Board of trustee Lynn Pombomyo, among others. As for mitigation being done FIRST, it appears that the DEIS contemplates construction commencing on the FIRST day of the project in Floral Park BEFORE any mitigation takes place, which is completely contrary to the request by the Floral Park community. II. Grade crossing eliminations need to be done first, done right and done on time. The MTA LIRR must prove it can actually complete a grade crossing elimination as promised. The MTA LIRR and NY DOT are challenged to do just one at first by actually demonstrating it can do so from conception to birth in 9 months as they have promised. While the DEIS contemplates simultaneous portions of the megaproject commencing on the first day of construction, there is no guarantee that the grade crossing elimination at New Hyde Park Road will be completed within a year, as has been promised. Should any grade crossing elimination NOT be completed within its promised time, then the MTA LIRR should provide and pay a daily penalty payment to each of the incorporated villages in immediate proximity to the overdue grade crossing site. For example, the Covert Avenue grade crossing site should provide the villages of New Hyde Park, Floral Park</p>

	<p>and Stewart Manor with a sum certain based upon the number of residents in each of those communities. III. Hosting communities shouldering the burdens must obtain the greatest benefits. The hosting communities must be better off as a result of the megaproject with no decline from their status quo. There also needs to be demonstrated and agreed that there will be a comparable increase in the amount of service to the hosting communities with the amount of train traffic they are asked to bear and certainly not a decrease, as has been suggested with respect to the Hempstead line, which is the primary source of service for Floral Park and Bellerose. The DEIS is woefully inadequate in demonstrating that there will be a commensurate increase in service and decrease in travel times for the Floral Park and Bellerose communities as a result of this \$2 billion boondoggle. While both the Floral Park and Bellerose stations adjacent to the main line tracks, the DEIS makes no assurances that they will experience an increase in passenger train service as a result of this megaproject. One way to alleviate this situation is to guarantee in perpetuity that the Floral Park LIRR station will become a permanent station stop on the Oyster Bay LIRR line. This will ensure that the Floral Park community will be provided permanent access to the other main line communities, especially Mineola, which will be serving as a secondary hub station for access to the entire main line service. IV. MTA LIRR must be a good neighbor to its hosting communities. The megaproject must be guided by a guiding principal to provide a helping hand to its surrounding communities and not give them a thumb down finger instead of thumbs up approach. For example, the proposed quarter mile impact zone is woefully inadequate and instead an at least one mile area radiating from the Right of Way must be established as a minimum study area. Once again the DEIS refuses to expand the impact zone as has been requested. This has resulted in a serious under reporting of potential adverse impacts on the adjacent communities. V. MTA LIRR must provide full disclosure and transparency as a key to building trust and credibility. The hosting communities deserve direct representation and oversight throughout the entire megaproject, including the establishment of a Technical Oversight Board with members selected by and from the hosting communities being provided meaningful input and status. [emphasis added]. The hosting communities must be provided direct access to their own independent experts and counsel, who must be reimbursed as part of the megaproject and not by the local communities themselves. Once again the DEIS is seriously flawed in not providing for the establishment of a Technical Oversight Board which includes direct representation of the hosting communities. In addition representatives of the MTA LIRR as recently as Thursday January 26, 2017 at the Floral Park Hillcrest Civic Association continue to deny that the request for such a Technical Oversight Board was made during the Scoping hearings, which is false. VI. Reverse commute justification has already been debunked, dead and buried. Any further discussion of the reverse commute basis needs to be abandoned as even the Governor has acknowledged that it is not a viable basis for moving forward with this over billion dollar megaproject. Although Hofstra University continues to beat this dead horse issue, Hofstras own self-interest in apparently being no doubt richly compensated for hosting the LIRR public comment sessions, for example, despite the fact that Hofstra is not even located in one of the hosting main line communities, alone raises serious conflict of interest and credibility issues. It appears that the MTA LIRR continues to cite reverse commuting as a basis for justifying the megaproject, even though it was abandoned by the Governor and his representatives. Rather than invest millions of dollars in an insignificant sub-</p>
--	---

	<p>class of commuters, the MTA LIRR should ease the burdens of its most loyal and frequent passengers utilizing service in the primary peak direction. Freight trains increasing, however, are of legitimate and frightening concern. It is imperative that the MTA LIRR keep the surrounding communities safe. The LIRR needs to place strict limits in perpetuity which would prohibit the use of any track expansion for freight use. There also needs to be limits placed on the type of cargo allowed, especially radioactive and hazardous waste. The DEIS is completely lacking in candid discussion and description of increased freight operations that will result from this megaproject. Unless there are strict limitations placed on the operations and type of cargo allowed to be carried on the NEW tracks, the surrounding communities will continue to be placed at risk. VII. Design and build means there needs to be better planning and reviewing, not less. This megaproject as proposed requires an even greater level of specificity and planning due to the design and build process being proposed. If no design is agreed upon with the hosting communities, then no building is to take place until such a consensus is reached and obtained. The DEIS continues to ignore the need for greater, not lesser, specificity in order to allow the public to meaningfully comment upon the megaproject. VIII. The FTA must continue to have the final review under NEPA, not just the MTA LIRR acting as its own judge and jury under SEQRA. This may be the most important and significant issue which the MTA LIRR must agree to before anything further takes place. The megaproject which was announced in May of 2005 Federal Register continues in full force and effect, including oversight responsibility and review of the Federal Transit Administration pursuant to NEPA. As the MTA LIRR has proclaimed, however, it may not even be held accountable under SEQRA, especially if it attempts to invoke its statutory exemption rights under SEQRA, although it is not conceded that the MTA LIRR can arbitrarily decide and without reason act as judge, jury and executioner for this megaproject. The MTA LIRR must therefore agree to fully comply with all NEPA requirements, including review and approval by the FTA and/or FRA, which already have such responsibility for the East Side Access Megaproject, which cannot be allowed to be segmented from the current proposal. The MTA LIRR already has commenced the NEPA process and it is challenged to immediately disclose and release the Draft Environmental Impact Statement which it has already submitted to the FTA office for the Second Region office located at Bowling Green in downtown Manhattan. The taxpayers have already spent over \$7 million for that information, which must be made part of the current record going forward too. Since the Scoping meetings in May of 2016, there has been a sea change in our government with the election of President Donald John Trump as our 45th commander in chief. According to press reports published after the DEIS was released: Gov. Cuomo to meet with President-elect Donald Trump for talk on potential repeal of Obamacare, infrastructure http://www.nydailynews.com/news/politics/gov-cuomo-talk-donald-trump-obamacare-infrastructure-article-1.2948893 He said he wants to also speak to Trump about infrastructure and development, where I think we have a great opportunity. After his phone conversation with Trump in November, Cuomo said having a New York native in the White House could be a bonus for the state, especially when it comes to infrastructure improvements. President-Elect Donald Trump Meets With Gov. Andrew Cuomo Days Before Inauguration Another topic on their agenda "infrastructure. If he [Trump] wants to put federal money to use, and put federal money to use quickly, this is the state to do it, Cuomo said. Cuomo is pushing for huge projects across New York, including improving LaGuardia Airport and John F. Kennedy International Airport, as</p>
--	---

well as the Gateway Project, which aims to upgrade rail connections between New York and New Jersey. After his meeting with President elect Trump New York Governor Cuomo in the lobby of the Trump Tower at the elevator watch press gaggle said: WE TALKED ABOUT INFRASTRUCTURE, WHICH IS SOMETHING THE PRESIDENT ELECT VERY MUCH WANTS TO CONCENTRATE ON. WE ARE READY TO GO IN NEW YORK. WE ARE READY TO BUILD. IF HE WANTS TO PUT FEDERAL MONEY TO USE, AND PUT FEDERAL MONEY TO USE QUICKLY, THIS IS THE STATE TO DO IT. [emphasis added]. MANY OF THE BIG PROJECTS THAT I WANT TO GET DONE INVOLVE FEDERAL INTERACTION. IMPROVING LAGUARDIA AIRPORT, THAT'S FEDERAL INTERACTION. IMPROVING JFK AIRPORT, THE SUBWAY SYSTEM THAT NEEDS DRAMATIC IMPROVEMENT THAT INVOLVES THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. SO BASICLY THE CONVERSATION WAS ABOUT BOTH THE OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE STATE OF NEW YORK AND THE NEEDS OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK WHILE THE PRESIDENT ELECT IS GOING DOWN TO HEAR ABOUT THE FEDERAL POLICIES. - New York Governor Andrew Cuomo Governor Cuomo also said at the Trump Tower elevator press conference that when Washington sneezes, the State of New York gets the cold. But when Albany gets a cold, our Long Island LIRR Mainline communities appear suffer the frostbite that results in painful and permanent damage, including even a loss of our members in our communities. At his inaugural address President Trump proclaimed, in part: For many decades, we've enriched foreign industry at the expense of American industry; subsidized the armies of other countries while allowing for the very sad depletion of our military; we've defended other nation's borders while refusing to defend our own; and spent trillions of dollars overseas while America's infrastructure has fallen into disrepair and decay... We will build new roads, and highways, and bridges, and airports, and tunnels, and railways all across our wonderful nation. We will get our people off of welfare and back to work -- rebuilding our country with American hands and American labor. We will follow two simple rules: Buy American and hire American.- United States President Donald John Trumps first inaugural address In addition, President Trump met with the Congressional Leaders in Philadelphia and made the following comments: WE BELIEVE THE WORLD'S BEST COUNTRY OUGHT TO HAVE THE WORLD'S BEST INFRASTRUCTURE. IT IS WHAT OUR PEOPLE DESERVE AND IT IS WHAT WE WILL ENSURE THEY GET. OUR INFRASTRUCTURE IS IN SERIOUS TROUBLE. WE WILL BUILD NEW ROADS AND HIGHWAYS AND TUNNELS AND AIRPORTS AND RAILWAYS ACROSS THE NATION. WE WILL FIX OUR EXISTING PRODUCT BEFORE WE BUILD ANYTHING BRAND-NEW, HOWEVER. WE HAVE TO FIX WHAT WE HAVE. IT'S A MESS. SO WE ARE GOING TO FIX IT FIRST. THE THING I DO BEST IN LIFE IS BUILD. WE WILL FIX IT FIRST. BECAUSE WE HAVE ALOT OF THINGS THAT ARE IN BAD SHAPE[- United States President Donald J. Trumps remarks at Congressional Republican Retreat in Philadelphia on January 26, 2017 [emphasis added] In light of both the remarks of Governor Cuomo and President Trump, including the federal governments renewed commitment to making America great again, especially to fix what we have and the building of new railways all across our nation, for the MTA LIRR to refuse to use federal funding and guidance to create the new third track is now unconscionable. As has been urged by the elected representatives of the Floral Park community, the MTA LIRR has a number of things that need to BE FIXED FIRST before the new Third Track megaproject is undertaken. The MTA LIRR needs TO FIX WHAT WE HAVE especially at the non ADA compliant and outdated MTA LIRR Floral Park and Bellerose stations, as well as the grade crossing eliminations, that have been promised by the LIRR but unfulfilled since

	<p>the 1930s. The MTA LIRR certainly has A LOT OF THINGS THAT ARE IN BAD SHAPED but to dedicate over \$2 billion to build a brand-new third track, before the MTA LIRR does FIX WHAT WE HAVED is now completely out of step with the new presidential mandates. The DEIS is therefore woefully obsolete and out of step with the clear message and will of we the people that have been the forgotten and ignored in both Washington and Albany. In addition the DEIS does NOT promise to either Buy American and hire American. It therefore leaves open the possibility that the \$2 billion megaproject will buy and use Chinese steel and even not be required to hire American. Once again it is urged and demanded that the MTA LIRR present its \$2 billion megaproject in conformance and compliance with both SEQRA and NEPA. IX. East to west just works best, as going west to east is just beastly. It is obvious that should any construction begin to take place, it should be commenced in the east and be completed in the west. In reviewing the most significant megaproject recently undertaken in the region, such as the East Side Access and the Tappan Zee Bridge, for example, the work is commenced in the area with the least significant obstacles, with the area with the most difficulties being done last. The East Side Access megaproject, for example, has been built starting east going west into Grand Central Station, rather than starting west at the Grand Central Station and going east. So should this megaproject, much like the sun raising in the east on Long Island in Greenport and setting in the west in Floral Park. The MTA LIRR must commence its megaproject beginning in Hicksville, and only commencing work in Floral Park at the end of the process, rather than at the start. The DEIS appears to suggest that on day one of the destruction and construction phase of the megaproject, the bulldozers will commence their work in Floral Park, and that the megaproject will be taking place over the entire 10 mile swath of western Nassau County. This is completely opposite of what is being urged by the Floral Park community. While we all want the \$2 billion megaproject to be done on time and under budget, it is outrageous that the community which will be FIRST put at risk for having the construction phase being way over time and way over budget is in Floral Park. In all, the current scoping and DEIS document is inadequate, incomplete and not in compliance with both the letter and spirit of the law in New Yorks own SEQRA requirements or the federal NEPA requirements. In addition, unless and until the MTA LIRR provides a lock box guarantee of dedicated funding for the entire megaproject, it should not be permitted to move forward until, at the minimum, all of the grade crossing eliminations have been fully and properly completed.</p>
John Gibbons	<p>I am the Village Attorney for the Incorporated Village of Mineola (Mineola). These comments are being submitted on behalf of Mineola in response to the MTA/Long Island Rail Roads (MTA) Expansion Project Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). These comments are intended to assist the MTA in considering the project and in preparing all necessary environmental documents so that both the MTA and the public may properly evaluate any proposal to the main line corridor. As previously outlined in Mineola response to the Draft SEQRA Scoping Documents, dated June 9, 2016, Mineola has had extensive experience in the environmental review of LIRR-connected projects within village borders. Accordingly, it is respectfully suggested that the MTA give significant weight and attention to the comments which follow. A. Project Details 1. All of the proposed project details must be identified and circulated to the public. Specifically, the MTA needs to do the following: a. Identify with greater particularity the funding source for each phase of the project; b. Identify with greater</p>

	<p>particularity the actual timeline for construction commencement and completion for every phase of the project. This includes, but is not limited to, the initial construction staging, construction site preparation and actual construction; c. Identify with greater particularity the sequencing of construction for the entire project; d. Identify with greater particularity the proposed construction hours for each phase of the construction. This includes, but is not limited to, the initial construction staging, construction site preparation and actual construction. e. Identify with greater particularity the mitigation measures to be utilized regarding soil contaminants (identifying the amounts, source and procedures to remove the soil contaminants and the funding source for each phase of the soil contaminant mitigation process); f. Identify with greater particularity the construction staging areas before and during each phase of the construction. Please identify the proposed construction required to create the staging areas and the required construction to return them in appropriate condition; g. Identify with greater particularity the relocation of utilities before, during and after each phase of the construction. Specifically, Mineola requires plans, designs and studies regarding the relocation of the sanitary sewer lines and water mains. Any relocation plan must be accompanied by an appropriate study and/or report identifying the impacts; h. Identify with greater particularity any proposed disruption to Mineola's water distribution system. Please provide details of any work that will impact any mains, valves and appurtenances in connection with the project. Mineola will require review and approval of all plans and specifications prior to construction. Note any such work must comply with the applicable American Water Works Association standards and the requirements of Part 5 of the New York State Sanitary Code; i. Identify with greater particularity the impact on storm water drainage and measures to be taken to protect storm water facilities and to limit storm water run-off during and after any demolition and/or construction of each phase of the project; j. Identify with greater particularity the proposed construction, operation and maintenance of the parking facilities within Mineola. Specifically, please identify the entity responsible for construction, the entity responsible for operation, the entity responsible for maintenance and any proposed terms of use. Mineola would recommend that the proposed parking facilities be constructed and operating before any anticipated ridership increase occurs within the Village; k. Identify with greater particularity the person(s) responsible as point of contact for all questions, concerns and issues that will occur prior to and during staging/construction of the project. Mineola would recommend a designated liaison be appointed to address Mineola's concerns and be in direct communication with the Building Department on a daily basis. Further, Mineola would recommend that the designated liaison be available to the public at large; l. Identify with greater particularity the method in which business owners and home owners may submit claims for property damage as a result of the construction. Mineola would recommend that a designated fund be established and set guidelines be prepared and disseminated before the commencement of any construction; m. Mineola would recommend the creation of a designated fund for the reimbursement of legal fees and costs for studies and reports required to be performed by the Village to identify and review the impacts directly related to the Expansion Project. These studies and reports will include, but not be limited to, parking, traffic, sanitary sewer system and water distribution system; n. Identify with greater particularity any proposed property takings (both temporary and permanent). Specifically, the impacts of the takings must be identified, distributed and reviewed before any construction</p>
--	---

	<p>commences. Any takings that will reduce parking, divert traffic or otherwise impact the community must be properly studied and provide suitable alternatives; o. Identify with greater particularity the projected parking and traffic requirements in Mineola for the anticipated increase in ridership and a plan for mitigating such increased parking and traffic should be developed; p. Identify with greater particularity the easements (permanent and/or temporary) that will be necessary during and after construction; q. Identify with greater particularity how emergency services will be affected before, during and after construction; r. Identify with greater particularity the mitigation measures that will be in place to ensure that the proposed project will not result in soil or water contamination. Specifically, the MTA needs to identify the existence, location, amounts and removal of any toxic or harmful materials existing (including the levels and locations of any volatile organic compounds); s. Identify with greater particularity the noise and vibration sources/timing during and after construction of the proposed project. Any proposed sound attenuation walls should be located on the north and south sides of the rail road tracks. The sound walls must be at least seven (7) feet tall and contain fire access doors; t. Identify with greater particularity the economic study that will be conducted to review the impacts upon property owners and businesses during and after construction; u. Identify with greater particularity an improved pedestrian crossing at Willis Avenue. Mineola is not in favor of an underground pedestrian tunnel. The pedestrian crossing should be in keeping with the aesthetic design of Mineola and could include a pedestrian bridge. v. Identify with greater particularity the station improvements for Station Plaza. Mineola is not in favor of adding benches or other seating in the outdoor areas. w. Many businesses in Mineola in proximity to the LIRR have suffered in the past due to many LIRR-related projects in the village. A careful analysis of projected impacts upon businesses must be made and a plan for preserving business operations during construction and thereafter must be formulated; and x. Mineola has suffered a significant reduction of its assessment base as a result of takings in connection with other LIRR-related projects, especially the Grade Crossing Elimination Project and the Mineola Intermodal Center. If advancement of the proposed project will result in any further loss of assessed valuation by the village, a method to compensate Mineola on a permanent basis for such loss must be devised.</p> <p>2. Freight cargo a. There currently exists a certain level of freight traffic on the LIRR main line. The NEC Future Tier 1 Final Environmental Impact Statement provides that the FRA recognizes that freight rail service is critical to the continued vitality and competitiveness of the Northeast economy□. Please respond to this statement in light of the information already shared by the LIRR. b. What assurances can the LIRR provide that it will keep its current restrictions for the operation of freight trains in place? Although the potential for increased freight traffic is dismissed in the DEIS, an evident by-product of the project is the potential for increased freight travel in the future. The impacts must be identified and carefully considered.</p> <p>3. Alternatives a. Identify with greater particularity all available alternatives to achieve the intended purpose of the proposed project. Specifically, a cost benefit analysis should consider the relative impacts of other initiatives that would improve service reliability at a lower cost and impact to local communities. These initiatives includes: i. Construction of a new passenger train yard in Huntington for the westbound commute, thereby reducing the need to deadhead eastbound trains. ii. Electrify the Port Jefferson branch; iii. Complete the second track into Ronkonkoma; iv. Grade crossing eliminations that do not adversely affect local communities; v. Correct</p>
--	---

	<p>the Jamaica Crawl by upgrading problematic switches; vi. Complete East Side Access into Grand Central Terminal; and vii. High speed signaling switches in conjunction with the LIRR system. b. Identify with greater particularity why the proposed project could not be separated into phases and each phase considered as an alternative with its own general impacts and a realistic time-line for completion. B. Conclusion Mineola is a special village. Although it is a key transportation center, it is much more. The residents of Mineola strive to preserve and promote a quality of life which focuses upon safety, security, fine homes, manicured lawns, uncluttered roads, culture, recreation, education and a sense of community. Any project proposed for Mineola must also protect and promote that quality of life. Mineola is also special as a business community. The business owners and professionals in the village are committed to complementing the residential community in promoting Mineola as a wonderful place to visit or in which to live or work. It is urged that the environmental review of the proposed Main Line Corridor Improvements Project take into consideration and share in, at every phase and in every category of review, the promotion of the dearly-held values of the Mineola community.</p>
John Gibbons	<p>This memorandum has been prepared on behalf of the Incorporated Village of Mineola as part of its review of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Long Island Rail Road Expansion Project "Floral Park to Hicksville. The DEIS was prepared in accordance with the requirements of the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA). The memorandum focuses on the potential impacts of the proposed alternatives presented in the DEIS for elimination of existing grade crossings on Main Street and Willis Avenue in Mineola, and in particular the impacts of the proposals on downtown Mineola in terms of traffic patterns, pedestrian and bicycle safety, land use, urban design, community character and economic development. The final section of this document lists recommendations to mitigate the potential impacts of this project. Projected Impacts of Project Outlined in DEIS The DEIS includes an analysis of the different impacts the proposed development will have on Mineola if constructed. The impacts considered include land use, socioeconomic, environmental justice, visual, historic, natural resources, contaminated materials, infrastructure, transportation, air quality, noise, construction, safety and security, electromagnetic fields and climate change. There are also discussions of cumulative, secondary, irreversible and unavoidable impacts and alternatives to the proposed action, as required by SEQRA. The following sections provide an overview of the impacts reported in the DEIS and a discussion of other possible impacts and mitigation strategies, as determined by the Village of Mineola. Land Use-The study area used for the land use impact analysis consists of the area within ¼ mile of the centerline of the LIRR right-of-way and within ½ mile radius around the Mineola Station. The DEIS states that the only substantial land use impacts generated by the proposed project would be to the properties that would be acquired, as well as visual impacts to the immediate vicinity where the pedestrian bridge(s) would be built. The proposed impact will likely have a greater impact on land use in Mineola than is projected in the DEIS document. The increased rail capacity may make properties in downtown Mineola more attractive for development and redevelopment. On the other hand, the large standalone parking decks and underpasses would negatively impact the visual environment and pedestrian friendliness of the area, thereby decreasing activity and demand for different uses in downtown. Therefore high quality design measures, like the ones listed in the final section, should be implemented to mitigate any negative visual impacts and to</p>

	<p>complement possible future development around the station area. Traffic-An analysis of the projected impacts the proposed project will have on traffic conditions, safety, and accessibility, under the two build options is provided in the DEIS. Future conditions were analyzed for the years 2020 and 2040 by modeling the traffic generated if future development growth continued at the current, status quo, rate (the Baseline Scenario) and the additional traffic generated if the proposed project were constructed (Build Scenario). The traffic generated under each scenario was used to project corresponding level of service (LOS) at intersections surrounding the train station in Mineola. This analysis was completed for both alternative build scenarios, as previously mentioned. The resulting LOS data for the Baseline and Build Scenarios were then compared to measure the potential impact the proposed project will have on traffic. Out of the 15 intersections analyzed by the DEIS, most would be unaffected, in terms of LOS, by the proposed project under either option. However, some intersections would be significantly impacted by the proposed development and would begin to operate below acceptable levels of service. Examples of such adversely impacted intersections include: Willis Avenue at Third Street (Option 1): Under the 2020 Baseline Scenario, would operate at a LOS of A during PM peak hour, but would operate at LOS E under the 2020 Build Scenario. Would operate at acceptable LOS for all three peak periods under 2040 Baseline Scenario, but would operate at LOS F for all three peak periods under 2040 Build Scenario. Willis Avenue at First Street (Option 1): Would operate at LOS A during AM and PM peak hours under 2040 Baseline Scenario, but LOS E during AM and PM peak hours under 2040 Build Scenario. Willis Avenue at First Street (Option 2): Would operate at LOS D under 2040 Baseline Scenario during PM peak, but LOS F under 2040 Build Scenario. Willis Avenue at Second Street (Option 2): Would operate at LOS C under the 2020 Baseline Scenario during PM peak hour, but would operate at LOS E under 2020 Build Scenario. Would operate at LOS C during AM peak hour under 2040 Baseline Scenario, but would operate at LOS F during AM peak under 2040 Build Scenario. The data therefore suggests that under either construction option, the proposed project would negatively impact traffic congestion at some local intersections in Mineola, especially along Willis Avenue. It should be noted that no data was provided in the DEIS for anticipated growth in queuing. Increased traffic congestion and car idling due to queuing would have a negative impact on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and quality of life for Mineola residents. The DEIS document provides strategies to mitigate impacts at each intersection, however it does not specify whether NYSDOT or any other agency would assist the Village of Mineola with the repaving, restriping, and other construction activities necessary to implement these measures. If the proposed project were approved, NYSDOT could work with the Village of Mineola to help implement traffic congestion mitigation measures as necessary. According to the DEIS document the total parking demand around the train station in Mineola is projected to be 2,502 spaces by the year 2040. The proposed project would increase off-street parking capacity to 2,401 total parking spaces, which would decrease the parking space shortfall from 976 to 101 spaces. While pedestrians and cyclists in general would not likely be negatively impacted by the proposed project, there will be impacts on pedestrian accessibility to businesses in the downtown. A pedestrian bridge will be constructed over the LIRR tracks and the existing grade crossings to accommodate pedestrian crossings. However, making it more difficult for pedestrians to cross the tracks could negatively impact businesses, as residents of the new multifamily developments on the south side of the Main Line may</p>
--	--

	<p>be less inclined to walk to businesses on the north side. It should also be noted that a pedestrian bridge is proposed between the Main Street parking garage and the adjacent parking area. Depending on the design of the proposed parking garage, this treatment may not be necessary and instead a set of stairs, elevators, and pedestrian bridges may suffice. LIRR should address the reasons for this treatment, whether it be due to parking garage design or the perceived safety of the subject pedestrian crosswalk area. Cyclists would use the two-way underpass on Willis Avenue under build Option 1, while under build Option 2, they would use the Main Street underpass for northbound trips and the Willis Avenue underpass for southbound trips. As discussed in during the Project Scoping review phase of the process, bicyclists are only likely to use the underpasses if they are as safe and convenient as the existing viaduct on Mineola Boulevard. This would mean the underpasses would need to be graded and constructed in a manner which cyclists would be highly visible, especially at underpass entrances and exits.</p> <p>Socioeconomic Impacts-If the proposed project were to be constructed, it is expected to generate 1,297 full-time equivalent (FTE) direct construction employment opportunities, 762 FTE jobs off-site, \$3.18 billion in demand for local industries in Nassau County. However, if the proposed project were constructed, it would require the acquisition of several commercial properties in downtown Mineola. Not only would businesses around the station area be directly impacted, but the loss of downtown commercial property will result in an estimated loss of property tax revenue of about \$32,168. The revenue loss would likely be offset by the fact that the increased train service would attract new businesses, jobs, and residents to downtown Mineola. However, as stated in the previous section, mitigation strategies would need to be implemented to ensure the downtown remains an attractive place for businesses and residents in order for the area to capture the anticipated growth potential. There is also the issue noted above of the increased difficulty for pedestrians to get from one side of downtown to the other in either alternative for Main Street. Alternative 2 also would have impacts by reducing visibility from passing motorists and making Main Street less pedestrian friendly in the block between the Main Line and Second Street.</p> <p>Air Quality-The DEIS determined that no microscale analyses need to be conducted for CO, PM2.5, PM10, or other criteria pollutants, even though Nassau County is considered a Maintenance Area for PM2.5 and CO and a Moderate Nonattainment Area for O3. Ambient air monitoring data was provided in the DEIS and showed that all ambient air concentrations were well below National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), except for the 8-hour ozone standards. Overall, the proposed project should improve air quality along the project corridor by reducing vehicular trips and idling times at grade crossings. In Mineola, however, traffic congestion and idling times would significantly increase at some intersections due to the proposed project, offsetting the overall air quality improvements. The DEIS should provide estimated queuing length and idling time data in order to better understand the air quality impacts of the proposed project.</p> <p>Climate Change-The DEIS does not calculate any net greenhouse gas (GHG) emission that would be generated by the proposed project. Instead, it provides a qualitative analysis of expected climate change impacts from the proposed project. Overall the proposed project is expected to result in a decrease in GHG emissions by encouraging the use of rail over automobiles and by upgrading station equipment (signals, lighting, ticketing) with more energy efficient technologies, thereby reducing electricity usage. Other components to enhance clean and efficient power use would be utilized, including: An</p>
--	--

	<p>aluminum third rail, Third rail heater controls, More efficient lighting and signals (LED, automated, motion sensor controlled), Energy efficient pumps or other such powered equipment. In Mineola, any negative climate change impacts would be largely due to the idling of vehicles caused by increased congestion. As mentioned in the previous section, DEIS should provide queuing and idling data, and should also recognize that mitigation measures are needed to offset the negative environmental impacts caused by traffic congestion.</p> <p>Historic Impacts-There are three historic architectural resources that would be impacted by the construction of the proposed project, according to the DEIS. The first two are the former Mineola LIRR Electrical Substation and Nassau Tower, located at Main Street and Station Road. LIRR proposes to completely demolish the substation building and construct additional parking on the site, constituting an adverse impact on SEQRA and Section 14.09. Nassau Tower is proposed to be demolished as part of the track realignment. In addition to the substation, the commercial buildings at Station Plaza North, which are located within 100 feet of the proposed project, could also possibly be negatively impacted by construction of the proposed project. The DEIS states that LIRR would prepare a Construction Consultation Plan (CCP) in coordination with the New York Office of State Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP) to ensure construction would not cause inadvertent impacts on historic architectural resources. The Denton Building at 210 Old Country Road and the Citibank (former European-American Bank) building at 199 Second Street are also listed as architectural resources, but are not listed for inclusion in the CCP. Additional information should be provided about the types of strategies LIRR plans to implement to mitigate the impacts of the demolition of the historic substation and tower.</p> <p>Recommended Mitigation Measures-The following are recommendations for how LIRR and NYSDOT could work with the Village of Mineola to implement strategies to mitigate the anticipated negative impacts of the proposed project on the downtown area. The following potential mitigation measures would help alleviate impacts the proposed project would have on aesthetics; pedestrian and bicycle friendliness, connectivity and convenience; visibility of businesses; foot traffic; vehicular congestion; and community character. Photographs and other graphics are appended to this document to illustrate some of these concepts.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bury overhead electrical lines to make room for streetscape improvements. Where wires cannot be placed underground, place pedestrian-scale lighting on utility poles. 2. Update existing sidewalks and construct new proposed sidewalks in a manner consistent with the overall streetscape theme of downtown Mineola. This includes using brick pavers along sidewalks, planting street trees, installing benches and installing pedestrian-level street lamps. 3. Construct new crosswalks and update existing crosswalks with differentiated brick pavers, stamped concrete or similar treatments, in coordination with the existing downtown streetscape theme. 4. Provide decorative bollards between narrow sidewalks and the street, and in other locations as necessary. 5. Install bicycle racks adjacent to the train station, pedestrian bridges, and along Main Street directly north of LIRR tracks, as well as potentially other facilities such as bicycle lockers and a bike repair station. 6. Landscape, plant trees and/or install public art/monuments in new dead spaces created by proposed project. <p>Examples include: The proposed Front Street median, west of the proposed roundabout; The proposed Main Street median, north of the proposed roundabout; The buffer between the Willis Avenue right-of-way and the proposed realigned sidewalk on the east side of Willis Avenue, between Front and Third Streets; The center of the proposed Main Street roundabout; Surrounding</p>
--	--

	<p>proposed surface parking and parking garages; and The proposed kiss-and-ride lot, which would be ideal for a micro-park. 7. Place directional signage and striping in key locations where proposed changes in traffic patterns are not intuitive, including: The intersection of Third Street and Willis Avenue, specifically in regards to the Third Street left-turn movements; Front Street and Willis Avenue intersection; North of Oyster Bay Branch tracks, surface southbound movement on Willis Avenue, north of the commercial driveway; Southbound movements at intersection of Second Street and Willis Avenue; Main Street at proposed kiss-and-ride lot entrance; Main Street at Third Street, indicating it is not a through street (unless the direction of Front Street is changed as described below); 8. Consider reversing the direction of vehicular traffic on Front Street so that it is one-way eastbound instead of westbound. This change would eliminate awkward, conflicting traffic movements at the entrance to the kiss-and-ride lot and at the intersection of Willis Avenue and Third Street. Such a change might necessitate further adjustments to traffic directions on connecting streets. 9. Install pedestrian-level wayfinding signs highlighting key landmarks, businesses, districts and roads in downtown Mineola. Appropriate locations for signage include: near pedestrian ramps, staircases and bridges; the ground level of parking garages; and key transitional intersections such as Third Street and Willis Avenue, Second Street and Willis Avenue and Main Street and Front Street. 10. Provide directional signage for motorists to get into the downtown and directing them to various locations within it, particularly to parking facilities. 11. Place bicycle signs near entrances and exits of underpasses, and to direct bicyclists to designated routes. 12. Create gateway monuments and treatments at Main Street and Mineola Station, on either side of the LIRR tracks. 13. Design pedestrian bridges with transparent materials and/or materials consistent with the design theme of downtown Mineola. 14. Incorporate the following elements into the design of parking garages to screen these structures and activate the street: Vegetated buffers/walls; Transparent materials, where applicable; Murals or other public art to break up blank facade; Ground-level retail uses; Articulation and detailing that reflects historic Mineola architecture and also provides visual interest and breaks up monotonous facade. Examples of Design Features: Streetscapes and Plazas Bollards, benches, pavers, landscaping along low-traffic street " Hoboken, NJ Benches, lighting, landscaping along shopping street Arlington, VA Examples of Design Features: Signage Wayfinding signs in downtown " Phoenix, AZ Wayfinding signs " Bolton Landing, NY (left) and Newark, NJ (right) Sign directing motorists to parking " Bergenfield, NJ Sample bicycle directional signs Examples of Design Features: Parking Garages Parking garage with ground floor retail space " Arlington, VA Parking garage with ground floor retail space " Reston, VA Examples of Design Features: Pedestrian Bridges Pedestrian bridge with transparent materials " South Amboy, NJ Pedestrian bridge with monumental treatments " Vanderbilt University Bicycle Facilities and Signage Bike repair station " Richmond, VA Bicycle racks " Hoboken, NJ</p>
Dennis McEnery	<p>The MTA LIRR announced in its own PRESS RELEASE that it had submitted a Draft Environmental Impact Statement to the Federal FTA and that it would be eventually released to the public. To date that promised release has not taken place. The MTA LIRR's own press release acknowledges the need for FEDERAL oversight and review for this mainline megaproject. Once again, it is requested that the \$7 million of tax payer money that was apparently WASTED by the MTA LIRR be made part of the current SEQUA record for review and potential judicial consideration too. Press Release February 7, 2008 LIRR IMMEDIATE MTA LIRR Submits Main Line Corridor - Third Track</p>

	<p>Project Preliminary Draft Environmental Impact Statement To Federal Transit Administration For Review The MTA Long Island Rail Road's Main Line Corridor (MLC) project - which provides for a much-needed Third Track in a critical 10-mile stretch between Floral Park and Hicksville - has reached an important milestone as the Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) submitted the Preliminary Draft Environmental Impact Statement (PDEIS) to the Federal Transit Administration for review. The MLC - Third Track project will improve service reliability for the LIRR system wide by providing more capacity and flexibility to move trains. Five LIRR branches, carrying 41 percent of the Railroad's total ridership, converge on this busy stretch of the Railroad, known as the Main Line Corridor. The Third Track also is a vital component of the LIRR's effort to get ready for the completion of the \$6.3 billion East Side Access project in 2014 when LIRR customers will - for the first time - be able to enjoy a direct ride to the East Side of Manhattan via Grand Central Terminal. East Side Access will allow the LIRR to operate up to 24 trains per hour in the peak of the rush hour to Grand Central. More than 100,000 LIRR customers currently travel to Penn Station and Brooklyn during the morning peak service. For about half of the customers traveling to Manhattan, Grand Central Terminal would provide easier access to their final destination. With East Side Access, customers will save up to 40 minutes of travel time daily - the equivalent of up to 20 vacation days annually. The Third Track will add a "passing lane" to the MLC - separating express trains from local trains - and will offer greater capacity, operational flexibility and faster recovery time in the event of incidents or delays. The MLC plan is designed to also offer other community benefits, such as improvements at grade crossings and upgrades to key bridges throughout the corridor, such as Ellison Avenue in the Village of Westbury. Through the planned elimination of grade crossings in the Third Track corridor, the project enhances safety and accident prevention, improves traffic flow in local communities while also reducing train horn warning noise. The draft plan the LIRR submitted to federal official's offers two grade crossing separation alternatives which address the five grade crossings under review in the MLC. They are: Covert Avenue, South 12th Street and New Hyde Park Road in the Village of New Hyde Park; School Street in the Village of Westbury and Urban Avenue in the New Cassel area. There are two options, either A or B, proposed for grade crossing improvements with no priority assigned to one option over the other. Option A would address four grade crossings (three separations and one closure) while Option B would address two crossings (two separations). Crossing Option A Option A would separate the roadway from the tracks at New Hyde Park Road and Covert Avenue. The New Hyde Park Road crossing is a very busy North-South roadway with 19,500 vehicles per day that currently experiences extended traffic backups due to the gates being down. New Hyde Park Road and Covert Avenue traffic would cross underneath the tracks, similar to the Roslyn Road crossing elimination presently under construction in Mineola. South 12th Street crossing, which experiences considerably less traffic than either New Hyde Park Road or Covert Avenue, would be closed and a pedestrian crossing would be constructed over the tracks to enhance the safety of New Hyde Park Station customers. Also under Option A, Urban Avenue would be closed to traffic with a pedestrian bridge constructed over the tracks. Urban Avenue traffic (about 7,500 vehicles per day) would be diverted to a new bridge over the tracks, connecting Bond Street with Railroad Avenue. School Street would remain open at-grade with protection enhancements for vehicular traffic. Crossing Option B Option B is intended to minimize community impacts even further, particularly in the Village of</p>
--	---

	<p>New Hyde Park, where Covert Avenue and South 12th Street would remain as grade crossings with protection enhancements for vehicle traffic. The other proposed improvements would be identical to Option A described above, with New Hyde Park Road separated, Urban Avenues traffic diverted to a new Bond Street bridge and School Street remaining at-grade. The LIRR has listened to the public following input at the six scoping meetings held in mid-2005 and it has significantly altered its original plan for the Third Track. Public involvement proved to be invaluable during the development of the project's alignment and grade crossing proposals. In addition, over 40 meetings with federal, state and village officials, and community leaders helped refine the alignment and identified alternatives that have been incorporated into the new plan - significantly reducing potential property impacts. Providing faster and more frequent access to the East Side of Manhattan will help ensure that Long Islanders can continue to quickly reach high paying, high skilled jobs and also will help keep the Long Island housing market competitive with Westchester and New Jersey. "The LIRR is planning for the future and we need the support of Long Islanders for this important project," Williams said. "The Third Track will give the LIRR more capacity and flexibility to keep trains moving. East Side Access represents the biggest opportunity to improve LIRR's service in more than 100 years. "We've worked hard to listen to the communities along the Main Line to reduce the property impacts of the Third Track project and we will continue to seek public input as the project moves forward," said Williams. Future Project Milestones Once the FTA reviews the plan, IT WILL BE MADE AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC REVIEW [EMPHASIS ADDED] and additional public hearings will be scheduled. If final FTA reviews are complete in early 2009, engineering design on the project would take place during 2009, with an estimated construction start in the 1st Quarter of 2010.</p>
Dennis McEnery	<p>Contrary to public statements that have been made, the MTA LIRR did NOT even include the expansion of an additional track between Hicksville and Floral Park within its TWENTY YEAR plan released in 2013. The MTA LIRR should FIX WHAT IT HAS and complete those other projects identified as having HIGHER urgency than the previously abandoned and discredited third track megaproject. Here is the announcement made in 2013 by the MTA LIRR: MTA's 20-year to-do list replaces LIRR diesel trains, more Originally published: October 2, 2013 6:52 PM Updated: October 2, 2013 9:34 PM By ALFONSO A. CASTILLO alfonso.castillo@newsday.com http://www.newsday.com/long-island/mta-s-20-year-to-do-list-replaces-lirr-diesel-trains-more-1.6185656 Building a second track as far east as Yaphank, replacing all diesel trains, and rebuilding six aging bridges are all on the Long Island Rail Road's to-do list for the next two decades. The Metropolitan Transportation Authority on Wednesday released its Twenty-Year Capital Needs Assessment, which outlines \$106 billion in infrastructure projects across the MTA's agencies through 2034. MTA chairman and chief executive Thomas Prendergast said in a statement that the assessment, combined with major expansion projects like the Second Avenue Subway, "will promote economic growth in regions throughout the state." The LIRR's listed needs mostly include long-discussed projects, such as work associated with East Side Access to Grand Central Terminal, construction of a second track between Farmingdale and Ronkonkoma, modernization and reconfiguration of tracks and switches at Jamaica, and reopening Republic Station in East Farmingdale to anchor a planned transit hub serving the Route 110 corridor. Other projects have not been discussed publicly as much, including eventually expanding the Double Track project to Yaphank, rebuilding Babylon Station, and building new train yards on the Huntington-Port</p>

	<p>Jefferson branch and on the Babylon-Montauk branch. The LIRR's projects total \$13.4 billion. The biggest portion of that, \$2.3 billion, will be spent on buying new trains. In addition to buying as many as 318 new electric cars, the LIRR will invest in a new "alternative diesel fleet" to shuttle riders between electrified stations and unelectrified stations, according to the report. "Infrastructure investment and modernization will continue to be a central focus of the LIRR, particularly as it moves towards its Bicentennial Anniversary at the end of this 20-year needs period," the report said. Mark Epstein, chairman of the LIRR Commuter's Council, said what stood out most from the report was WHAT WAS LEFT OFF [EMPHASIS ADDED] it: any mention of a long-debated plan to build a third track between Floral Park and Hicksville. Prendergast and LIRR president Helena Williams have said they support the plan, which would increase capacity on the Main Line and allow for more reverse commuting onto Long Island. But the \$1.3-billion plan has been stalled for years because of a lack of funding and political support. "A lot of the projects they're doing now, without a third track, will not reach their full potential," Epstein said. "This is supposed to be your wish list for the future. And I guess we'd wish for a lot more than this."</p>
Andrew Ward	<p>My comments are related to the third rail plan in the location of Mineola, south of the tracks between Roslyn Road and Glen Cove Road. This area is populated by hundreds of single family homes and two multi-story residential apartments. The homes are within feet of the existing tracks. Sound - your predicated noise modeling assumptions in our community, M6, was one of the highest at 91.4 Decibels. I believe your retaining wall should be higher in the areas bordering this residential area. Currently, the night time, 12 am - 6 am, hours bring considerable noise to our homes and with the new track we know additional freight will be operational throughout the evenings. Based on the noise assumptions, additional mitigation should be employed to limit the extra noise produced. Project Description related to track switching devises located next to our Mineola community. Between Roslyn Road and Glen Cove there are substantial switching devises planned which will most likely create additional noise to the community. This devises should be placed in commercial area nearby. Lastly, regarding the addition of two new Parking Garages in the Mineola village downtown area. Please do not get add parking within the village community. Mineola village is crowded enough with cars. The Mineola Village is already hosting the MTA Parking garage of 1000 cars. If you add parking, more outside the village commuters will drive through the village and crowd our small village.</p>
Theresa Coen	<p>After the derailment in Jamaica on Wed Feb 8, and the many many tunnel closures, and the Atlantic Ave track problems this year to date...the thought of spending resources on a 3RD Track for only 10 miles on Long Island is not a prudent investment for spending on a broken old system that needs Upgrading thru the entire line. The 3rd track is not Focusing on Environmental Issues and Quality of life in a small community Noise Pollution/ Air Pollution/ sight pollution will increase forever with the extra track And the real problems of the old infrastructure of all the rails is not being addressed. Just to mention a few of the constant delays in the Tunnels, Atlantic Ave, and many broken rails everywhere on long island.</p>

William Corbett	<p>My name is William J. Corbett Sr. I am a spokesperson for Citizens Against Rail Expansion, a coalition of 130 organizations, elected officials and former elected officials who strongly oppose this proposed multi-billion dollar third track project. While we support the elimination of the grade rail crossings, we do not support construction of the third track. The testimony below is my own analysis and opinion and does not necessarily represent the views of all the members of our coalition. I will summarize my testimony since we are only allowed such a brief time slot and these comments are supplemented by a lengthy page by page critique and analysis of the DEIS. The elimination of the 7 at grade rail crossings is positive and should have been done years ago and should go forward without the third track project. The need for reverse commute is nonexistent since the trains now running are less than half full. OUR MAJOR OBJECTIONS ARE: 1. During construction and thereafter the loss of vital parking spots at the Floral Park Station. 2. The impact of the removal of hundreds of tons of toxic chemicals that are in the soil the entire 9.8 miles and the dangerous remediation thereof. 3. The adverse impact on traffic flow to small businesses, shoppers and residents. 4. The lack of provision of handicap access at the Floral Park Station and essential maintenance and improvements to that station. 5. The lack of sound barriers from Tulip Ave. along South Tyson Ave. to the So. Tyson Ave. underpass. The inconvenience to commuters is hardly mentioned in the report. The DEIS warns that the Carle Place station may be closed for a year with travelers being bused to Westbury. What other inconvenience can commuters expect? Of course there will be more busing, more closed stations and multiple train delays, so why isn't this spelled out so people can understand the negatives. As we understand it no additional train stops are scheduled for the communities most affected. Isn't it correct that the third track will be an express from Hicksville to Jamaica with no stops in between? The citizens of Suffolk County, except for some large and wealthy corporate supporters, do not favor this project. Most moved to Suffolk to escape congestion and to live in less industrialized communities. Suffolk doesn't need more industry with its existing problem of having landfills closed. The last thing wanted are businesses that will generate more waste. They also have concerns with the shortage of water in the future that increased industrialization will exacerbate. Our major concern is that the railroad has, for decades, used toxic and harmful chemicals to control the growth of foliage growth on the right of way and to kill rodents. These chemicals have sunk into the soil over many years and are a hazard to the local population. What is the plan for assessing this terrible situation? How will the soil be removed in a safe manner that will not generate harmful dust and particles into the air? We know that there are clusters of cancer along the tracks. This project must be stopped until the Federal Government or State Health Department does a complete assessment of the danger. In one area of Garden City out of 20 homes that back up onto the tracks there are a dozen instances of residents with cancer. There are similar cases in Bellerose and Floral Park where the property of homeowners adjoins the tracks. The adverse impact of this project will hurt local small businesses along the route. For example, in Floral Park during the construction phase there will be a loss of 50 vital parking spaces in the area of South Tyson Ave. where parking is already very tight. Where will these commuters and shoppers go? What provision has been made? Has there been any consideration of acquiring the property known as Koenigs parking lot for a metered parking area or perhaps even a two story parking facility? Has there been any consideration to adding a below ground underground parking garage under the parking lot on Woodbine</p>
------------------------	---

	<p>Court? Has there been any consideration of adding a parking facility in and under the sump adjacent to the Floral Park Post Office on Tulip Avenue? At a hearing several years ago, I asked the LIRR to erect screening on South Tyson Avenue to prevent large heavy pieces of metal from flying down off the tracks. I provided pictures of some of the objects that I have collected that have flown down with the potential of killing someone. Why won't the LIRR try to be a good neighbor and take action to prevent a tragedy? I was told by a railroad official that the only time they will do something is after someone actually gets injured. There is no reason this screening should not be put up immediately and not wait until there is much more activity in the area with danger to the public. In addition to testifying about this, I have made many calls and appeals that have fallen on deaf ears. Doesn't anyone at MTA care about anything other building new things? Why not care for and improve the existing infrastructure and making safety corrections for the residents? Also, the DEIS report fails to provide sound barriers on top of the wall from Tulip Ave. to South Tyson underpass. How can you say that you have provided sound barriers at all residential locations and overlook this area which has a large apartment house just a few feet from the tracks and a number of offices and businesses that are currently disturbed by the loud noise of trains going past? During construction, much of which will be done at night and on weekends, what will be done to lessen the noise, lights and inconvenience to local residents? The DEIS is devoid of information about the increase in freight traffic. We know that Suffolk has been forced to move garbage through our community by rail since the closure of most of their landfills. Why is the report not analyzing that situation and being up front with the real purpose of the project? A terrible flaw in the plan is the fact that construction overlaps exist. Tyson Ave., New Hyde Park Road, Plainfield Ave. and Covert Ave should not be worked on at the same time forcing extreme crowding of the existing roads. These roads are clogged at rush hour and construction at more than one site at a time will create an impossible situation. Little detail is given in the report of how the project will be staged. For example, if Belmont Race Track is used there is reference to Plainfield Ave. as the access route. Does this mean that the Mayfair Ave. gate in the west end residential neighborhood in Floral Park will not be used? While millions of dollars will be spent replacing and improving other stations there is no mention of adding handicap access to the three Floral Park platforms which should have been done years ago. THE FOLLOWING COMMENTS REFER TO SPECIFIC PARTS OF THE 2500 PAGE DOCUMENT. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: S-1 reduces delays for more than a half million passengers per week does not take into account the numerous and extensive delays during the 5 or more years of construction. Provides 2490 new parking spots but not one in Floral Park. In fact unless construction on the east end of the Floral Park platform is not done properly there will be a loss of access to parking under the tracks and 40 spots will be lost. S-3 The primary purpose is to improve rail service, reliability, public safety, and quality of life along the LIRR Main Line segment between Floral Park and Hicksville. This is untrue. During the construction phase there will be horrendous inconvenience for residents of the effected communities. When new switches were installed just west of the Bellerose station most of the work was done at night from 8 p.m. until 6 a.m. in the morning for months on end with noise and bright lights shining into the bedrooms along the route causing many sleepless nights. This night and weekend construction will be nightmare for local residents. S-3 While the report says 250 passenger trains on a typical weekday in Floral Park, we not only have the 250 but an additional 50 going to and from</p>
--	---

	<p>Hempstead and additional freight trains rolling through at night for well over 300 trains every weekday and evening. S-7 Talks about retaining walls. How can these be constructed without going on residential property? We understand that some residents of Garden City have been told that construction easements will be sought to use of their property. S-13 Construction would entail varying disruptions to rail service, certain passenger rail stations, and local traffic operations More details are needed since commuters have no idea of how they will be inconvenienced for 5 years or more. The Governor will have lots of angry people asking why this was ever done as they experience these long delays. S-13 Under the Proposed Project, no changes to land use (WITH THE EXCEPTION OF IMPACTS TO A LIMITED NUMBER OF BUSINESSES). I practice elder law and most of my clients are elderly and already have difficulty finding parking for appointments. It is anticipated that South Tyson Ave. will be closed for an extended period of time. How will clients get to my business and the 5 other businesses on this one short street? S-14 Use of properties abutting roadways would not be subject to adverse impacts with a small number of exceptions The Proposed Project would not impact general land use patterns of the communities. This is patently false in the case of Floral Park where numerous small businesses will be adversely impacted. Further as far as Floral Park is concerned it is not true that community businesses that stand to benefit from improved transportation connectivity. S-16 alludes to the location of staging areas and exact details are required to intelligently comment on this aspect of the proposal. S-18 CONTAMINATED MATERIALS. Here there is an admission that pesticides and herbicides have been used on the entire 9.8 miles to kill plant growth and rodents. While the report goes into great detail about adjourning businesses little is said and little detail is given about the extent of serious contamination on the entire 9.8 miles on the railway right of way itself. We believe that the Federal Government or State Health Dept. should oversee the testing along the entire right of way since it is obvious that these harmful chemicals have been used everywhere and hundreds of tons of contaminated soil and gravel will have to be removed with the danger of putting these substances into the air. BEFORE ANY CONSTRUCTION BEGINS THE PRELIMINARY TESTING OF THE ENTIRE RIGHT OF WAY MUST BE DONE WITH THE RESULTS MADE PUBLIC WITH DETAILS OF THE ACTION PLAN MADE AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC COMMENT. Of particular concern are the areas near residences and near the Floral Park Playground and Pool where children play. Certainly no work should be done in that area except during the winter when the pool is closed and the playground has less activity. It may be that the roller hockey rink would have to be moved temporarily during construction to avoid the skaters inhaling the deadly dust from the construction site. S-20 VEHICULAR TRAFFIC As stated before there is unnecessary overlap on the construction on the Floral Park bridges and New Hyde Park grade crossings. Not more than one construction site at a time should be worked on. S-21 PARKING Serious consideration must be given to acquiring property for additional parking in Floral Park. Consideration of putting a second story for metered parking over the vacant land just north of the South Tyson Ave underpass should be considered which could accommodate a number of cars. Consideration should also be given to construct a below ground level of parking under the Woodbine Court parking lot just south of the South Tyson Underpass. Also a three level parking facility could be constructed in, at and above the inactive sump north of the Floral Park Post Office on Tulip Ave. This would serve commuters during the day and provide parking at night for Centennial Hall. S-22 NOISE AND VIBRATION How can it possibly</p>
--	--

	<p>be lessened with moving trains closer to homes and additional trains? S-23</p> <p>CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS The report states that noise and vibration levels from construction up to two years at any one location could be a nuisance at residences, schools. COULD BE? Certainly this will have a strong impact on local residents and the value of their property bringing the tracks closer to their homes. Why should they be subjected to this torture for this unnecessary endeavor? S-27 the adverse impacts would occur in construction temporary short-term impacts that cannot be avoided. Further reference to fugitive dust which can have severe health impacts on local residents and details must be provided before any work is started. Why hasn't the State Health Dept. weighted in on this issue years ago? 1-13 This chart reinforces the point that there is no justification for reverse commute as the Governor has admitted in the past and the MTA has agreed in the past. 1-20 RETAINING AND SOUND ATTENUATION WALLS Where these are to be installed "why not on both sides of the tracks in residential areas? In 1-21 it states that from Floral Park to New Hyde Park the wall will be 4750 feet long. Will it be on both sides? 1-24 STRUCTURE MODIFICATIONS Will the construction at South Tyson Ave. because the elimination of any parking spots under the tracks on the street after construction is completed? 2-8 Correction: report should state it is a roller skating rink and not an ice rink. 3-1 ECONOMIC CONDITIONS Report says impacts on commerce would be minimal. The affected businesses would receive just compensation and relocation assistance I have a small business would appreciate knowing what you can offer me to enable me to stay in business. Report further acknowledges minor disruptions to business districts in terms of changes to access to small number of businesses. If this is true, what will be done to remediate the situation? 3-2 States that there would be continued vehicular and pedestrian access to the business district. We hope this is true and will be enforced. 3-17 It is a false conclusion that The Proposed Project would not result in any impact to the Tulip Avenue business district in Floral Park. In the past we have been told that there might be closure of the underpass at Tulip Ave. If that is so even a partial or short term closure would have an adverse impact. It is anticipated that So. Tyson underpass will be closed temporarily, it is important that Tulip Ave. and Plainfield Ave. underpasses not be closed at the same time. 4-7 CONTAMINATED MATERIALS Not only Floral Park but many environmental justice communities probably have the same amount of hazardous chemicals in the soil and they must be likewise protected by extensive studies before any work is undertaken. If the Governors promotion of Design-Build means that toxic substances will be dealt with if and when found, this is not the appropriate way to handle this problem. Testing must be done before a single spade of dirt is moved. FIGURE 5-1A-7 Photo caption is wrong. Should be view north rather than View south. 5-28 The work to be done in Floral Park is broadly outlined here but it does not indicate the impact on parking both during and after the construction phase. Will the 36 parking spots under the tracks from Tulip Ave. to So. Tyson Ave. be lost? What can be done to alter the construction plans to see that those spots are not eliminated? In the past there have been proposals to add 4 more spots to that area. Why not do this at the same time? 5-19 At the last round of hearings several years ago I testified that large metal pieces fall off the tracks onto South Tyson Ave. that pose a threat to pedestrians and could possibly kill someone. I have contacted the LIRR numerous times asking that screening be placed along the elevated track fence with no response. It would be a very minor one day project to add screening to protect the public. However, if this project goes forward a sound attenuation wall/barriers should</p>
--	---

	<p>be installed north and south along the elevated tracks in Floral Park. For the long term this would solve potential noise and vibration disturbances and keep debris from falling onto the street. TABLE 3-10 BRIDGE MATRIX Where it says Widen existing Hempstead track spans over station parking lot. Does this mean that you will not be eliminating any parking spots under the tracks once the project is completed? If so there is an opportunity to add 4 spots. Can this be done at the same time? CHAPTER 10 TRANSPORTATION RAIL FREIGHT SERVICE/OPERATIONS Residents who live along the tracks in Floral Park and Garden City believe that there are more than three round trips per day. They say that the vibration from the freight trains is much greater than the passenger cars which raises the question as to who checks and monitors the weight of the freight trains. The report neglects to report that the State of New York has ordered the closure of most of the landfills in Suffolk County and more and more garbage is being taken off Long Island in these freight cars, some of which are not covered. Why are there no projections as to the increase in freight traffic with the increase in garbage?</p> <p>The contract with the freight carrier was renewed last year. We hope that some restrictions were placed on them against carrying radioactive materials since we know that the Queens County Borough President prevented the hauling of radioactive materials from Brookhaven National Laboratory through floral Park and the other communities along the main line. The materials that are radioactive should be removed by barge and not on the rails to avoid any possibility of contamination of our citizens.</p> <p>F. PARKING 1-66 Our second greatest concern is the disruption of parking during and after construction. While the Tyson Ave. work is being done, it is anticipated at least 50 parking spots will be eliminated. We are hopeful that the end result is that the parking spots under the railroad tracks from Tulip Ave. to South Tyson will not be permanently lost. Intelligent engineering and construction of the additional track could be done in a manner where these vital parking spots would not be lost. The statistics on page 10-67 which indicate that Floral Park has an excess of parking spots is wrong. The parking lots are usually full as are the street metered spots. There are also 2 hour time limits on many spots which preclude their use by commuters. The long term solution would be for the MTA consider constructing a parking facility over the property just north of the main line at So. Tyson Ave. (known as Koenigs) for metered parking. This would benefit both commuters and the public including local businesses. On many days there is no parking available in any of the lots on Magnolia Ave. and Iris Avenue. Floral Park and Bellerose have a high percentage of senior citizens and retirees who need convenient and nearby parking when they shop locally; parking in the commercial area is now at a premium. Lack of commuter parking causes many commuters to park on the street where there is a 4 hour limit and many experience frequent parking tickets which are \$25 each. PAGE 10-70 states that with the opening of the East Side Access in 2020 there will be a shortage in Floral Park of 32 parking spaces for commuters. Why wait until 2020 to make the additions? Why not do it now with either a second level parking facility on the Koenigs property and putting a below level parking area at the Woodbine Court Parking facility? PAGE 10-39 states that without the third track in 2040 there would be new riders from Floral Park with a shortage of 238 parking spaces. So with or without the third track there will be severe parking shortages in Floral Park. Once again, why wait until 2040 when the problem could be solved now and commuters for the next 20 years could enjoy adequate parking through implementing the above suggestions for expanded parking. PAGE 10-73 mentions the parking</p>
--	---

	<p>shortfalls at Floral Park and lists possible accommodating options with Construction of parking garages atop existing surface lots. If you don't acquire the Koenigs lots and building now you will have a difficult time in the future since the owner is has a plan to develop additional apartments on the site so the time to act is now whether or not the third track is approved and funded. CHAPTER 11 AIR QUALITY 11-10 When are the Green Locomotives being ordered and when are they expected to be put into operation? This chapter did not address the pollutants that will be put into the air if and when the track bed is worked on and the toxic chemicals that were used to kill vegetation and rodents. This is vitally important for the future safety of our neighborhoods. CHAPTER 12 NOISE In Floral Park the John Lewis Childs Elementary School is located close to the work site and will be negatively impacted by this project. It was rumored that the MTA would be providing new soundproof windows for the school. Is this true? Also, if you will be using the school parking lot for staging, where will the school busses park at night and the teachers in the daytime? Will you provide soundproof windows for my office which is just across the street from the construction and is already plagued with excessive noise and vibration during the work day? CHAPTER 13 CONSTRUCTION SOCIOECONOMICS the MTA has little credibility when it comes to assessing the cost of a project. For example, look at the East Side Access at Grand Central Station and the Second Avenue Subway which are way over budget. The cost will no doubt exceed \$4 billion and will take more than an estimated 5 years. Where are these funds to come from? Will the cost of train tickets go up? Undoubtedly many taxpayers, many of whom never use the LIRR, will be paying for this project. The effect on the local economy is negligible. We would like to see detailed evidence that Nassau County would gain anything. Workers from outside the area may well come in to do a great deal of the work. Should this ever happen, it should be stipulated in the RFP that only local workers will be retained during the construction. TRANSPORTATION Exactly where will the workers park their cars? How will existing tracks be used to transport construction materials when commuter trains are running? If there is concern about construction during the day and interfering with businesses and the school, then construction would have to be at night or on weekends. This would further upset the residents. With the announcement of the possible one year closure of the Carle Place station, what other stations might anticipate closing? NOISE AND VIBRATION If you construct during the day you interfere with business and a school in Floral Park. If you work at night and on weekends you place a terrible burden on local residents who need sleep. Your remediation efforts were nil when you did the new switches just west of the Bellerose station. The neighbors still complain about the noise, lights and vibration for months on end. Railroad officials told the local people that they do not have to abide by local ordinances which allows them to ride roughshod over the residents. MEASURES TO MINIMIZE COMMUNITY IMPACTS 13-6 While representatives of the Governor and MTA continue to meet and keep in touch with local people they are not providing many necessary details that are needed to evaluate the program. While this DEIS has answered some of the questions raised at the earlier hearings, there are still very wide gaps in the information being shared. It seems like the design-build concept that the Governor propounds is flying by the seat of your pants with many unknown consequences. It sounds good but in reality it opens Pandoras Box to many uncertainties which will arise. ENVIRONMENTAL PERFORMANCE In the past when projects were done there was little effort in advance to eliminate the sizeable rat population that lives in the track bed along the tracks with the work forcing the</p>
--	---

	<p>rodents into residential neighborhoods. The rodents should be eliminated long before the work is done using traps, chemicals that prevent future births and substances that will eliminate the vermin. 13-8 CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE FIGURE 13-1 This chart shows an unnecessary overlap on the work in Floral Park and New Hyde which will cause horrendous traffic jams. No work should be done on more than one crossing or bridge at a time to allow traffic to disburse on a number of different roads. Plainfield Ave. now has reached its capacity during morning and evening rush hours and closing more than one nearby crossing at a time will cause great problems. CONSTRUCTION ELEMENTS AND PHASING THIRD MAIN LINE TRACK 13-9 & 10 STRUCTURE MODIFICATIONS The report states that a new single track bridge would be constructed to accommodate the new third track at South Tyson Avenue□ The question is what impact will that have after construction? Will we lose all 36 existing parking spots under the tracks? If so can the plan be modified so existing spots will not be eliminated and 4 more added? GRADE CROSSING ELIMINATIONS 13-11 The report states that Grade crossing elimination activities would occur at no more than one location at a time within each of the three regions. You go on to identify as regions New Hyde Park/Garden City□ but you failed to include Floral Park in that region. Floral Park abuts New Hyde Park and no work should be done at New Hyde Park at the same time work is being done at Floral Park, Covert Ave., New Hyde Park Rd., Plainfield Ave. or So. Tyson Ave which all should be in the same region. CONSTRUCTION WORK HOURS AND TRACK OUTAGES 13-23 While this section states that efforts will be made to keep the noise down at night, it is certainly qualified by the words except where not feasible and Noisy activities adjacent to residential properties would be avoided in overnight hours to the maximum extent practicable. Once the contract is awarded, the contractor does what he wants and there is little MTA supervision as we experienced when new switches were installed a few years ago west of the Bellerose station. Will MTA have a consumer or public representative on site at night to insure that the contractor does what he is supposed to do? VISUAL RESOURCES 13-27 We find a troubling statement which says Temporary lane and/or road closures would be needed during the construction of the Proposed Project. In such cases, the temporarily closed lanes could be used as staging where equipment and materials would be stored. If it is anticipated that South Tyson Ave. from the underpass to Tulip Avenue would be closed we find this totally unacceptable since it will hurt seven small businesses located on that street. Also staging on Mayflower Place would result in the loss of vital parking and also would not be acceptable. This section further states that you will use directional lighting at night to protect residences from light pollution, but the evidence of your past work on new switches just west of the Bellerose station totally ignored such procedures. Who will be on scene to receive resident complaints and to make sure contractors abide by this assurance? HAZARDOUS AND CONTAMINATED MATERIALS 13-30 This section talks about testing that will be done to determine if further testing is necessary. It is our contention that harmful chemicals were used along the entire 9.8 miles and all the ground along the route should be assumed contaminated and treated in that manner. TRANSPORTATION 13-32 While there are assurances that the hundreds of tons of landfill will be moved into position by train to the extent practical this provides a loop hole for contractors to take advantage of. There is mention that there still might be up to 15 truckloads a day delivered to any particular site. How will this be enforced? Who will be on site to make sure the outside contractors adhere to this protocol. If you claim to offer bonus money to contractors who complete their work</p>
--	--

	<p>ahead of schedule what makes you think that they will have as many truck loads a day as they can regardless of any limits you try to impose? AIR QUALITY 13-39, 13-40 The assurances on the section on Dust Control are encouraging and need to be strictly adhered to since we strongly suspect that there will be tons of hazardous track bed to be removed and carted away. To protect public health, who outside of the contractor will monitor these important procedures to make sure they are carried out? NOISE AND VIBRATION 13-41 We were told on a number of occasions that augers would be used to construct troths or ditches in which to place retaining walls and noise barriers. I don't find this emphasized in the report. There should be a prohibition for contractor using pile drivers which can cause vibrations that harm residences and business structures. ON PAGE 13-44 it is stated that While intrusive and annoying, these exceedances would be episodic and temporary in nature.□ If this is the case when noise levels would be exceeded this work should be done during the day on weekdays between rush hours and on Saturday, again during the day. ON PAGE 13-46 you lay the groundwork for violating local noise ordinances where you state While these work hour restrictions would apply to typical construction projects, MTA and LIRR are exempt from the jurisdiction of municipalities, pursuant to Section 1266(8) of the Public Authorities Law□ the report goes on to say that you will observe local regulations except where not feasible to accommodate work affecting rail operations. Who will make the decision to violate the rules "the contractor or a state official? With bonus money being offered to contractors who finish ahead of schedule you know they will find excuses to work beyond the specified hours. SAFETY AND SECURITY 15-1 This section talks about Improvements and upgrading of station conditions to improve lighting and visibility. Why are no such improvements being made to the Floral Park station? UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS 20-1 We agree that □most of the adverse impacts...would occur in the construction, rather than the operational, phase The report outlines here many adverse impacts which need to be mitigated in a supervised manner and not left to the goodwill of the contractors. CONCLUSION While it is our hope that the seven grade crossings will be eliminated and that the third track is never built, there are listed above a number of concerns and suggestions to address the problems of parking, noise and vibration, traffic interruption, and the safe removal of contaminated soil. Also, the lack of handicap access to the three Floral Park station platforms and needed improvements to the station are of major concern and should be addressed whether or not the third track ever happens</p>
Joanne Zeller	<p>This is a one family house located on the South Side of the Main line that the LIRR has proposed to expand within an unknown time frame from the date of this memorandum: 2/13/2017. The foregoing items are of great importance to us as long standing residence of this community. The first issue is about soil quality. It is our wish that at its expense the Long Island Rail Road take a very cautious approach consisting of a soil test to the house and surrounding area before, during and post construction. We are requesting soil testing adjacent to our property. We are requesting for assurances from the LIRR that they will remediate and indeed compensate owners in the event of unforeseen contamination. A second issue of concern is the additional noise that we anticipate from the Third Rail Expansion. We would like to know the distance of the Third Rail from the house. How high is the retainer wall to be built? Our preference from an esthetic standpoint would be for a wall not to exceed 4-6 feet in height and plantings to be introduced around it to absorb the sounds of train traffic.</p>

	<p>Third, the issue of soil being moved and displaced during the construction phase is of concern. We are concerned that soil erosion is a risk to our property. To the extent possible, we would like to the LIRR build team to be aware of the vibration that the home is exposed to and to reinforce the soil barriers which absorb those vibrations and reduce the strain to the house and foundation. Fourth, there is concern with respect to the power that is running at train level and its effects on the land and potentially to the house which is close to it. Will the Third Rail project require more power to run at ground level and what are its potential effects to the air, and sewer systems? Fifth, we would like specific details with respect to the hours of operation during the construction phase on our block/street? Sixth, we would like the LIRR to be expedient in its work and minimize the closure of the Carle Place station. Among the many factors that led to our purchase of this house was its closeness to the station and the ability to walk to and from trains. The proposed closure of the Carle Place station will require that we coordinate our travel to and from Westbury which is a major inconvenience to our household. Seventh, of major appeal to us as residents of the Westbury/Carle Place area is its small village feel which is embodied by the Carl Fuschillo Park located by Carle Place train station. We urge the LIRR to respect the Parks natural beauty consisting of lush trees, a clean baseball field, tennis courts, playground that is well maintained so that families can enjoy recreational facilities on a daily basis. Specific to our property and the fact that it houses two working professionals we would like the LIRR to be made aware that we cannot tolerate any damage or interruptions the electricity and connectivity of the house as we maintain home offices and any such interruption can result in adverse effects to our livelihoods. In order to safeguard the integrity of our home we would like a definitive time frame so that we can initiate a recent homeowner's documentation with a respected and licensed Engineer. We are also asking for the LIRR to compensate us for any expenditure for this endeavor. By way of conclusion we look forward to a respectful interaction with the LIRR.</p>
Cristina Rojas	<p>Not only the duration of the construction will ruin our environment, but forever we will have additional contaminants like: Dust metals from the iron (contacts like the wheel to rail/brakes), the trains that are not fully or electric but use fuel, at the crossings and in general there will be more noise due to the horn (which is used persistently) The contact the train has with the rails/brakes will increase the vibrations in the area. I already have many cracks in my house and the same is two blocks away from the rails. We already have planes, helicopters, trucks and vehicles in the area/turnpike noise and air polluting. Do we need more discomfort at this high tax paying County/Village? The politicians have done nothing for the above mentioned polluters and will comply with The LIRR. The average resident will have to live with this discomfort and not even be offered compensation like tax cuts for those affected.</p>
Hillary Siemsen	<p>For inclusion in the public record, I hereby submit my comments in opposition to the MTA/LIRR Third Track project. 1. We do not need any more noise or vibrations that will result from additional third rail trains " we are already unmercifully inundated with noise and vibration from air traffic landing to JFK International Airport. 2. We do not need any hazardous wastes/chemicals to be hauled through our village and the surrounding villages. 3. As a resident of the Incorporated Village of New Hyde Park, I use the village parking lot at South 12th Street every day. What parking will be available to me and how will it be coordinated with the village? The suburban landscape of the village would certainly be compromised if high-rise parking structures are erected. 4. How many additional trains will be stopping at New Hyde Park every</p>

	<p>day; in particular, during the weekly AM/PM rush hours? 5. We do not need another debacle like the LIRR project at Roslyn Road, which was chaotic and took much too long to complete. 6. I have been a LIRR commuter for 40 years, and the service has never been as bad as it has in the past three or so years. It used to run no matter the weather; now it shuts down after 10" of snow. How will a third track fix this? Many, if not most of signal/switching problems occur in Penn Station or west of Jamaica. A third track is of no use here either. 7. My suggestion: upgrade your existing rails and infrastructure; elevate the grade crossings and let the residents of the ten-mile stretch live in peace.</p>
Kathy Lally	<p>The 3rd Rail will: create some temporary jobs (who will get those jobs/contracts?), will create havoc in the neighborhoods it passes through during construction and operation, raise health, air and quality of life concerns along the way, The 3rd Rail will NOT: increase safety measures needed by LIRR which should be a top priority, fix existing problems with tracks, switches and tunnels, prevent snowstorms/clear platforms during stormy weather, help with derailments west of FP, improve stations/platforms, keep the young on LI - without drastic cost cutting by LIRR and local governments they cannot/will not stay - and without them ridership will decrease as they depart LI along with the retirees who can no longer afford to stay here....thereby bringing ridership down - not up. A derailment on the LIRR, tree down, or whatever - lets add a 3rd rail to bypass it and get people into the city without delay - so now what - the LI Expressway is backed up - accident here, accident there, overturned truck, - should we widen the LI Expressway so we can bypass the problems? No - it isn't practical....neither is the 3rd rail. Add safety features, upgrade outdated equipment - that will make a difference. Governor Cuomo has big dreams and plans - but has yet to explain where the \$\$\$\$ is coming from. Does he plan to personally pay for all his dreams to become realities? Starting a home project without solid financial planning would be totally irresponsible...that same principle is true for major government projects. 3rd Rail - how does the benefit outweigh the cost and problems it will cause? Free College - are teachers volunteering to teach with no salary and no benefits provided? No facility costs involved in operating the colleges? That's the only way College can be provided for free. Free is not free if it is costing the taxpayer \$\$\$. Governor Cuomo, slow down and seriously think these matters through. Most levels of government have left us taxpayers wondering if any of you remember that you work for us, the people, and the taxpayers.</p>
Laura Kramer	<p>I am very distressed at the proposed LIRR "improvement". I live a block from one of the crossings (New Hyde Park Road) and live with the constant train noises, which are deafening when one is outdoors, and the train movements continually shake the home and cause cracking in the home. To think about added noises for an extended period of time is overwhelming. The noises of digging machinery around the block for road improvement have made it extremely uncomfortable up until now, as it is not just noise but the vibrations which can be felt inside one's own body! The thought of freight trains going through the community is terrible, tearing down businesses will drive up my property taxes which are already high. I estimate that the area homes property value in the community will also be negatively affected due to any on-going construction and increased traffic. Navigating around the construction will be a major inconvenience. The idea of living so close to the proposed construction zone makes me feel ill and distraught and I'm sure many residents do not think this project is necessary, and are considering moving to avoid the chaos of this proposed monstrous</p>

	<p>project. I, as well as many area residents have pets - animals suffer from noise as well, and one cannot explain to their pets, the brutal interruptions of noises/odors, in their lives. I am concerned about the upheaval this project will cause throughout the community, especially in the immediate neighborhoods of the tracks. I am concerned about the result of the digging, the potential hazardous materials which will be uncovered and the exposure to residents which are likely to cause health issues, or exacerbate the current health issues which residents may already experience. A completed project will also create more vehicle and foot traffic, creating more noise, pollution and noise. The cost of the project is ridiculous. I wholeheartedly object to this proposed project!</p>
Caitlin Fitzgerald	<p>I have been following the news stories as well as speaking to my parents regarding a potential new track being added to the LIRR Mainline which is across the street from my house. I am very concerned about this additional disruption especially during the time the additional track is built. I am currently 15 years old and I am in the middle of my sophomore year at The Mary Louis Academy and have made the Principals list (the highest level) each semester. Going forward I am concerned about the following as I would like to continue on the path that I have started which includes going to the best college that I can possibly go to. I raised some of the following during the Scoping process and did not find answers to the following questions that I raised back in June 2016. If the construction occurs during the school year, will it disrupt my studying and homework each afternoon/night? Distraction can have a cumulative effect. Will the construction work occur in the morning and wake me prior to the normal time I currently wake for school? Will my bus stop be changed thus necessitating me to get up earlier to travel a greater distance? Will I still have the same sense of security when I walk out my front door if there are strangers (i.e. construction workers) on my block each day? Will there be construction equipment on my block each day that will make crossing the street more dangerous? Will there be any dangerous dust or debris be released during the construction? Will I be able to use the park for various activities? Will our pool be closed during the summer? Will I still be able to walk (via the Linden Ave tunnel) to the park/pool? Will any of our sports seasons be cancelled at the park? Including the various fund raisers that occur. Will my house shake especially when a freight train rolls by? Will additional freight trains be on the existing and new line? Thank you and I look forward to hearing your responses to these and other questions about the project that could have a significant effect on what I believe is my promising future. Also I have a little brother that shares similar concerns</p>
Mirella Avalos-Louie	<p>As a homeowner and resident of New Hyde Park, I am extremely worried about traffic flow and pollution. Traffic patterns into and around Floral Park into New Hyde Park will be extremely congested and in low-lit areas perhaps dangerous. Walking through town will not be possible. I would like to know how the LIRR will be mindful of the toxic materials and air pollution that this project will produce. What will be done to assure the public, especially those with pulmonary illness, that health risks will be taken into account? Property acquisition of residential property is unacceptable.</p>
Kevin Fitzgerald	<p>Thank you for allowing us to comment on this project. However due to many of the items outlined below we must object to this project moving forward. Some of the reasons are that we feel on a macro level are as follows: 1) There is no meaningful justification for this project. Although the DEIS and project website state various reasons for the project, the DEIS is devoid of any factual basis (e.g. studies, statistics</p>

	<p>etc). Although Appendix 10 of Chapter 10 has a study it was not added until January 9. There was not sufficient time to review and digest this study to make meaningful comments. 2) As taxpayers we feel that the approximate \$2 billion could be used for other infrastructure projects on Long Island (e.g. fix aging bridges, build/repair roads, etc). We would like to point out that we do feel that the grade crossing eliminations that are part of this project would be worthwhile endeavor. In addition, the Long Island Railroad in our opinion has other priorities that should be funded first that would provide benefits. Just in the past week, the LIRR had significant delays on different days due different reasons (none of which would be solved by a 3rd Track) such broken rails between Atlantic Terminal and Jamaica, crossing gates not closing at crossings east of Hicksville, and a train derailment at Jamaica. Funds spent on the LIRR should be first used to correct and upgrade existing infrastructure as opposed to being on used on this project for which the justification is speculative in nature 3) The new track will not increase or improve service to Floral Park. In fact, it may appear that due to the configuration (i.e. new 3rd track will merge into the existing north track on the Hempstead line at South Tyson Ave) there may be less service on the Hempstead Line. 4) If the new 3rd Track is constructed, we would suggest that all westbound trains on the Hempstead line run express from Bellerose to Jamaica. If they do not and have to cross over (as they do now) to stop at Queens Village, Hollis and the Hillside Facility, some of the proposed benefits of the 3rd track will be eliminated as trains will have to wait during the crossovers On a micro level specifically some of the concerns that we as homeowners and parents that live directly across the street from the Mainline are as follows, some of which we pointed out during the Scoping Process that we feel have not been answered in the DEIS: What time of day will the construction take place? We are concerned amongst other items that our children will not get the proper rest if construction is at night or starts early and that they will be distracted in the afternoon/evening while doing homework and studying. What days will the construction take place? Will it include weekends Will all workers where proper identification to ensure they are clearly indefinably to us as residents? Will all construction workers go through verifiable background checks to ensure that they have no criminal background? As a parent of two children we want to continue to ensure that our children remain safe. Although the DEIS says Construct retaining walls on the south side of LIRR ROW and sound attenuation walls on the north side of LIRR ROW working from Plainfield Avenue east and from Covert Avenue west (Chapter 13 page14 and again at Chapter 5 page19) what assurances are there that the south side attenuation wall and north side attenuation wall will be built simultaneously? Otherwise if one side gets built the other side will have a significant increase in noise/sound pollution. The retaining wall on the Southside should be no higher than the wall on the north side. The DEIS per Chapter 5 page 18 states. The final heights and locations of sound attenuation walls will be determined in consultation with the community prior to the publication of the Final Environmental Impact Statement and will be included therein□. The residents of Charles St including myself should be included in these discussions. Will Charles St be used for any staging area for construction? Will any construction equipment need to be placed on Charles St? Will any properties on Charles St be taken even as an easement for the construction stage? What traffic studies have been done to ensure that additional traffic on an already busy Charles St will not occur? This includes any construction to remove grade crossings? If so, we would like those released to the public. What studies have been completed to</p>
--	--

	<p>ensure surrounding properties including ours will not have damage either during the construction phase or when additional trains are using the line when the additional track is in use? If so, we would like those released to the public. As the houses on Charles St including ours are near 100 years old we are concerned about the foundation, the walls, the utilities (gas line, sewer, electric etc). There is no mention of a study or review showing potential results to the previously mentioned items that the construction may do Will there be additional electrical currents needed as there will be increased capacity. What examination of the soil in the construction zone has been completed? If so, we would like those released to the public. What examination of the existing vibrations and noise from additional train traffic has been completed? If so, we would like those released to the public. Will there be additional freight trains using the tracks once completed? In closing we welcome your responses to our questions however as previously stated in the past and today we vehemently object to this project and the disruption that it will cause to our home not only structurally, but environmentally and perhaps financially.</p>
Helen Gilmartin	<p>I am opposed to the construction of the third rail. New Hyde Park is a small suburb and because it is close to the city it takes away from the suburb flavor as it is. We do not want a third rail to further citify Our neighborhood. I am strongly opposed.</p>
Michael Antic	<p>Chapter 7, which deals with natural resources, points out that the Nassau/Suffolk Aquifer System underlies the study area and will have to cope with the additional strain placed on it by water runoff from the new underpasses and tracks. The introduction states "measures ... would be developed, as necessary, to mitigate and/or reduce any of the Proposed Project's potential significant adverse effects on natural resources," but concludes the section stating "no mitigation measures are necessary to address potential significant adverse impacts to natural resources." The study never defines "significant adverse impact" and I would believe the goal should be NO adverse impact. Within the body of this section, New York State tries to shift responsibility to Nassau County claiming that the six storm water ponds are not regulated under the Clean Water Act and that the County has jurisdiction over them.</p>
Maureen Fratianni	<p>Very concerned that the value of my house will drastically go down. I am against the third rail project.</p>
Tom Koch	<p>No. This is a terrible project. The MTA cannot be trusted as a valued organization. The proposal of 2 Billion Dollars of tax money is better spent in other ventures. This is the same MTA that is currently 4 Billion Dollars Over Budget for the East Side Access for LIRR and as it stands now 4+ Years behind schedule. (estimated completion date of 2023, however it was supposed to be completed 2013) This is a 10 year overrun for a promised project. I commute on the LIRR Daily and the service is horrible (and another increase is proposed). Please do not fund or support a third rail.</p>
Patrick Lonergan	<p>The building of the "Third Track" would have a serious detrimental effect on the efficient operation of Winthrop Hospital and the government offices during the construction phase, but do nothing to alleviate the cause of more than 80% of the delays and cancellations. I suggest that a contingent of workers be retained to repair and maintain the East River tunnels and the track and track bed in and out of Jamaica Station (Jay). This would provide long-term jobs and maintenance of facilities.</p>
Judi Mason	<p>I am opposed to the proposal as it exists today. I am aware nothing I write here matters.</p>

Walter Gosden	I am totally opposed to any construction for the LIRR third rail project. It will completely disrupt the whole business community, devastate any normal travel north and south of the tracks at Tyson, Plainfield and Covert Avenues, and affect hundreds of elementary school children at the John Lewis Childs School whose property and buildings are on the north side of the railroad tracks.
Salvatore Capone	I oppose the Third Track from Floral Park to Hicksville. A disaster in the making. .
Katherine Hoey	I am totally against this project as it is explained today. The construction alone in Floral Park will destroy businesses. Traffic will be a nightmare. People who live near the tracks will be subjected to noise and debris for months if not years. Look at how long it took for the 2nd Ave Subway to be PARTIALLY finished. The estimates of time and cost are ALWAYS way under. Fix the LIRR Stations. Fix the grade crossings. These are safety issues. But please don't create a third track Floral Park to Hicksville. The need does not warrant this action. Doing so will ruin the quality of life in Floral Park and other towns on the line.
Edward Muro	The project is much needed and long overdue. Long island needs viable transportation and the third track will reduce delays in travel time. In addition, modernized stations, expanded parking, and grade-crossing eliminations that are included in the project ensure that homeowners and commercial property owners alike will benefit from a transformational beautification of the corridor.
Robert Owens	The project is unnecessary, cost prohibitive and will adversely affect the quality of life for residents in Floral Park. Upgrade the current system and eliminate the grade crossings. No evidence whatsoever that this project is "vital" for the economic well-being and future of Long Island. Typical empty rhetoric to justify a project that will only benefit the businesses and labor unions who will profit from the project and the politicians who curry favor from those groups. Stop asking the taxpayers to drink the Kool-Aid. Focus on upgrading the current infrastructure.
Christin McDonnell	Houses in the west end of floral park are going up for sale like never before. Neighbors are all talking about time to exit floral park and some even long island. This will devastate this beautiful hamlet and the reason for this has nothing to do with helping commuters. Everyone knows that the long island population is decreasing along with all of New York State. This is about hauling waste and crony capitalism. It's a disgrace. We are planning to put our house up for sale if this goes through along with family members and friends.
Nadine Fentner	We need the 3rd track badly.
Patricia Mangan	I am vehemently opposed to this project as the DEIS does not address the devastating health, social and economic consequences of this extension on the citizens of Floral Park, New Hyde Park and Garden City. We stand to lose our quality of life and gain nothing in return.
Erin Power	I am strongly against the Third Rail Project
June Michalak	I am a cancer survivor. The chemicals from the ground surrounding the train tracks is the cause. The fact that there is no mention of chemicals in the environmental impact study is a clear indication of the Governor's intention to steamroll this project directly over the health and welfare of the taxpayer. Threatening to begin a project in New Hyde Park- essentially cutting the resistance of adjacent towns and villages off from each other is another telling sign. Stating to the public that this project will go through without addressing the freight capacity increased on the central track, the increased garbage transportation, and the fact that the plan makes no reference to which

	portions of land will be taken by eminent domain- all indications of how ill-conceived this plan is and how clandestine the Governor's intentions really are. My comments could go on for pages. For now, this project cannot proceed, at all, in any areas, until the ground is tested and the chemicals are addressed.
Christine Reekie	I live 1 block and the second house on the second block from the Bellerose LIRR station. I am aware of how close the railroad runs to private homes and our two grammar schools, and our park and the pool. The tampering with soil that contains toxic material to inhibit growth along the sides of the track is a real concern, I find it difficult to believe the LIRR when they have already ignored concerns about the need for seniors to access the elevated tracks in Floral Park. I find it extremely strange that after leaving the tracks crossing roads for all these years that it is now a reason to elevate the tracks so you can do what you want. As stated you can see that I believe there are real concerns and I also believe that business also will suffer due to proximity to the work planned and possibly extended road closures.
Annette Sequino	Your idea of adding a third track to four stations....Floral Park, New Hyde Park, Mineola, Garden City is totally inconsiderate!!! I'm a resident of New Hyde Park for more than 40 years and have commuted to Manhattan while living here. There's no problem with transportation as it stands. If you need to get more people to and from Manhattan, Here's the secret. BUY MORE DOUBLE DECKER TRAINS! THEY TAKE DOUBLE THE AMOUNT OF PEOPLE TO AND FROM MANHATTAN and it poses no problem for any of us. Men make very complicated suggestions. You need a woman to bring everything back to practicality. Evidently, you didn't consider the fact that this hinders walking people, bicycle people, baby carriages, trucks, autos and more. The three cross streets going North and South (Covert Avenue, South 11th Street, New Hyde Park) are main thoroughfares in New Hyde and highly used daily. Change for Change sake solves NOTHING. It just creates more and more problems and inconveniences! Please put yourself in our place and see if you would want this change.
Dennis McEnergy	The MTA LIRR's projections that this megaproject will cost \$2 billion and will be completed within just a few years' time is completely unsupportable, based upon the MTA's recent track record concerning any projects, be they large or small. For example, the East Side Access megaproject is BILLIONS over budget and YEARS overdue. Even the Third Track megaproject has had spiraling cost estimates, initially about \$400 million and now FIVE TIMES that estimate at \$2 BILLION. Therefore unless and until the MTA LIRR obtains full and complete and guaranteed funding for this megaproject, it should not be allowed to move forward. It is especially concerning that the MTA LIRR itself will be responsible for this megaproject. As the MTA Inspector General in October 2012 reported concerning the relatively small project of replacing staircases at the LIRR's own Great Neck Station, it took over 115 working days over the course of six months at a labor cost of more than \$261K to complete a job that should have taken less than 10 weeks and cost less than \$100K. Can the MTA LIRR seriously dispute that its Third Track megaproject may cost over 2 and half times the \$2B it has already conceded that this megaproject will cost, making it an over \$5 BILLION commitment rather than "just" \$2 BILLION? PLEASE MAKE THE LIRR GREAT NECK STATION STAIR CASE FIASCO PART OF THIS RECORD: MTA/OIG Report #2012-05 October 2012 IMPROVING THE MANAGEMENT OF CREWS IN THE MTA LONG ISLAND RAIL ROAD'S STRUCTURAL MAINTENANCE DIVISION Barry L. Kluger MTA Inspector General State of New York OVERVIEW The MTA Long Island Rail Road (LIRR) maintains its vast network of stations, bridges and facilities with an in-house workforce comprised of five- or six-

	<p>person crews. Unlike those performing particular duties each day at the same facility, these crews might be assigned to various locations over a wide area throughout any given day. While monitoring the performance and whereabouts of such workers is certainly challenging, doing so is essential to maintain an appropriate and cost effective level of productivity. The Office of the MTA Inspector General (OIG) examined the replacement of a staircase at the Great Neck station performed by a crew from LIRR's Structural Maintenance Division and concluded that workers were not productively engaged. We estimate that several thousand labor hours and more than \$160,000 were wasted through lax supervision of the crew assigned to the project. Notably, the problems that OIG encountered on this project appear to be systemic. Our findings indicate that low expectations on the part of the supervisor in charge of the project with regard to the amount of time that the crew was expected to spend at the job site each day, reduced the productivity of the crew. Moreover, because division managers and the project supervisor did not employ a project schedule and budget to plan and monitor the project, they could not ensure that the project would be completed in a timely and efficient manner. Indeed, our review of two other LIRR construction projects performed by crews from Structural Maintenance—a fence installation along a roadway in Manhasset and staircase replacement at Deer Park station—revealed that the same management deficiencies, including low expectations, also delayed the completion of these projects. In conducting its review, OIG utilized information obtained through the LIRR's Automatic Vehicle Location Monitoring (AVLM) system. The LIRR has employed AVLM since 2007 to track all trucks and vehicles that support the maintenance of its infrastructure. This system allows LIRR to locate vehicles in real time, and run historical reports on vehicle location. OIG used the AVLM data specifically to reconstruct the amount of time crews spent at the job sites for our three case studies. We also supplemented our analysis of Great Neck with several field observations of the crew members and interviews with their supervisor.</p> <p>Summary of Findings The staircase replacement at Great Neck station was completed in 115 working days over the course of six months, consumed 5,677 labor hours, and cost more than \$261,000 in labor alone. Based on input from a construction, engineering, and scheduling consultant retained by OIG, we estimate that the work should have taken the LIRR crew 2.5 months to complete, consumed 2,500 labor hours and cost just over \$98,000 in labor. The supervisor in charge of the project could not adequately explain why the staircase replacement at Great Neck took so long to complete. On average, slightly more than one hour each shift, totaling some 660 labor hours, was lost on the Great Neck job specifically because the crew members were slow to arrive at the job site and/or left the site well before the scheduled end of their shift. This total represents 12 percent of the labor hours consumed on the project, and 21 percent of the overall 3,177 labor hours we determined were wasted time. Approximately 120 labor hours were lost on the Manhasset fence installation, because the crew members left their headquarters late and returned early. The lost time represents 13 percent of the 926 labor hours consumed by this project. The Manhasset project employed an inefficient method of fence construction that predictably extended the length of the job. The project supervisor could not adequately explain why he employed this method. At Deer Park, the crew was offsite for 13 percent of an expected onsite time of six hours and 15 minutes. This down time further reflects a pattern of inefficient management. Supervisors do not use the AVLM system to track the performance of their crews. Because Structural Maintenance managers and</p>
--	---

	<p>supervisors do not employ commonly used management tools, such as project work scopes, schedules, budgets and status reports to plan and monitor the construction work performed by the division, project delivery dates are not established for projects, the cost of the job is never calculated and progress is not tracked and reported by supervisors to management as the job progresses.</p> <p>The crew that worked on the Great Neck project frequently claimed that it “worked through lunch,” and were paid time-and-a-half for the 30 minutes it claimed to work. Although the amount involved was small (about \$5,200), LIRR management acknowledged that Structural Maintenance workers would rarely have a valid reason for working through lunch. As a result of these project management and reporting deficiencies, managers and supervisors cannot adequately plan the work, control costs, take remedial action in timely fashion, or fully explain why projects are not completed in a reasonable time. The absence of project management and reporting also weakens management’s ability to measure performance and hold supervisors and crews accountable for their work. Recommendations In order to ensure that all field crews are productively engaged, LIRR management must set standards for work performance, have adequate tools to measure that performance, and periodically monitor these workers. OIG recommends that LIRR management: Set clearly-defined expectations for its field crews regarding job site arrival and departure times, and require that supervisors and foremen enforce those expectations. Require supervisors to utilize the LIRR’s AVL to monitor their crews on a daily basis Require development of work scopes, budgets, and schedules for construction jobs performed by crews in the Structural Maintenance Division. Require that each supervisor in charge of a crew performing work prepare a written status report for review by the principal engineer of the Structures Department at least once every 30 days.</p> <p>Establish and enforce a written policy and procedure for employees that defines and controls “working through lunch.” Summary of Agency Response We discussed our findings and recommendations with LIRR management throughout our review, rather than waiting for the report process to be completed, and then shared with management our preliminary report in early June 2012 for agency comment. In a written response to the OIG dated September 4, 2012, the railroad accepted all our recommendations, noted that it had already implemented many of them, and declared: “In short, the LIRR has taken proactive steps to change the way in which these types of projects are managed.” Specific steps taken by LIRR are detailed in this report following each recommendation. BACKGROUND The Engineering Department (Engineering) is responsible for the design, construction, maintenance and rehabilitation of LIRR’s physical plant, excluding rolling stock. Construction and maintenance is performed by five sub-departments, one of which is Structures. This sub- department is responsible specifically for the design, inspection, construction, maintenance and rehabilitation of line structures throughout the LIRR System.</p> <p>The Structural Maintenance Division (Structural Maintenance) is a unit of the Structures Department (Structures) that is responsible for repairs to train stations, support structures (such as bridges), and right-of-way enclosures (such as fences and retaining walls). Almost all of this work is funded by LIRR’s operating budget. The applicable reporting structure within the Engineering Department is detailed in Chart 1. LIRR’s chief engineer is the highest ranking official in Engineering. Structural Maintenance is divided into three subdivisions. Each subdivision is headed by a supervisor who reports to the engineer for Structural Maintenance (Maintenance Engineer), who in turn reports</p>
--	---

	<p>to the principal engineer for Structures. As of January 2012, Structural Maintenance employed 82 individuals as mechanics, work equipment operators, and welders. These employees were organized into 16 crews of five or six workers under the direct supervision of a foreman. Each crew was assigned at least one work truck or van. Crew members normally report to their designated headquarters at the start of the work shift, and then travel together to the job site. For a project expected to require several months of continuous work, however, the Maintenance Engineer will usually direct the assigned crew to report directly to the job site each morning for the duration of the job in order to minimize travel time. The State-of-Good-Repair (SOGR) subdivision within Structural Maintenance employed five crews who were responsible for rehabilitating LIRR railroad bridges in accordance with the agency's goal to bring these assets to SOGR by 2024.¹ This work entails concrete repairs, rehabilitation of the bridge deck and waterproofing; it often takes several months to complete. ¹ State-of-Good-Repair is defined by the Federal Railroad Administration as a condition in which the physical asset is functioning as designed. The acronym "SOGR" is used in this report to describe both the unit performing the work and the condition it works to bring about. LIRR's bridge goal can be found in "Twenty Year Capital Needs Assessment 2010-2029," Metropolitan Transportation Authority, Draft – August 2009. Chart 1. Reporting Structure</p> <p>The West End subdivision is typically responsible for repair work at LIRR facilities in Queens and Nassau County, while the East End subdivision typically handles repairs in Suffolk County. Some jobs take only a short time to complete, and involve routine tasks such as repairs to station doors and windows. Other jobs, which take longer, are designed to bring LIRR assets into a State-of-good-repair, or to enhance customer service and safety. Examples of this work include replacing staircases at LIRR stations and installing security fences around LIRR's assets and its right-of-way to enhance safety. As explained more fully below, this report reflects our analyses regarding the productivity of workers assigned to projects in Great Neck, Manhasset, and Deer Park, carried out by the SOGR, West End, and East End subdivisions respectively.</p> <p>PRODUCTIVITY OF STRUCTURAL MAINTENANCE CREWS On any given day LIRR Structural Maintenance crews are employed in geographically dispersed locations. In our view, this deployment raises two significant issues: Are Structural Maintenance crews putting in a productive work day? What management tools are supervisors, the Maintenance Engineer, and the principal engineer using to help ensure that workers are productive?</p> <p>To address these concerns we focused on jobs that were expected to require several weeks or months of construction. At the time of our review in September 2011, the staircase replacement by SOGR at LIRR's Great Neck station was underway, and was expected to require at least several more months for completion. This job became our primary case study. Two other jobs, the installation of a chain link fence in Manhasset and the installation of aluminum stairs at the Deer Park station, were analyzed post-completion for comparative purposes. Case Study 1: Staircase Replacement at Great Neck Station The station staircase provides access from Great Neck Road to the westbound platform. According to the maintenance supervisor in charge of SOGR work, the original stairs were constructed of concrete. Over the years, the heavy use of salt to remove snow and ice had caused the stairs to deteriorate. During that time, LIRR maintenance crews would fill in cracks in the concrete with new concrete and layer the stair treads with fiber glass covers and abrasive grit to reduce the possibility of injury</p>
--	--

	<p>on the stairs. However, water continued to seep into holes in the treads and damaged the concrete underneath, including the supporting walls. In April 2011, the maintenance supervisor for SOGR and the Maintenance Engineer inspected the stairs in response to a complaint, and found that they were in very poor condition. The supervisor explained to OIG staff that he believed that the stairs were in imminent danger of collapse, and recommended that they be replaced. The Maintenance Engineer directed that the work begin immediately. The following were the major work elements: Install temporary partitions around the work site to protect the public. Remove the light poles, railing and ornamental iron railing. Demolish the existing concrete stairs and partially demolish the concrete walls that supported the staircase. In total, about 40 cubic yards of concrete was demolished. Place the demolished concrete in a pit below the staircase so that it would not have to be removed from the site. Install new concrete on top of the partially demolished wall. Install reinforced concrete slabs that serve as the stairway platforms at street, intermediate, and lower levels, and waterproof the concrete slabs. Install new aluminum stairs and railings, as well as a drain line. Reinstall the light poles and ornamental iron railings. Workers had to remove, clean, paint and reinstall these railings. Work began on April 28, 2011, and continued full-time until full completion on November 9, 2011. The Maintenance Engineer assigned one maintenance crew from SOGR to work on the stair replacement. This crew performed the demolition, all of the concrete work and preparation, and installation of the aluminum stairs. Plumbers from another division in the Structures Department installed the waterproofing and the drain line, and electricians from the Power Department (also part of Engineering) performed the electrical work. The SOGR maintenance supervisor managed this work. Five workers and a foreman made up the crew assigned to this job. They were paid to work the 7:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. shift, which is a 7.5 hour workday, with a half-hour paid lunch. Figure 1 shows the staircase at completion. Figure 1: Staircase Replacement at Great Neck Late Arrival/Early Departure from Job Site In August 2007, LIRR installed an Automatic Vehicle Location Monitoring system on its entire fleet of work trucks and supervisory vehicles. A transmitter is mounted in each vehicle and a remote computer records by geographical coordinates every stop made by the vehicle and is accurate to about ten feet. Consequently, it is an excellent tool for tracking vehicles used by LIRR work crews. The crew assigned to the Great Neck job used two AVL-M-equipped work trucks to travel between the Bayside Yard crew quarters (Bayside or Yard) and the job site at the Great Neck train station. OIG analyzed records from the AVL-M system for the vehicles that workers used to travel to and from the job site in order to determine how much time they spent there. OIG also conducted six field observations of the work crew assigned to the job, and observed workers entering and leaving their assigned headquarters while the job was in progress. Chief Engineer's Expectations for Workforce Productivity We used the chief engineer's expectations regarding LIRR's field crews with respect to when they should arrive at and depart from the job site as a framework to analyze the AVL-M records. The chief engineer said that under normal circumstances it would be reasonable to: Allow 20 to 30 minutes each morning at the crew quarters so that so that workers could load the trucks and the foreman could give workers a job briefing and safety talk. Allow five to ten minutes for workers to buy a cup of coffee. Assume that the crew should arrive back at their crew quarters no earlier than 20 minutes before the end of their scheduled shift in order to unload the truck, secure equipment, and wash up before leaving. Analysis of Worker Time Spent on Site Based</p>
--	---

on the chief engineer's expectations, the Bayside crew assigned to the Great Neck job should have left the Yard no later than 7:30 a.m., may have stopped for ten minutes to get coffee, then traveled to the job site. Because the Great Neck station is only 3.5 miles from the crew quarters, ordinarily just a 15 minute drive, the crew should have arrived before 8:00 a.m. and returned by 2:40 p.m. OIG compared these expectations to the actual AVL M readings for the crew vehicles from April through November 2011.² As Chart 2 makes clear, workers rarely arrived at the site before 8:00 a.m.³ We took care to restrict the analysis only to those days when the crew went to Great Neck in the morning and returned to the crew quarters in the afternoon. We excluded 19 days when the crew drove to another location in the Footnote continued on next page.

a.m.³ Indeed, the average arrival time was 8:45 a.m. with the crew arriving at the job site between 30 minutes and one hour later than expected on 34 of the 97 mornings (35%) that we analyzed. Remarkably, though, crews arrived between one and three hours later than expected on another 19 mornings (20%); and on two mornings, although expected by 8:00 a.m., the crews actually arrived in the afternoon. When we questioned the maintenance supervisor about the late arrival time, he had assumed that the travel time between the crew quarters and job site was one half-hour. He further assumed that if the crew encountered traffic on the way to the site, the drive could take 45 minutes. He seemed surprised when we informed him that according to the AVL M history, it should take about 15 minutes to drive to the site from Bayside Yard, which is about 3.5 miles from the job site. ⁴ Indeed, the crew needed slightly more than 20 minutes travel time on only five of the 26 days that they drove directly to the job site in the morning without stopping. The maintenance supervisor also stated that it might have taken the crew more than 30 minutes to load the truck on some mornings. He went on to note that because of space limitations at the work site, he could not store materials, nor could he set up a tool shed at the location. Because all of the tools and materials used on this job had to be transported to the site, he told us that he would expect the crew to arrive at the job site between 8:00 a.m. and 8:15 a.m. However, the morning (e.g. Morris Park) before travelling to the job site, and four days in the afternoon when the crew stopped at another LIRR facility before returning to the crew quarters. ³ To simplify the presentation, we report the AVL M records for one of the two vehicles used by the crew. During our observations the vehicle records were comparable. ⁴ This calculation is based solely on those driving directly to the work site and not stopping for gas, coffee, etc. supervisor could not adequately explain why on average the crew arrived at the job site after 8:45 a.m.

According to the AVL M records, on most days the crew stopped for less than 15 minutes in the morning, presumably to get food. However, on at least 13 mornings (or 13 percent of all mornings studied), the AVL M records indicate that the crew spent between 20 minutes and 30 minutes at a delicatessen in Bayside. During one OIG field observation we saw workers leave Bayside Yard about 7:45 a.m., and drive about one half-mile to a delicatessen where they purchased food. For the next half-hour OIG observed workers sitting in their trucks apparently eating breakfast. The crew arrived at the job site that day at 8:35 a.m. Late arrival is only part of the problem. Workers also left the job site earlier than expected. Since it takes about 15 minutes to travel from the job site to the Bayside crew quarters, workers should be leaving the job site no earlier than 2:25 p.m. However, the average departure time was 1:51 p.m. And, as Chart 3 shows, workers almost never left the job site at or after 2:25 p.m. Indeed it was more likely that they left before 2:00 p.m. On 50 of the 112 afternoons studied (45%) the

	<p>crew left the job site between 1:00 p.m. and 2:00 p.m. to return to the crew quarters. As one example, on Monday October 17, 2011, OIG observed the crew exit their headquarters at Bayside Yard at 10:02 a.m. and arrive at the job site at 10:16 a.m. It appears that workers were preparing for a concrete delivery that was expected to happen the next day. OIG observed workers tying rebar inside wooden forms. At 12:05 p.m. the crew broke for lunch. They returned to work at 12:55 p.m., 50 minutes later, although their authorized lunch period is only 30 minutes. Shortly thereafter, they began to pack up their equipment. At 1:40 p.m. they departed the job site, and arrived back at Bayside Yard at 1:50 p.m.—meaning they arrived back at the station from the job site a full 35 minutes before they were expected to leave the job site itself. We discussed with the maintenance supervisor in charge of the job the issue of the crew’s early return to their headquarters. He claimed that at times preparatory work was performed in Bayside Yard, including cutting stair components and fabricating formwork, and that this could explain some of the early departure times. He also told us that he was not concerned that the crew workers returned to the Yard at 2:00 p.m.—one hour before the end of their shift. He believed that workers needed time to unload the truck. However, we questioned why the workers would need an hour in the afternoon, when he had previously told us that workers were expected to assemble tools and materials and load the truck in 20 minutes to 30 minutes in the morning. Also, our own observations at the job site showed that workers loaded the truck in about 15 minutes, suggesting that about the same amount of time was needed to unload it. It seems clear from the foregoing that the maintenance supervisor and the chief engineer operated under very different expectations regarding to crews traveling to and from job sites. And clearly, this discrepancy presents a problem. LIRR management should set clearly-defined expectations for its field crews regarding job site arrival and departure times, and require that supervisors and foreman enforce those expectations. Notably, according to the AVL records, on six occasions the crews left Great Neck to return to the Bayside Yard before 1:00 p.m.—more than two hours before the end of their shift. Moreover, as the following example illustrates, when workers leave the job site to return to the Yard several hours before their shift is scheduled to end, it does not mean that the crew performed productively at the Yard when they got there. On Friday, September 30, 2011, OIG observed the LIRR crew installing concrete stair landings. The workers finished at 11:00 a.m., packed their tools, and left Great Neck at 11:19 a.m. to return to Bayside Yard. They arrived back at Bayside Yard at 11:35 a.m. and entered the trailer which serves as the crew’s headquarters. Payroll records indicated that workers claimed that they worked through lunch, which means they were paid time-and-a-half for the 30 minutes they supposedly worked. OIG continued the observation at Bayside Yard from the pedestrian overpass just west of the Yard until about 12:40 p.m., but saw no work going on in the Yard. Because this is a construction job, we question whether the workers performed any job related tasks inside the trailer. The AVL records showed that the trucks were parked in the Yard for the remainder of the afternoon. The LIRR supervisor had no explanation, and we conclude that lax supervision allowed this downtime to occur. After allowing time for travel, loading/unloading the truck, and time to buy coffee, we estimate that on average slightly more than one hour each shift, and 660 labor hours in total, was lost on this job because the crew was slow to arrive at the site and/or left the job site well before their shift was scheduled to end. For a six person crew, this represents almost three weeks of lost time—a significant amount of unproductive time that LIRR</p>
--	--

	<p>should eliminate. The Cost of Great Neck Staircase Replacement Each day the foreman completes a time and attendance report.⁵ That report is signed by his or her supervisor and submitted to the payroll department for processing. The report includes the time worked by each crew member, along with the codes for the location of the site and type of work performed there. To capture the payroll costs of the staircase replacement at Great Neck we segregated the 2011 payroll by the codes for location and type of work. Our analysis found that the project consumed 5,677 labor hours, and took approximately six months to complete. The labor cost for this project, including fringe benefits, totaled \$261,428. We interviewed the maintenance supervisor in charge of the work at Great Neck about his expectations for this job before starting it. He told us that he expected the staircase replacement to be completed in about four months. However he acknowledged that his timeframe was only a very rough estimate, not based on a written scope of work, or schedule of work activities. Further, he had no idea how many labor hours would be needed to complete the job, or how much the work would cost. As noted, the job actually took six months to complete. Moreover, the Maintenance Engineer explained to the OIG that none of his division's work is planned or monitored using project schedules or budgets, regardless of the potential cost or expected duration of the job. Rather, each supervisor uses rules of thumb to establish a timeframe within which they expect a crew to complete a project, without factoring in or tracking associated costs.</p> <p>To help us establish an independent estimate of how many days and how much labor it should have taken an LIRR crew to replace the staircase at Great Neck station, we retained a consultant with expertise in construction, engineering, and scheduling. Our consultant provided estimates of labor hours by trade; materials needed, and total cost to complete the project as if the work were performed by a private contractor at prevailing wage rates. In addition, our consultant assumed that the private contractor would use essentially the same construction methods employed by the LIRR crew to replace the staircase.⁶ To make this estimate, our consultant reviewed the as-built drawings and field drawings, as well as purchase orders for materials, and conducted a site visit to inspect the completed staircase. Our consultant also attended the interview that OIG conducted with the supervisor in charge of the job. Based on this evidence, our consultant estimated that the project should take about 2.5 months to complete, and consume 1,714 labor hours. Similar to LIRR work schedules, our consultant's estimate assumes that crews are working on the job for 7.5 hours, and have a half-hour paid 5The time and attendance report is known as the "Engineering Department Daily Labor Distribution Report." 6 Where our consultant's approach to construction differed from the LIRR's approach was in the demolition of the old staircase. Our consultant's estimate assumed that workers would use pneumatic chipping guns to demolish the concrete. In contrast, the supervisor in charge of the staircase replacement told us that the LIRR crew mainly used manual tools to demolish the stairs. Lunch. However its estimate also assumes that workers are required to report directly to the job site, leave the site at the end of the work day, and are paid at private sector rates. Because these assumptions are not consistent with LIRR's labor rates, restrictions, and practices, we made adjustments to our consultant's projections to allow for workers traveling to and from the crew's headquarters; stopping to purchase a beverage or food; and handling materials and equipment at the beginning and end of each work day. By factoring in these allowances, the maximum amount of productive time during a regular shift for work at Great Neck is reduced from 7.5 hours to approximately six hours.</p>
--	---

	<p>Based on our revised assumption that LIRR workers had only six hours of productive time on the Great Neck job, we estimated that the project should have consumed 2,500 labor hours, taken ten weeks (2.5 months) to complete, and cost \$98,291 in labor.⁷ These figures are significantly below how long the project actually took and how much it cost. Table 1 below presents the OIG Estimate as well as the actual time and labor cost of the project charged by the crews. Table 1. LIRR Great Neck Station Staircase Replacement Estimated vs. Actual Labor hours Total Labor Cost OIG Estimate 2,500 \$ 98,291 Actual 5,677 \$261,428 While OIG found that the job should have taken 2.5 months, the job actually took approximately six months to complete, and was almost triple the cost. We estimate that several thousand labor hours and more than \$160,000 was wasted. Not only did LIRR spend too much time and money on the Great Neck job, but Structural Maintenance lost an opportunity to complete other critical work. The crew assigned to replace the stairs at the Great Neck Station was diverted from bridge repair, which is especially critical because the line structures category, which includes bridges, is the only LIRR asset group not in a State of Good Repair.⁸ When asked to explain why this job took six months to complete, the supervisor said that one possible explanation was that the workers were occasionally re-assigned to other work. ⁷ Our consultant estimated that the labor cost for a private contractor to replace the staircase at Great Neck would be 131,305. The OIG-estimated cost for LIRR to complete the project is 25 percent lower than our consultant's estimate (\$98,291 compared to \$131,305), because LIRR labor rates are significantly lower than private contractor rates at prevailing wages. For example, the cost inclusive of fringes and benefits for an LIRR mechanic ranges from \$301 to \$377 per day. In contrast, our consultant estimated that the wages and benefits for a private laborer were \$549 per day. ⁸ See "Twenty Year Capital Needs Assessment 2010-2029," Metropolitan Transportation Authority, Draft – August 2009, p. 48. However, our analysis of AVL records puts them at the Great Neck site and indicates that workers were rarely reassigned to another job.</p> <p>Indeed, our analysis of AVL records and site observations explain some of the poor productivity that we found. As noted, about 660 labor hours were lost on the Great Neck job because the crew was slow to arrive at the site and/or left the job site well before their shift was scheduled to end. This represented 12 percent of the labor hours consumed on the project, and 21 percent of the 3,177 labor hours that were wasted. Left unexplained, however, is the remaining unproductive time. Because Structural Maintenance does not require its managers or supervisors to employ commonly used management tools, such as project work scopes, schedules, budgets and status reports to plan and monitor the construction work performed by the division, OIG compared the timing of material invoice records to the payroll records for this job to establish milestones for how the job proceeded. While the payroll records indicate that workers began charging the job on April 28, 2011, the invoices for materials indicate that the stair treads and risers were not delivered until July 22, and that concrete was invoiced on August 24, August 25, September 16 and October 26. Evidently, the only work occurring during the 12 weeks between April 28 and July 22, was temporary site protection, demolition, the removal of lights, railing and ornamental railings and some of the formwork for the concrete installation. Also, the crew could have cleaned and painted the ornamental railing. According to the schedule provided by our consultant and adjusted by OIG, this phase of the work should have been completed by the LIRR crew in about four weeks instead of twelve. While the maintenance supervisor could</p>
--	---

	<p>not adequately explain why the crew needed 12 weeks to demolish the stairs and remove the railings and lights, we did learn that the crew used manual tools to demolish the staircase. In contrast, our consultant estimated that the same work could be performed using pneumatic chipping tools, which would clearly save time and effort. However, because no job progress records were kept for the Great Neck project, it is impossible to know how much time could have been saved by using this alternate approach. Had a job schedule and periodic status reporting been used by management to monitor this job, we would have better information on why demolition was significantly delayed. More generally, project schedules and status reports would have helped us to understand why the whole project took so long to complete.</p> <p>Productivity Problems Also Found on Manhasset and Deer Park Projects We were aware that Structural Maintenance crews replaced stairs at other LIRR stations, and performed other construction work such as installing security fencing and repairing platform edges. To determine whether the problems that we found were unique to the Great Neck staircase replacement, or an example of systemic problems within the division itself, OIG analyzed two other construction jobs completed in 2011 by different Structural Maintenance crews working under different supervision: the installation of a chain link fence along a roadway in Manhasset, and the installation of aluminum stairs at the Deer Park station. On both jobs, workers reported to one location and had to drive to the job site. As with the Great Neck project, the crews assigned to the Manhasset and Deer Park projects were frequently slow to get to the job site in the morning, and often left earlier than expected in the afternoon. Further, like Great Neck, these projects did not have expected completion dates, and the cost and progress of the work was not tracked and reported by supervisors to management. As a result, we tried to piece together a picture of the job's progress through after-the-fact interviews with the supervisors responsible for the work.</p> <p>Case Study 2: Demolition and Installation of Fence in Manhasset Beginning in August 2011, a LIRR maintenance crew from the West End subdivision replaced about 1,000 linear feet of chain-link fence along Thompson Shore Road (Figure 2). The project took about five weeks to complete, and consumed 926 labor hours. Total labor cost based on payroll records was \$42,055, including fringe benefits.</p> <p>Figure 2. Fence Installation in Manhasset</p> <p>Analysis of AVL M Records To determine whether the crew was onsite for an appropriate amount of time each shift, we repeated the analysis of AVL M and payroll records conducted for the Great Neck job. At Manhasset, the crew assigned to this job worked the 7:15 a.m. to 3:15 p.m. shift, and reported to the LIRR facility at Morris Park, about a 50 minute drive from the site. Other than loading fencing and some equipment onto the truck each morning, all remaining work was performed at the job site. Again using the chief engineer's expectations as a guide, the OIG assumed that the crew should have left Morris Park no later than 7:45 a.m., stopped for ten minutes to get coffee, and then arrived at the job site at about 8:45 a.m. In the afternoon, workers should have left the job site a little after 2:00 p.m. in order to leave enough time at the end of the shift to unload the truck. Accordingly, the crew should be onsite for five hours and 15 minutes per day, and working except for a 30-minute paid lunch period. Nevertheless, our analysis showed that the crew averaged only four hours and 15 minutes per day onsite, including the half-hour for lunch. As a result, we estimate that 120 labor hours was wasted because crews left their headquarters late and returned early. The lost time represents 13 percent of the hours consumed on this project. As Chart 4 shows, workers arrived at the job site before 9:00 a.m. only once. The average arrival time was</p>
--	--

	<p>9:26 a.m. and the crew frequently arrived at the job site after 9:30 a.m. When leaving the job site, the crew almost always left unnecessarily earlier than expected to return to the crew quarters. Chart 5 shows that workers left the job site after 2:00 p.m. only once. The average departure time was 1:37 p.m. Originally, when we questioned the supervisor and the manager about the scope and time period of the work, we were told that 2,000 linear feet of fence was installed at the site. However, we inspected the site after the work was completed and found that only about 1,000 feet of fence had been installed, which evidenced even greater delay. The supervisor had been under the erroneous impression that twice as much work had been completed. He also appears to have had low expectations for how much fencing could be installed each day. The supervisor told us that he expected that workers would install about 50 feet of fence each day. This appears to be the pace at which the workers completed the job because the fence was installed in 23 days. To ascertain how long it should take to install a chain link fence we called a fence installation service in New York. We were told that the project should be completed in seven work days.⁹ Even after adjusting for travel and all other non-productive time, the LIRR crew spent about twice as much time as necessary on this project. The major problem, it seems, lies in the method of fence installation. To account for the length of the job, the supervisor explained that workers used a manual post hole digger to set the fence posts. However, OIG believes that this method of fence construction was unnecessarily inefficient and extended the length of the job. LIRR's Chief Engineer stated that the process of installing steel posts was manual because the work area did not offer enough room to operate a power augur.¹⁰ He also stated that a two-person power augur would not be appropriate for this job, because it would bind as soon as it hit tree roots, which were abundant in the area, and that provisions would be needed for workers to clear a path for the augur when it binds. However, OIG believes that even if a power augur was inappropriate for this job there are other types of power post-hole digging equipment that would have significantly reduced the amount of labor time needed to complete this project.¹¹ Ensuring that efficient methods are used during construction is critical for controlling costs. Case Study 3: Staircase Replacement at Deer Park Station Between March 15, 2011 and July 5, 2011 a maintenance crew from the East End subdivision replaced the aluminum stairs on both the westbound and eastbound platforms at the LIRR Deer Park Station, (Figure 3 shows the new staircase on the westbound platform.). The project took 2,607 labor hours to complete, resulting in a total labor cost of \$84,396 including fringe benefits. The crew assigned to this job worked the 7:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. shift, and workers reported to the LIRR facility at Babylon Yard, which is about a 20 minute drive from the job site. Most of the work was done at the site. As it did with Manhasset, OIG analyzed AVLM and payroll records and interviewed supervisory personnel to determine whether the crew spent the expected amount of time at the work site and whether the job progressed at an acceptable pace. ⁹ The fence installer calculated the seven days as follows: three days to demolish the old fence and remove it from the site; one day to set the posts in concrete; and three days to put up the new fence. ¹⁰ An auger is a handheld drilling device that utilizes a rotating vertical screw blade. ¹¹ While a power augur is a hand-held device, a mini skid loader with an augur attachment is a potentially more powerful tool. A mini skid loader is a tractor-like engine-powered machine with lift arms used to attach a wide variety of labor-saving tools or attachments. Figure 3. Staircase Replacement at Deer Park</p>
--	---

	<p>New Staircase on Westbound Platform Analysis of AVL M Records Because the crew was supposed to arrive at the Babylon Yard headquarters at 7:30 a.m., and Deer Park is 20 minutes from that yard, the crew should have arrived at the job site at about 8:30 a.m. (allowing for time to load the truck, travel time and coffee purchase). Nevertheless, the crew arrived at the job site between 8:30 a.m. and 9:00 a.m. only 36 percent of the time (Chart 6). On 61 percent of the days the crew arrived at the job site between 9:00 a.m. and 9:30 a.m., and arrived sometime thereafter on the remaining days. The average arrival time was 9:00 a.m. Notably the crew did not arrive on or before 8:30 a.m. on any of the mornings that we studied. Because crew members are off work at 3:30 p.m., they should have left the job site about 2:45 p.m. in order to leave enough time to drive back to the yard (20 minutes) and unload the truck (20 minutes). However, Chart 7 shows that workers left the job site at 2:30 p.m. or later only three times, but left before 2:00 p.m. more than 25 percent of the time. Indeed, the crew's average departure time was 2:15 p.m. As a result of late arrivals and/or early departures, this crew was onsite an average of five hours and 15 minutes each day instead of an expected six hours and 15 minutes, losing an estimated 334 labor hours. This discrepancy continues the pattern of lack of supervisory attention and low supervisory expectations regarding productivity. In our view, LIRR management should clarify its expectations for its field crews regarding arrival at and departure from a job site and require that supervisors and foreman enforce those expectations. LIRR's chief engineer agreed with our observation. In addition, maintenance supervisors should use the AVL M to periodically spot check the location of their crews. Specifically, to ensure that crews are meeting LIRR management's expectations, and to further improve accountability, supervisors should be required to utilize the AVL M to check when crews leave their headquarters in the morning and return in the afternoon.</p> <p>"WORKING THROUGH LUNCH" PAYMENTS Our review of the payroll information for the staircase replacement at the Great Neck station found that from May 2011 through July 2011, and periodically thereafter, workers were regularly paid for "working through lunch." Employees who work through lunch are paid at the time-and- one-half rate for the half-hour. Employees who claimed that they worked through lunch on the Great Neck job were paid a total of \$5,197. However, we question the need for LIRR to pay its crew to work through lunch when there was so much downtime on this job. Our analysis of the AVL M records found that on ten of the 43 days that the crew claimed that it worked through lunch, it inexplicably returned to the crew quarters at Bayside Yard one hour or more before the end of its shift. On one of these days, Friday September 30, 2011 (see page 11), the crew claimed to have worked through lunch, yet OIG observed workers return to the Bayside Yard trailer at 11:35 a.m., and not leave the trailer for at least the next hour. As a result, we also question whether any work was actually performed during the paid lunch period. We did not find this pattern on the two other jobs that we analyzed. When we pointed out the frequency of lunch payments for the workers on the Great Neck job LIRR management had no explanation. In 2009, the chief engineer issued a verbal directive prohibiting paid lunches for all Engineering staff except when approved as necessary by an appropriate manager.¹² The chief engineer acknowledged that Structural Maintenance employees would rarely have a valid reason for working through lunch. After we brought the matter to his attention, OIG learned that the chief engineer addressed the issue during subsequent meetings with managerial staff. It seems clear, though, that LIRR needs to strengthen this advisory by issuing a written policy governing lunch payments, and by holding</p>
--	--

	<p>managers accountable for enforcing these policies by ensuring that such payments are justified. 12 This directive clearly paid off: between 2009 and 2010, for Engineering as a whole, lunch payments declined from approximately \$918,000 to \$265,000—a reduction of 71 percent. However, the chief engineer acknowledged that the practice had begun to increase again in 2011. That year lunch payments rose 52 percent to \$404,000.</p> <p>PROJECT SCOPES OF WORK, BUDGETS AND SCHEDULES While a formalized scope of work, project schedule, and budget are rarely needed for a maintenance task to be completed in a few hours or days, OIG strongly believes that the Maintenance Engineer and maintenance supervisors must use these tools to effectively manage construction work performed by the division, such as bridge rehabilitation and staircase construction. A scope of work typically breaks out the work to be performed on a project into specific tasks. It improves project planning by helping to ensure that all tasks needed to complete a project are identified. A project schedule helps ensure that activities are properly sequenced, and can be used to monitor the progress of the work. Without a written schedule and estimated end date, supervisors and their managers cannot properly manage the work, and cannot pinpoint problems or bottlenecks in the schedule. A budget establishes a plan for and limits on project expenditures, including labor, and helps supervisors and managers monitor and control the resources consumed on a project. By improving the information available to the Maintenance Engineer and the principal engineer during project planning, project schedules and budgets could also help to forestall the use of inefficient construction methods. Any project estimates that seem unreasonable could then be addressed by these managers before the project proceeds. Written schedules and budgets are also critical for ensuring transparency and accountability. Without projected costs and completion dates to use as baselines against which to compare actual results, management's ability to hold supervisors and work crews accountable is severely compromised. Similarly, project status reporting could help keep management informed as to how a job is progressing. According to our consultant, the Great Neck staircase replacement should have been a relatively simple job to complete because it did not require either specialty or foundation work. Yet because Structural Maintenance does not use the basic construction management tools discussed above to oversee construction projects, the managers responsible for the Great Neck job could not adequately explain why the project took so long and cost so much. While our site observations and analysis of AVL records confirm the existence of and provide some explanation for the poor productivity we have described, there are obviously more lessons to be learned and greater transparency and accountability to be achieved, if project scopes of work, schedules, budgets and status reports are maintained and utilized by the division. We learned that the Projects Division within the Structures Department does use these management tools to monitor its own construction. In 2011, for example, the Projects Division was responsible for New York State Department of Transportation-funded bridge repairs in Queens,¹³ the installation of cement foundations as part of a capital project to replace nine substations at various locations on Long Island,¹⁴ and the installation of retaining walls along the LIRR's main line, among other work. The manager of the Projects Division told us that budgets and schedules are required on these jobs, primarily because the work is funded by the MTA capital program, or by a specific federal or state funding source. The inference is that because the funding source is different, the application of different rules and/or greater oversight will result in the same type of work being managed in a more</p>
--	---

	<p>professional way. The LIRR chief engineer agreed that the Structural Maintenance Division should use work scopes, budgets, schedules and periodic reporting to plan and monitor construction projects performed by their crews. 13 LIRR employees repaired concrete, waterproofed the bridge deck and replaced the tracks at bridges in Queens and Brooklyn that support freight service. 14 A substation supplies electrical power to the tracks to support train movement. As noted, LIRR workers fabricated the foundation; outside contractors provided the buildings and the equipment.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATIONS In order to ensure that all field crews are productively engaged, LIRR management must set standards for work performance, have adequate tools to measure that performance, and use these tools to measure field crews against these standards. Accordingly, OIG recommends that LIRR management do the following:</p> <p>Recommendation 1: Set clearly-defined expectations for its field crews regarding job site arrival and departure times, and require that supervisors and foreman enforce those expectations. LIRR's Verbatim Response and Status Report: "A letter was sent from the Chief Engineer to all Engineering Department employees on June 4, 2012 defining daily expectations and work assignments. In addition, the Chief Engineer met with all the represented Supervisors in early June and reviewed in detail what is expected from them while performing their work assignments. One primary topic included minimizing travel times between headquarter locations and work sites. The Structures Department enhanced its internal controls and now requires that all gangs fill out a Daily Production Report. This report is completed by the Foreman and submitted to the Supervisor on a daily basis. The report details daily work production for the day and is reviewed to ensure that work is taking place as planned and on schedule. In addition, as of May 11, 2012, large scale item information such as ties, surfacing and rail replacement from the Daily Production report is entered into the Daily Mechanized Report. This serves as an asset management tracking system and notes what was replaced, when, where and how many." Status – Complete</p> <p>Recommendation 2: Require supervisors to utilize the LIRR's AVL system to monitor their crews on a daily basis LIRR's Verbatim Response and Status Report: "As an interim step, the Department analyzed who has access to the AVL system and issued a memo on June 28, 2012, instructing non-registered managers and supervisors on how to gain access to it. The memo further indicated that the AVL system would be used for investigating MVA accidents, monitoring idling vehicle activity, verifying crew whereabouts and validating overtime and claims. The Department is also currently in the process of updating its Intranet website with a direct link to the AVL User manual. More importantly, however, the Engineering Department will establish a strengthened centralized management function that will be responsible for many of the tasks discussed in this report, including vehicle usage and time and attendance." Status – Ongoing</p> <p>Recommendation 3: Require development of work scopes, budgets, and schedules for construction jobs performed by crews in the Structural Maintenance Division. LIRR's Verbatim Response and Status Report: The Department instituted a new procedure – Control of Structural Maintenance Renewal Work on June 12, 2012. The purpose of this procedure is to define the methods and instructions to control activities of Structures in the performance of their large scale renewal work. The procedure requires that the Engineering Project Plan document contain the scope of work, estimate, budget allowance, work order number, risk or community impact statement, base schedule, base material requirements, quality plan and impact if any on Engineering Asset Management Program. By</p>
--	--

	<p>establishing the Engineering Project Plan documentation required for the Maintenance Renewal work, the overall performance will improve. More specifically, the documentation provides for improved planning and execution, improved effectiveness of work management process, enhancement of the communication objects and early identification of issues and critical element. Status – Complete Recommendation 4: Require that each supervisor in charge of a crew performing work prepare a written status report for review by the principal engineer of the Structures Department at least once every 30 days. LIRR's Verbatim Response and Status Report: The Principal Engineer of Structures issued a memorandum on June 27, 2012, requiring Structures Engineers to submit to the Principal Engineer monthly written updates for these large scale projects. Status – Complete Recommendation 5: Establish and enforce a written policy and procedure for employees that defines and controls "working through lunch." LIRR's Verbatim Response and Status Report: In May 2012, the Engineering Department established a procedure for authorizing "working through lunch". This procedure requires the respective Engineer, which is a level above the Supervisor, to grant field approval for any paid lunch period. Furthermore, on a weekly basis, a summary of approved paid lunch periods will be reviewed by the Assistant Chief Engineers and the Chief Engineer. A formal written procedure was established on June 20, 2012. The strengthened centralized office will periodically review compliance with the policy. Status – Complete CONCLUSION Because LIRR's infrastructure is dispersed over 700 miles of track, on any given day the five- or six-person crews that maintain its stations, bridges and facilities may be scattered among several work locations. Effective management of this dispersed workforce is critical to ensuring productivity and a cost-efficient maintenance operation.</p> <p>However, OIG's examination of three projects performed by crews from LIRR's Structural Maintenance Division reveals that these workers were not productively engaged, and that their performance problems are systemic. The small size of these crews and their wide spread geographical area of employment do not have to be obstacles to effective supervision, provided that appropriate steps are taken to address the weaknesses that we identified. To begin, Engineering Department senior management must (1) set clear expectations regarding when crews leave their headquarters in the morning and return in the afternoon, and (2) require that supervisory management enforce those expectations. This action alone could reduce the amount of unproductive time by as much as one hour per day on average with a consequent and significant reduction in costs. Further, management must require the development and utilization of work scopes, schedules, budgets, status reports, and other appropriate tools for monitoring crew performance on projects designed to bring LIRR assets into a state-of-good-repair, or to enhance customer service and safety. Because these project management and reporting tools have been lacking, managers and supervisors could not adequately plan the work, control costs, take remedial action in timely fashion, or fully explain why projects are not completed in a reasonable time. Also, by improving project management and reporting capabilities, management's ability to measure performance and hold supervisors and crews accountable for their work will be enhanced. Toward these ends we discussed our findings and recommendations with LIRR management throughout our review, rather than waiting for the report process to be completed,, and then shared with management our preliminary report in early June 2012 for agency comment. As is clear from the LIRR's written response detailed above, the railroad accepted all our</p>
--	--

	recommendations, noted that it had already implemented many of them, and declared "In short, the LIRR has taken proactive steps to change the way in which these types of projects are managed." We are encouraged by LIRR's response, but will monitor its implementation of our recommendations to ensure that improvements in productivity, managerial effectiveness, and cost efficiency are realized.
Santhosh George	I don't support adding a third rail. It will disrupt existing communities and cause unnecessary traffic delays for unendless days.
Sally Corbett-Turco	I am writing to voice extreme concern about the Draft EIS and the projecting in general. The project is costly, disruptive, unsafe and unnecessary. It will damage quality communities that already have enough rail capacity for commuters. The people of our state do not want unnecessary projects. We want fiscal discipline and strategic projects. The only focus and spending should be on projects that improve the safety of the existing stations, rail lines, and subways. To veil safety projects as being part of an unnecessary multi-billion dollar addition of a third track between Floral Park and Hicksville is not good governance. Fires underneath rail lines, derailments, insufficient training and monitoring of workers, antiquated operational systems and safety mechanisms, insufficient handicap access, unsafe and unclean stations, and many other necessary projects should be the focus rather than a third track project that will ruin quaint, picturesque, safe and thriving suburban villages and cost the state money. Again, please abort the unnecessary third track project. It will be a travesty to the property values and livelihoods disrupting ecosystems - both human, commerce and natural for years at a price tag that is exorbitant.
Robert Johnson	I have a few questions and would appreciate your answers and explanations to each. 1) Why are more freight/cargo trains using this rail line now then they have in the past 6 months? Were they using another rail line before and why don't they continue to use it? 2) Since this proposed expansion project will add additional trains to this line and increasing more vibrations to surrounding properties and adding increase to the probability of fracturing foundations and walls who will be responsible for the repair costs? 3) Where will the project employee's be parking their vehicles...our street has a 1 hr parking code. 4) Will the cargo trains be transporting hazardous material? 5) What hrs and days will this project add noise and air pollution to our street? 6) Why can't you use the money to add additional double decker passenger cars to increase passenger volume?
Anthony Turco	The Draft EIS presents a number of serious concerns, most alarming is the provision of a very expensive, dangerous and unneeded 3rd Track. I have environmental and safety concerns as well as concerns for the economic well-being of the main streets and downtowns from Hicksville to the Floral Park and their residents. Please concentrate on needed upgrades to the entire existing system and not the third track. Please pull the third track plans and improve what you have to alleviate the crashes, injuries and deaths that have become very prominent in the news and all too regular.
Patrick O'Hara	When Governor Cuomo announced the Third Main Line Track project at the beginning of last year I was excited that some sort of Main Line capacity relief was finally moving forward. Though as details of the project have come out over the last year, I've grown skeptical about how many of our problems the Third Main Line track will be able to solve. In my opinion, there are few things more important than getting some sort of Main Line capacity relief built it is probably the second or third most important transportation project on Long Island (behind better north-south connectivity and

	<p>maybe a contraflow lane all the way to the city line on the LIE). We need far better reverse-peak service to make Long Island a place where businesses are willing to set up shop and to make LI a place that the city's enormous workforce can easily access. We also need to make sure that we have sufficient room to carry those who will still need to commute into the city while being able to take full advantage of East Side Access and other infrastructure improvements elsewhere. That said, it's important to distinguish between a good idea and a good plan here can be a number of different ways to bring a good idea into fruition, but not all the ways to do that are necessarily good plans. East Side Access, for example, is a very good idea, but the current cavern they're excavating deep under Manhattan is not the greatest plan. The earliest origins of East Side Access date back to 1963 when Nassau County's Planning Commission proposed the concept of a LIRR route to the East Side in a report for then-County Executive Eugene Nickerson. But the plan proposed by Nassau County more than 50 years ago is very different than what the MTA is currently constructing now the county's proposal made no mention of constructing a deep cavern 140 feet below street level. The plan that the MTA selected has fallen victim to years of delays and billions in cost overruns since the beginning of the project, the completion date has slipped by as much as ten years and the cost has gone up as much as \$5.7 billion. At \$12.0 billion (per the MTAs July amended Full Funding Grant Agreement) we are getting close to ESA costing double the \$6.3 billion cost estimate from 2006. East Side Access is a good idea, but being implement with a bad plan, and were paying for that, quite literally. We have to be very weary of bad plans not just signing on to them because they are a means to implement a good idea, since bad plans usually turn sour and always come back to bite us in some way down the line. This particular iteration of the Third Main Line Track is a good idea, but a bad plan. Here are some major flaws: THE PROPOSED PROJECTS DESIGN HAS SIGNIFICANT FLAWS--NASSAU 2 Interlocking and the Oyster Bay Branch--The DEIS indicates that the proposed project modifications to NASSAU 2 Interlocking, where the Oyster Bay Branch splits from the Main Line, will involve reconfiguring the interlocking to limit access to the Oyster Bay Branch from just one track "the westbound local track on the Main Line. Presently, NASSAU 2 Interlocking is configured to allow trains from either of the two Main Line Tracks access the Oyster Bay Branch (trains on the eastbound track can go to the eastbound Oyster Bay Branch track, and trains on the westbound Oyster Bay Branch track can go to the westbound track), however, the proposed project currently calls to have both the eastbound and westbound Oyster Bay Branch tracks merge in to the westbound local track, and only the westbound local track. With the proposed plan, all Oyster Bay trains would have to switch onto the westbound local track at NASSAU 1 Interlocking, which would be relocated to just east of GC-Merillon Avenue. That means that an eastbound train to Oyster Bay would have to switch onto the westbound track east of GC-Merillon Avenue, run in the wrong direction, stop at Mineola at the westbound platform, then proceed onto the Oyster Bay Branch on a 15 mi/hr switch. This seems like a significant flaw that will shortchange Main Line riders for decades Oyster Bay Branch trains splitting off the Main Line will have a much greater effect on westbound local service than they do now the LIRR would not be able to run any westbound trains on the local track while this operation (which could take several minutes) takes place for each eastbound train. While LIRR President Patrick Nowakowski has ruled out the possibility of truncating the Oyster Bay Branch to a shuttle operation between Mineola and Oyster Bay, this interchange is awkward at best and may be setting the LIRR up to be able to</p>
--	--

	<p>cop-out of making meaningful service improvements to the Oyster Bay Branch down the line.--No island platform at Mineola station--According to the DEIS, the proposed project calls for all stations New Hyde Park through Westbury, including Mineola station, to be configured to have two side platforms each on the outermost tracks. Previous iterations of the Third Main Line Track project calling for the current eastbound platform at Mineola station to be converted to an island platform (where trains stop on both sides), then a third track and a new side platform would be added in the space between the existing platform and the Mineola Intermodal Center. Having an island platform at Mineola station would enable trains on all three tracks to stop at Mineola, which would allow the LIRR to maximize intra-Island service to this large employment center. By not having an island platform and having just two side platforms instead, trains on the express track won't be able to stop at Mineola without switching to one of the outer tracks. This will likely negatively impact the potential for intra-Island ridership growth, reducing the potential economic benefits of the proposed project.--Several components of the proposed project are unnecessary and wasteful--The DEIS indicated that the proposed project will involve the demolition of all platforms in the project corridor (New Hyde Park station through Westbury station) and rebuild them with new 12-car long platforms that are 8 or 10 feet wide. This is understandable for platforms where the third track will be constructed in the space the platform currently occupies, but the new track is only being added on one side of the existing tracks, so demolishing all platforms at all stations seems to be excessive and wasteful. While the idea of making the stations look visually appealing and improving the passenger environment for riders is understandable (the DEIS states the new stations will have new amenities like Wi-Fi available), replacing the railings or overhangs would be reasonable, but demolishing whole platforms that were not built all that long ago just to rebuild a slightly different sized platform in the same place seems unnecessarily disruptive and wasteful. A couple tens of millions of dollars here or there in the grand scheme of a \$2 billion is easy to look past, but previous platform replacement projects have cost the LIRR upwards of \$20 million per platform. They could leave the platforms as-is and signalize the tracks to Greenport instead with that kind of money. Furthermore, the MTA went to significant lengths to avoid having to acquire any residential property, and that can be seen in a number of expensive ways along the project corridor. One of those ways will come at the east end of Westbury station. According to the DEIS, the LIRRs station design guidelines call for a certain number of egress points off of a platform (at least four staircases and two ramps). The LIRR believes they won't be able to add a satisfactory number of egress points on the east end of the platform at Westbury, so to remedy that, the proposed project calls for the construction of a second, new enclosed overpass (in addition to the parking garage one in the middle of the platform), at the east end of the platform, complete with two enclosed staircases and two additional elevators. It seems excessive compared to trying to acquire a few feet from the neighboring property to just drop a staircase down to the ground. The proposed projects plans for a new parking garage in Mineola also curiously include an enclosed pedestrian overpass, complete with stairs and a new elevator. If it were bridging across the tracks or bringing people to the platforms that would be one thing, but all its doing is saving people from having to use a crosswalk to cross one little access road. Again, probably just a drop in the \$2 billion bucket, but this stuff all adds up.--The proposed project design does not adequately address station access issues--The proposed project design, as stated in the DEIS, is extremely short on</p>
--	--

	<p>adequate measures to address station parking and station access issues. As part of the project, the proposed design calls for the construction of six new parking garages and one new surface parking lot for a net increase of 2,257 new parking spaces at the stations in the study area. Table 10-7 in the DEIS projects an increase of 3,670 riders at stations Floral Park through Hicksville, meaning the LIRR will have a shortfall of 1,413 parking spaces based on these projected new riders alone. This doesn't even account for the fact that parking at all these stations now is at or very near capacity, and existing riders don't have places to park under the current conditions. And in addition to not having enough new spaces in the project area itself, the whole Main Line corridor (including out to Huntington, Port Jefferson, and Ronkonkoma) is expected to see more than 30,000 new riders (table 10-7) between now and 2040, and how many parking spaces does the proposed project call to be built east of Hicksville? Zero. The LIRR can punt and pretend that this is a local municipality issue until they're blue in the face, but at the end of the day, if people can't get to the stations, they're not going to get on the trains. And when left with the choice between sitting in traffic on the LIE or walking four miles to the train station in the snow, sitting in bumper-to-bumper traffic doesn't sound all that bad. The DEIS contains almost no analysis on how all of these riders will actually get to their local stations, and it plays a big part in the usability of this project. The LIRR could build 10 tracks, but if people aren't going to be able to park at the station, they will drive someplace where they can, and the trains will be empty. Station access is very important and its little more than glanced over in the study. Take New Hyde Park station, for example. Table 10-7 indicates AM rush hour boarding's (for both directions) will increase by about 365 people per day. Yet the traffic analysis section of that same chapter says there will be zero new vehicle trips of people diving and parking at the station, just three new trips with people getting dropped off at the station, and zero new taxi trips to the station. How are the other 362 people supposed to get to the station? The draft study also just glances over any potential changes in demand for NICE bus ridership, saying that there likely wouldn't be any and that increased demand [for bus service] would be accommodated with adjustments to NICE bus service to complement the changes in LIRR ridership. Who will fund those service improvements? NICE is talking about cutting bus service again because they won't be able to make ends meet again next year. How many jobs are within a reasonable walking distance of stations vs. how many would need a bus connection to reach? What would be the impact on reverse-peak ridership potential if there's no improvement in bus service? The study doesn't go into any of these things, and many more people may quickly become dependent on connecting bus service if the LIRR isn't going to build sufficient parking. The DEIS is little more than a major heap of buck-passing when it comes to parking and station access. Parking is a significant issue at LIRR stations and not addressing it head-on as part of this project is neglectful and will seriously impact the potential of this project.--Scope of overpass modifications not clear--The DEIS states that some older structures along the project corridor will need to be modified to fit the third track. For some, the DEIS says the proposed project calls for the installation of a new single-span bridge to one side of the existing bridge with the new track running on that. However, for the Denton Avenue, Nassau Boulevard, Glen Cove Road, and Cherry Lane structures, the DEIS says they will be modified but doesn't spell what those modifications will involve. Vertical road clearances at the Denton Avenue (12 9) and Nassau Boulevard (11 6) structures will still be less than the typical 14 clearance. The DEIS does not spell out whether or</p>
--	--

	<p>not any additional measures will be taken to reduce bridge strikes at these locations. Low overpass strikes are a nontrivial source of delay to trains (and typically affect trains on all tracks, regardless if there are one or ten tracks crossing the overpass), and not addressing these low clearances with this project is shortsighted. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT NOT CAREFULLY STUDIED The project website (http://www.amodernli.com/environment/) stresses how the project will improve air quality in part by reducing congestion on the LIE, but Chapter 11 of the DEIS doesn't go into that at all. This potential significant environmental impact does not seem to have been studied at all. The noise chapter of the DEIS uses default FTA reference noise level[s] in the noise analysis, not actual sound levels produced by the LIRRs train equipment. The DEIS does not specify what noise levels the LIRRs MUs and diesels actually produce and how do the levels compare to the defaults. THE ESTIMATED COST OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT IS TOO HIGH The whopping \$2 billion price tag of the proposed project is a lot of money when you consider that all of the LIRR projects in the MTAs 2015-2019 Capital Program add up to just \$3.1 billion. And I have very little confidence in a budget estimate that's just one significant figure. \$2 billion could conceivably be \$2,499,999,999.99 "a penny short of a half billion dollars more. The DEIS just threw out that figure unaccompanied and failed to include any sort of cost breakdowns, unit costs, or anything to support the estimated budget" just a lump sum figure.</p> <p>And \$2 billion won't even buy us a solution to all of our problems if we have to come back in 15 years when peak-direction trains are bursting at the seams and add a fourth track, who knows how much that will cost, even if they are able to get it through. THE PROPOSED PROJECT TIMELINE IS NOT REALISTIC The DEIS said that the whole project will take just about four years to complete: with construction set to start as soon as the end of 2017 and be done by the end of 2021, though that is a very aggressive schedule. In four years the LIRR will not only have to build about ten miles of track, but rebuild ten platforms at five stations, complete all of the grade crossing work, replace six substations, and more. It would require the LIRR to work at a pace that we haven't seen in quite some time, and it's doubtful they could pull it off. It took the LIRR two years to redo the Massapequa station "to meet the timeline, they would have to work on all of the stations simultaneously, which would be pretty disruptive. To replace all six substations, the LIRR would have to move at a rate of one every eight months (since they can't be done simultaneously)" previous projects have taken much longer than that: the Kew Gardens & Hillside substation replacements took a total of 3 years, the Port Washington substation replacement project started in April 2013 and still isn't done, and the Richmond Hill substation replacement project started in October 2015 and still isn't done. The MTA and LIRR have a history of not quite meeting deadlines, to say the least. From projects as big as East Side Access to as small as the Rockville Centre escalator replacement, they aren't that great at nailing down completion dates. The LIRR missed its completion date on the Rockville Centre escalator project four times, and just opened in mid-February to meet the fourth projected completion date for the project. THE DEIS DOES NOT DETAIL HOW TRAIN SERVICE WILL IMPROVE The DEIS states that there will be no changes to peak-hour service on the Hempstead and Oyster Bay Branches, and the only changes to off-peak service to these branches due to the Third Main Line Track would be one additional midday train to Oyster Bay. Elsewhere, this DEIS is remarkably skimpy in terms of what's actually going to happen to rail service as a result of this project, especially when compared to even some</p>
--	--

	<p>smaller projects like the Mid-Suffolk Electric Yard, the Environmental Assessment for which had terminal and yard manipulations and general service patterns from Ronkonkoma. It leaves lots of unanswered questions. What's going to happen with service patterns east of Mineola? Will there still be through diesel service on the Main Line to Jamaica and points west? Will Port Jefferson or Huntington service be reduced to add Ronkonkoma trains? THE PROPOSED PROJECT WILL NOT ADDRESS PEAK-DIRECTION CAPACITY CONSTRAINTS While the proposed project would benefit reverse-peak riders by making trips from the city to Long Island in the morning and back in the evening possible, a Third Main Line Track will not address soon-to-be-pressing peak-direction capacity constraints, the LIRRs largest existing market. The LIRR currently uses both of the two existing Main Line tracks for service in the peak direction now "if the new track is used for reverse-peak service, then they will still have just two tracks available for peak direction service. According to the DEIS, the Third Main Line Track on its own will allow for just one additional peak-direction train during the entire 4-hour peak period: It's unlikely that one additional peak train will be able to sufficiently handle the expected increases in ridership the Third Main Line Track, Ronkonkoma Branch Double Track project, and East Side Access are all forecasted to bring. Table 10-7 in the DEIS projects a total AM Peak ridership of 76,240 riders for both the 2040 Build and No-Build scenarios for 57 or 58 trains (the 2040 Build scenario assumes the completion of the Ronkonkoma Branch Double Track project, East Side Access, and the Third Main Line Track project). Between now and 2040, the DEIS projects we can expect a 67% increase in AM Peak ridership, yet the Ronkonkoma Branch Double Track Project, East Side Access, and the Third Main Line Track all together would allow for just a 18% increase in the number of AM Peak trains on the Main Line. Those numbers don't quite equal out. Trains that run on the Main Line now range from twelve-car M7s that have 1,266 seats to short four-car diesels that have just 557 seats. The scheduled number of seats for each train averaged from the LIRRs 2015 Ridership Book totals 1,002 seats per train on the Main Line during the AM Peak period. The DEIS does not mention any drastic service style changes (i.e. eliminating diesel through service to western terminals) so it can be assumed that the average number of seats provided will stay relatively the same. If this is the case, for 1,002 seats per train on 58 trains, the LIRR will have approximately 58,116 seats available for riders during the entire morning rush hour. This is significantly fewer seats available than the number of riders the study assumes will want to fill those seats (76,240 riders in the AM peak period). If the project goes forward as planned now, there will be at least 18,124 standees during the AM Peak period every single day "about 312 per train" and standee conditions will be far worse on trains that operate at the height of the rush hour. Even if the LIRR were to run every single train with a 12-car set of new M-9 equipment (which will have slightly more seats), there will still be just 76,212 seats total available in the AM rush hour. That is less than the projected ridership of 76,240, and every time a train is canceled, short just one car, or has one of those fold-down seats locked in the upright position, there will be additional standees. The proposed project fails to do anything substantial to address looming peak-direction capacity constraints. Without additional action (i.e. the addition of a fourth track to add capacity), there will be standees down the aisle on every rush hour train and crowding conditions on trains will be unacceptable to riders. THE PROPOSED PROJECT WILL MAKE FUTURE EXPANSION MUCH MORE DIFFICULT Doing construction work in the Main Line corridor will very likely be a once in a lifetime opportunity. Regardless of attempts to</p>
--	--

	<p>treat local communities with kid gloves, the construction work will tick quite a lot of people along the right of way off, and that's inevitable the work they are planning on doing. Given how vigorously the local communities have fought this expansion (before any work has been done and before anyone's lives have been disrupted) the LIRR would have a better chance of developing mass teleportation technology than getting another significant construction project (i.e. adding a fourth Main Line Track to allow for more peak-direction trains) through this area anytime in the next 50 years. If the DEISs ridership predictions come to fruition, crowding conditions will reach unacceptable levels in the first few years after the completion of this project and East Side Access. Some sort of future capacity relief will likely be inevitable, and the problem will be significantly more difficult to address at another time than it would be now. In order to get the proposed project to require no residential property, the DEIS indicates the track will meander up and down the right of way. The existing tracks will have to be shifted in some locations in order to get it all to fit. Doing that would make adding a fourth track at some point down the line next to impossible "in order to go back and add a fourth track, the LIRR would likely have to take 25-35 feet of property from the backyards of hundreds of residential properties in every community along the corridor "significantly more property than would likely be needed if a third and fourth track were built simultaneously now. The disruption to local communities would be significant in the 2030s if impending peak-direction capacity constraints are not addressed now. THE DEIS DOES NOT ADEQUATELY CONSIDER POTENTIAL ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT The DEIS paid very little attention to any sort of alternatives to the proposed project. That chapter of the DEIS consisted of just nine pages with relatively cursory summaries of some different alternatives. There were no cost or ridership analysis done out for any of the alternatives none of the alternatives explored the addition of a fourth track to add more peak-direction capacity or how that would affect ridership. The project proposal has essentially locked everyone into the choice of either building a \$2 billion third track the way they have it presented (with all of its flaws) or building nothing. It's not much of a choice, and fare payers, taxpayers, riders, and local residents have all been put in a terrible position because the study authors did not do their homework. This project will devour quite a lot of political and financial capital, and it will not even solve all of our problems. Stakeholders are being sold a \$2 billion project (about \$40,000 a foot) that will not solve all of our problems and we don't have a clue if there is another project, or combination of projects, that might solve more of our problems or get us a better value for our money. That is something of significant concern. Adding a fourth Main Line track now can allow for a meaningful increase in peak-direction capacity (in addition to reverse-peak capacity) that can better accommodate the big influx of riders the DEIS projects well see in the next 20 or so years. While it would require the MTA and LIRR to take some property from homeowners now, any potential property takes will be far less now compared to having to take property from hundreds of homeowners if they have to go back and add a fourth track at a later date. Some alternatives not considered include the restoration of the former Central Branch through East Garden City, East Meadow, Levittown, and Plainedge. Abandoning the Third Track and restoring the old Central Branch instead would allow the LIRR to build up to two new tracks completely away from the Main Line. Restoring the Central Branch wouldn't be a walk in the park, but the right-of-way is still there, is mostly intact, and it shouldn't require any substantial residential property takings. While it will</p>
--	--

have to get through Eisenhower Park and there are a few commercial properties that have encroached on the right-of-way (all issues that could be reasonably addressed), its restoration would not require any significant construction work in Floral Park, New Hyde Park, Garden City, or Mineola “the communities that have been the most outspoken about this project. And while the Third Main Line track probably won’t do all that much for reliability, the Central Branch could. Right now if there is an issue that brings service to a halt in Mineola (a trespasser strike, a signal problem, or something), all two, three, or four tracks would come to a standstill. But if they built out the Central Branch, the new tracks would be a mile to the south, and Ronkonkoma trains could sail through to the city like nothing was wrong. A restored Central Branch could also bring new rail opportunities we haven’t seen on Long Island in decades, including a rail stop on the doorstep of one of the biggest employment centers on LI: the Nassau Hub in East Garden City. It could also bring rail service to East Meadow, Levittown, and Plainedge for the first time since the 1930s. The potential economic impacts of this alternative to the proposed project may be significant, however it was not even considered in the DEISs alternatives analysis. The idea of using bi-level trains is should be considered more thoroughly. The DEIS dismissed the alternative because it would reduce operational flexibility (since bi-levels couldn’t operate to Brklyn-Atlantic Term or NY-Grand Central) and increase diesel emissions and noise in the corridor (which neglects the potential to run the trains with proposed third rail locomotives). MTA Metro-North Railroad has reportedly been considering purchasing bi-level cars to operate bracketed by two electric locomotives in order to increase capacity. They seem to think it will work, so perhaps the two railroads should chat with each other about it. Reduced flexibility is an issue, but the LIRR may have to deal with it. If the LIRR can’t make trains longer or wider, they have to make them taller, and just run the bi-level trains to New York or Long Island City where they can. Alternatively, expanding mass transportation capacity using other modes may also help improve access and mobility. Extending the LIE contraflow lane all the way east to the city line and having it available during both rush hours is probably one of Long Islands most needed transportation improvements. Doing that would give LI a high-occupancy lane from Route 112 in Medford all the way through to the tunnel. That would not only encourage more carpooling, but make motor coach commuter bus service from Long Island to the city practical. Right now bus service from the LI to the city gets tossed into general traffic (which moves at walking pace) at the city line, and they can only get into the contraflow lane shortly before the tunnel and it’s only available in the morning rush. For that reason, bus trips to the city at the height of rush hour take forever, so nearly all ventures have flopped. More New Jersey commuters travel into the city by bus than train, so it’s a viable alternative. It’s not a perfect solution, but it’s one that has potential (and the Third Main Line track project isn’t perfect either). A bus rapid transit route down the LIE could also help alleviate some of the overall transportation issues on Long Island. The LIRR being the only real way to get into the city by public transportation in a relatively timely manner not only means the LIRR can get complacent and let service decline since they effectively have a total monopoly, but it also means that when there are big LIRR problems, people are left with no alternatives. In NJ, they not only have NJ Transit rail service, but NJT also has an extensive commuter bus network with service all the way to the city, so people have options to switch back and forth between the two. The DEIS discarded this alternative saying that more buses will add to congestion, which is not really how transit improvements work

	<p>if people who drive switch to the bus instead, you can fit 55 people in one bus, and there'll be 55 fewer cars on the road voila! Congestion on the LIE is actually reduced. The DEIS authors also discarded the idea of implementing a movable block system (i.e. Communications Based Train Control, like what's being put in on the subways) because it would be exceedingly complex and costly, though it doesn't say how costly it would be. Even such a system cost \$1.5 billion, were still \$500 million ahead. It's true that a system like this hasn't been used on any other FRA railroad in the US yet, but the LIRR is the largest commuter railroad in the county, it wouldn't kill them to lead the industry once in a blue moon instead of dragging 5 to 20 years behind everyone else.</p> <p>FREQUENT FAILURES OF THE EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE SHOULD BE ADDRESSED</p> <p>FIRST Some of the opponents to the Third Main Line Track project have suggested that we would have a better chance of reducing delays if the LIRRs existing infrastructure didn't break all the time, and they do have a point. Try as they might to keep up with maintenance, equipment and infrastructure failures are unfortunately common on the LIRR. In 2015, there were 33 significant incidents that happened directly on the Main Line between Floral Park and Hicksville. 18 of those incidents were a result of track or signal failures, five of them were equipment failures, and one was due to a freight derailment, adding up to about 1,000 late, canceled, or incomplete trains due to controllable issues. Through the first eight months of 2016, there were 22 significant incidents, and of those, 10 of those were track or signal failures and 3 were equipment failures, totaling 356 late, canceled, or incomplete trains. But most significant incidents don't happen on the Main Line "and congestion is the LIRRs biggest problem after disruptions. Current LIRR management is not that great at thinking on their toes. Every extra train they add as a result of the Third Main Line Track is one more train that has to somehow fit through the East River Tunnels or through Jamaica when there is a problem. The biggest improvement the Third Main Line Track will bring will be for reverse-peak riders, who are most often the first ones shafted during big disruptions. Just last month the LIRR suspended reverse-peak service west of Jamaica twice in as many days"4,300 more people being dumped onto the subway and getting to their destinations 20-30 minutes late. It's not a reason to not do the project, but the LIRR needs to work a lot harder to make sure we don't spend \$2 billion on a fancy new third track just to have all of the trains get delayed someplace else because of twice daily infrastructure or equipment failures. There were more than 7,000 trains delayed, canceled, or incomplete in 2015 as a result of a significant incident that should have been either completely prevented or should've been as worse as it was. Perhaps the \$2 billion...</p>
Dennis McEnery	<p>The MTA LIRR needs to move aside and designate the appropriate federal authorities such as the FTA as the "Lead Agency" and in ultimate review and approval of this Third Track megaproject. The MTA LIRR's treatment of its own stations located in Floral Park and Bellerose clearly demonstrate that it is unwilling or unable to FIX WHAT IT HAS and to do its projects UNDER time and UNDER budget. For example, instead of the MTA LIRR completing some urgently needed stair renovations at the Floral Park LIRR train station in the same calendar year, it ended up taking place over the course of THREE calendar years instead. Therefore the DEIS and Final EIS MUST include sum certain and SIGNIFICANT penalty amounts to the local incorporated villages for EVERY DAY the project takes beyond its schedule, as well as a certain percentage of all cost overruns OVER the budget. The Floral Park Mayor's message said it well: October 9, 2012 Once again the MTAs Long Island Railroad has been found to be wasting taxpayers money</p>

	<p>and its workers wasting a lot of time on several routine construction projects on Long Island. According to the MTAs own Inspector General, which reviewed staircase replacement projects in Great Neck and Deer Park as well as a fence replacement in Manhasset, LIRR workers started their workdays too late, ended their work days too early and wasted too much time in between, a complete triplification of waste, mismanagement and inefficiency. At the Great Neck staircase project, for example, LIRR workers took 115 days over six months logging 5,677 hours of labor costing New Yorkers \$261,000 for a project that was budgeted to have taken 10 weeks and about 2500 hours of labor at a cost of under \$100,000, which is two and a half times less than what the Great Neck staircase project ended up costing. This is not surprising to our LIRR Mainline communities, however, which saw the LIRRs Third Track Megaproject spiral out of control from about \$400,000 to over \$1.6 BILLION without even one bulldozer rumbling through our neighborhoods. MTA Chairman Joseph Lhota should be ashamed that he wants to resurrect the Third Track construction megaproject boondoggle, given the MTAs chronic history of underestimating how much taxpayer money is needed and how long its construction projects will take to complete. Unfortunately we do not have to go to Great Neck to see how badly MTA Chairman Joseph Lhotas construction projects really are in action, or should we say inaction. Floral Park knows all too well how inefficiently and how slowly it takes the LIRR to construct and complete replacement staircases. After watching several staircases at the now outdated and non-ADA compliant Floral Park station crumbling before our eyes, engineers finally declared them unsafe and in need of immediate replacement. We have now watched for months as entrances and staircases have been under repair, with no end in sight. Could it be that the same MTA management that let waste and inefficiency go unchecked in Great Neck is now doing the same thing in Floral Park? We demand that MTA Chairman Joseph Lhota tell us a date when his routine staircase construction project in Floral Park will be completed and how much it is going to cost New York taxpayers. One way for the MTA to demonstrate that it is changing its ways is to completely FINISH the construction at the Floral Park LIRR station by the end of the year, 2012 and not 2013 or 2014. Shame on MTA Chairman Joseph Lhota for having to wait until his MTA Inspector General's report to inform him what the mainline communities have been saying for years: maintain what it already has and do it on time and on budget.</p>
Rosemarie Turco	<p>Please remove the Third Track project from your plans for railroad modernization. The railroad and the entire MTA has many other more pressing needed improvements and the Third Track project is not what is needed. I am concerned about the communities through which the additional track would be constructed. I can only imagine if I lived in one of these villages and a project without justification went forth.</p>
Deb Sawicki	<p>I have numerous concerns about the impact on the Floral Park community, town resources (like the pool), schools, and businesses. My primary concern though is the health impact of the construction.</p>
Phil Guarnieri	<p>My problem with the Draft EIS is its paucity of information. I have nothing of substance to add to what I said at the meeting at Hicksville months ago. And that, it seems to me, is the whole point. There is nothing that has been disclosed since then that will allow for a fact-based perspective intelligent comment. The presentation struck me as the proverbial dog and pony show. Floral Park Trustee Archie Cheng painted a stark contrast between the efforts to inform the communities along the mainline when the tracks were elevated back in 1962 and what's happening now. There is no comparison</p>

	<p>between the information provided to the residents affected by that project and the information we have received now about the construction of the Third Track. The lack of transparency and detail is shocking and shameful. If anything there has been an honest over these last few years and decades for more accountability and transparency in government and our public institutions. Sunlight, after all, is a great disinfectant. Unfortunately, the LIRR/MTA has betrayed the very ideals and values it has sworn to uphold in serving the public by a studied reticence and a hidden agenda.</p>
James Refdan	<p>1) How do you expect our local school districts to fund our schools? The properties named as part of your right of way are commercial properties. Commercial properties pay more tax than a residential property. How is this deficit to the tax base being addressed? The State already owes my district millions, GAP. 2) I live across from the Merillon Avenue Train Station. The idea that a third rail will help is questionable. Your crews are constantly fixing the two tracks that you operate now. The train gets stuck in tunnels and at Jamaica most of the time. The third rail is a waste of money and resources. 3) How will you address the decrease in my houses value and the increase in my tax burden?</p> <p>4) Schools are stretched to the bare minimum and this plan will only exasperate that condition. 5) If Suffolk County is the reason for the third rail why isn't the rail being built along the federal highway known as 495? 6) Who exactly does this benefit? 7) The project detrimentally effects Nassau County towns, villages and school districts. Is there a plan to make the benefitting jurisdictions compensate the adversely effected communities?</p>
Alexa Mastrandrea	<p>Can someone fix the rail road crossing at the Nassau Boulevard station? The Nassau Boulevard, South Avenue one, to go to Adelphi. I've seen, several times, people getting stuck on the tracks because they don't know when to make a left turn. Can we fix the crossing or I don't know, make an overpass for the train? Someone's going to get hit by a train eventually.</p>
Kevin Walsh, Esq.	<p>I am counsel to Birchwood Court Owners, Inc. I am writing on their behalf with comments to the Final Scoping Document prepared in connection with the proposed project to construct a third track running from Floral Park to Hicksville which includes the elimination of grade crossings at Main Street and Willis Avenue in Mineola. Specifically, we are focusing on proposed closing of Main Street at the tracks and the elimination of existing grade crossing at Willis Avenue in Mineola and the effect a third track will have on Birchwood. In addition, the manner and method used during the construction phase of the project is of critical importance to Birchwood since we are located directly adjacent to the tracks at Roslyn Road. Birchwood is one of the largest residential complexes in Nassau County. We have 444 families living virtually on the LIRR tracks on the east side of Roslyn Road. We border the LIRR right of way and Roslyn Road. We have 45 garages right up against the LIRR right of way. Our owners endured many years of inconvenience during the grade elimination project at Roslyn Road. We are legitimately concerned with another LIRR construction project which will affect our residents in a disproportionate way when compared with others more removed from the construction. We appreciate that the Final Scoping Document has addressed many of the concerns of Mineola and its residents. However, and despite discussions with the Long Island Railroad we remain with the following concerns: 1. There is no indication of how the project will be staged along our property. We have our garages for our cars located right on our property line adjacent to the LIRR right of way. We need to evaluate how our property will be affected during construction; 2. If</p>

	<p>Birchwood property is used during the construction phase, the effect of Birchwoods property needs to be studied an appropriate mitigation needs to be in place; 3. If the Birchwood garages are temporarily lost, mitigation of this loss must be discussed. This loss is the loss of us and the loss of revenue so important with our garages; 4. If the Birchwood garages are permanently affected, appropriate mitigation for this loss must be discussed; 5. Mitigation of the other negative impacts of construction adjacent to Birchwood must be discussed; 6. If either Main Street or Willis Avenue is closed to vehicular traffic, such will increase traffic on Roslyn Road. Appropriate mitigation, traffic light, etc. needs to be studied; 7. In short, Birchwood is located directly on the LIRR right of way, a possible temporary or permanent taking must be studied and evaluated; and 8. We are concerned that the project will increase the dangerous walk many of our shareholders take crossing Roslyn Road as commuters to the LIRR station three (3) blocks away. Four (4) Birchwood residents have been hit by cars since the completion of the Crossing Elimination. Pedestrians crossing can't see the vehicles under the railroad bridge and the motorist can't see the pedestrian crossing. The State assisting Birchwood obtaining a traffic signal or light at our entrance could be a solution. While elimination of the grade crossings at Main Street and Willis Avenue can be beneficial as was the ultimate result with the elimination of the Roslyn Road grade crossing, such needs to be done without cutting off pedestrian and bicycle access to the down town from those east of Willis Avenue. Any plan to depress Willis Avenue and or Main Street must be done preserving the walkability from our property to the down town. While we understand the benefits of the elimination of grade crossings, however, such must be done without impairing the quality of life for our residents who reside in such close proximity to the tracks.</p>
Susan Larocca	<p>We do not want a 3rd track running through our villages and towns. This is for more freight traffic...danger to communities! Only one extra passenger train in each direction does nothing for commuters!! Gov Cuomo should try and help upstate NY who really needs it...leave Long Island alone!! Also we do not want land taken away and have to have barrier walls built to ruin the look of our village!!</p>
Phyllis Calvagna	<p>As a citizen of New York State I'm writing to inform you that I do not support the addition of a third track to the L.I.R.R. on Long Island in Nassau County. In general it appears to be wasteful spending but more particularly I feel that it will devastate the businesses and people in the areas for which you propose to add this track. Beyond the exorbitant costs that never seem to hold at their estimated levels when all is said and done, there doesn't seem to be any benefit whatsoever that would justify the project. I'm concerned that the villages and their residents will not see a long-term benefit after the lengthy and dirty construction phase that will stir up contaminants into communities, cause gridlock in small hamlets, and serve only to create very temporary work rather than create good, permanent jobs and economic stimulus that is needed. Further, if this is about moving more freight or making use of an ill-conceived and poorly located service facility in Suffolk, then the communities the third track is proposed to be laid in, are very right to be outraged. The third track must be removed from your project based on the damage it will do. Nobody I know has ever had a hard time finding a seat on the L.I.R.R. if they wanted one. However, they have never raved about the existing system or its cleanliness, safety, timeliness, amenities and accessibility, so those should be your only focus in modernization. Improve what you have in place already. Make it safer and more efficient. Bigger isn't better in this case.</p>

	Save your citizens money. I respectfully call for you to please revise your plans to meet the needs of citizens and communities.
Jordan Tang	Why does this project cost 9 billion? If compared to the Gotthard tunnel project, it only cost them 12.5 billion. They had to blast through 28km of mountain and here you are only laying some dirt and some rails. Please present your proposed budgeting items to a third party for review. Also it would be embarrassing if long island had a scandal similar to the big dig project of Boston. Don't be like Boston, plan your work intelligently and review your budget.
Mary Kennedy	I am very unhappy. This is going to change the rich character of our village, and our community sense of village life. The town is being torn apart, with various areas or streets taking years to do this Third Rail Project. This will be total disruption of our village. The traffic, noise, pollution, and general chaos and confusion will last for years in some areas. All of these so called projects the state does tend to help only a few. They always take much longer to do, cost much more than planned on, and by the way where are we getting all of this money to afford this project. We already pay very high taxes that keep going up. Even if we don't get billed for this costly project, the state will find some way to make us pay the sad toll. The cost is usually one to two times more than the original cost estimated. Once again Mta, state and government officials are jamming this down our throats. We have to pay the bill, though it will not benefit the many poor taxpayers of Nassau county. There are many poor, senior citizens and other who cannot afford this. Meanwhile government has no concern with the poor, needy and seniors fighting to stay in their homes.
Matthew Loesch	I strongly oppose the 3rd track project as designed. I find the DEIS report misleading. Conclusions are drawn on isolated points, with no real consideration for the cumulative impact on individual locations. I live on Euston Road in Garden City a few houses south of the Merillon Avenue train station (~300 feet from the LIRR). When I moved into my house in 2011 the prior third track project had already been rejected. Unfortunately, I assumed when purchasing my home that the 3rd track idea was permanently resolved. Had I known that the project would be resurrected it would have totally changed my purchase decision " I would have offered a much lower price for my house or more likely nothing at all. The 3rd track project as proposed would severely and adversely impact my family's quality of life and the character of my neighborhood with essentially ZERO offsetting benefits. As it stands today, looking towards the Merillon Avenue station from my property I see a stand of trees and bushes. This buffer helps integrate this small train station into the fabric of this quaint residential neighborhood. The third track proposal burdens my family and my neighborhood with the following negative long term impacts: 1. Trains move closer to our homes with the new 3rd track 2. The Merillon Ave station is moved even closer to our homes to make room for the tracks and a larger station. The station is unnecessarily enlarged, making it both longer and wider to accommodate 12 cars, access ramps and a pedestrian bridge, further encroaching on the neighborhood. 3. The totally unnecessary new pedestrian overpass with elevators and covered stair would be added to the Merillon Avenue station at the Euston Road intersection, which would be a major visual blight, and particularly offensive considering we already have an ADA accessible pedestrian sidewalk underpass at Nassau Blvd. Underpasses should be used in residential neighborhoods, not overpasses. 4. It appears the DEIS plans also calls for the track to be raised 2 feet at Nassau Blvd (which contradicts other portions of the DEIS which site no vertical changes at Merillon Ave).5. The combination of these changes mean the vital green

	<p>space, the trees/bushes and quaint residential character of the current station, is replaced with an industrial transportation complex. 6. Train noise will increase significantly, not only due to the closer proximity of the 3rd track, raised track elevations and increased train volumes, but due to a lack of sound mitigation improvements and the loss of essential buffer vegetation. Because this is a station section of the project there are no plans for train noise mitigation, like a sound wall that might be used on other sections of the track. 7. The DEIS did not include any photos of the project area with views from my neighborhood, views that will be destroyed by this project. (Those views are from residences looking north towards Merillon station or views of street and trees south of the tracks). 8. I strongly disagree with the conclusion of the VISUAL AND AESTHETIC RESOURCES section of the DEIS. The impact of the plan WILL in fact have a significant and adverse effect on the aesthetics of my neighborhood. In summary - long-term impacts: the project replaces beautiful buffer trees with a 3rd track and a much larger station with a multistory elevator overpass. It also increases train volume at closer proximity to homes without sound mitigation. The quality of life and visual characteristics of my neighborhood are destroyed. Regarding grade crossings: - We already have underpasses at Nassau Boulevard and Denton Avenue, so we will not benefit from less gate noise, but we will likely be harmed by an increase in automobile traffic (and related noise, pollution & safety concerns), particularly if current road crossings at Nassau Boulevard or Denton Ave are expanded. Regarding construction: - I don't believe the LIRR knows what is in the ground it plans on disturbing. In my neighborhood, there is a 1.5+ mile stretch of land where it did not provide a single soil test (south of the tracks from Herricks Road to New Hyde Park Road). This 1.5+ mile stretch is where the actual construction would happen. Further, the closest test areas (all north of the tracks) are all Category B sites. - I don't believe the LIRR is able to ensure construction related noise, pollution and delays will not have a significantly negative impact on my family or neighborhood during construction or long afterwards. Regarding neighborhood safety: - Our neighborhood is filled with small children, and the amount of children in the area continues to grow. Within the last year or so, the Village of Garden City approved the addition of a "Children at Play" caution sign and new stop sign at the end of Euston Road due to the train related traffic that currently passes through the area. The expansion of the railroad and the station would inevitably cause even more traffic, making the area even less safe for the growing young population in the immediate vicinity. I work in Manhattan and I commute on the LIRR from the Merillon Avenue station. So surely there should be some benefit, right? Essentially, no. : - According to the DEIS, The Proposed Project would result in the expansion of Main Line train service with eight additional eastbound trains (reverse peak direction) and one more westbound train (peak direction) during the AM Peak Period; equivalent additional service in the reverse pattern would be offered in the PM Peak Period. - There will only be one new peak train that may or may not stop at my station (Merillon Ave). This is a token benefit that does not require a 3rd track to accomplish. Providing a reverse commute is a phantom need: - The reverse commute is not supported by any data or real world example. The reverse commute is essentially nonexistent along other sections of the LIRR that are not capacity constrained. The potential for a reverse commute is entirely overly exaggerated. Simple economics: people don't pay New York City rents to commute for Long Island wages; people earning Long Island wages live on Long Island, pay Long Island rents and enjoy Long Island space. - The DEIS</p>
--	---

	<p>talks about 1 to 1.5 hour gaps for reverse commuter trains at the PM/AM rush hour peaks. In fact, the gaps in the reverse commute schedule are similar to the standard commute gaps in the current Merillon Avenue schedule. The Penn to Merillon Avenue peak PM trains I take most often have a 1 hour gap (between the 6:56pm and 7:54pm), so I don't have any sympathy for a reverse commute gap of 1 to 1.5 hours; especially considering the volume of commuters to on those 6:56pm and 7:54pm trains outnumber the reverse commuter trains by a factor of 10 and we pay a premium for our tickets. I find the reverse commute reasoning totally baseless. In the DEIS it states that these schedule gaps leave reverse commuter severely limited in their ability to travel by train to their jobs, however in truth this statement more aptly applies to traditional commuters like myself who deal with large schedule gaps every day. - In the DEIS 2040 estimates, the number of new traditional commuters added in the corridor (several thousand) is larger than the entire reverse commute population (a little over a thousand). The need is just not there. The LIRR has failed to support the need for a 3rd track or proven it provides the best return on investment for LIRR riders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This 10 mile stretch is not the biggest problem for LIRR riders. - I contend that Jamaica is the true bottleneck "a capacity constrained logjam with an ancient switching system. For example, on 2/12/17 a non-passenger train derailed in Jamaica taking a track off-line. As a result, there were numerous peak train cancellations and system wide delays for both the AM and PM rush. How does LIRR expect to add peak trains through Jamaica if it can't handle losing one track at today's volumes? - LIRR has yet to provide any useful real world, quantitative evidence to support an actual need for the 3rd track, particularly in light of other issues the LIRR faces. LIRR provided a generic picture of a 2 track bottleneck, this is not quantitative data support. LIRR provided some historical delay information, however it is useless unless without comparable system wide delay & volume data. Case examples are useless anecdotes. Anyone can cherry pick a data set to further an agenda. - How do the delays in the 10 mile corridor compare to those at Jamaica? In the first nine months of 2016 there were 13 peak hour Main Line Events Causing Ten or More Late or Cancelled Trains. What is the comparable statistic for Jamaica and the overall system? I was able to find the overall system data in the LIRR Operating Report for the month of December 2016. For the month of December 2016, only 7% (2 of 28) of events causing ten or more late or cancelled trains occurred in the corridor (a case of switch trouble and a trespasser strike). At 7% of system events adding 3rd track would not solve the LIRR's issues with system performance. However, 57% of events (16 of 28) in December were related to poor maintenance (equipment or switch trouble). - Even if the 3rd track is approved and completed - nothing will change, the number of delays and cancellations will actually increase due to the real bottlenecks and issues including Jamaica, old switches, poor maintenance, hapless communications etc. <p>Alternatives:- LIRR should focus on maintaining and improving what it already has, before expanding just because it wants to or just because a Governor wants to stimulate the economy with massive negative ROI capital projects. How about these ideas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Deploy accurate, timely and functional communications systems. This would actually help commuters get home in a more efficient and less stressful way. b. Leave on time. It's much easier to arrive on time when you leave on time, my experience is that trains rarely ever leave on time (I have data to back that up). c. Optimize the utilization of the current track capacity with big data analytics and reformulated schedules. d. Focus on proactive maintenance of switches, signals, rails and equipment. e. These and other capital light, non-intrusive
--	--

	<p>projects would actually improve conditions for all LIRR stakeholders. - Capital intensive alternative - Rebuild the double track from East Garden City to Farmingdale: Rebuild the decommissioned train tracks that go directly from Floral Park to Farmingdale and totally bypass this troublesome 9.8 mile corridor. By adding two new sets of tracks and bypassing local stops along the corridor this alternative would more than double the capacity compared to the current proposal. This alternative would require significantly less disruption with only 6.8 miles of new tracks. I may be one of the few, but my home and my immediate neighborhood will be permanently and irreparably harmed by this project. I hope the 3rd track plan is permanently abandoned or at a minimum, significantly revised at the Merillon Avenue station.</p>
Elaine Licari	<p>I cannot stress enough how disappointed I am in these plans, which are obviously a manifestation of the proverbial "carrot and the stick". I do not believe anyone is against making the crossings of the LIRR safer, but why tie this into a 3rd track, which is totally unnecessary except for industrial use, providing no benefit whatsoever to the villages involved. In fact, the way this "project" is planned can only be a hardship to the communities, so why gift wrap it? The Floral Park LIRR train station has had an elevator shaft for more than 50 years that is useless. Why has not the LIRR and Governor Cuomo's office addressed this years ago and made the station ADA compliant? And the plans seem to address the crossings almost simultaneously. This is ludicrous and dangerous. At least if one crossing at a time were undertaken, the traffic burden would be increased, but with all of them at once, it will be a nightmare. One does not have to be an engineer to appreciate this. In addition, I believe that all of the first response/Fire Departments in New Hyde Park are north of the tracks. How are they going to be able to respond to an emergency on the south side? The members of the governor's consortium, for the most part, have businesses in Suffolk or have organizations that will not be directly impacted by this "project". Why do they have more say than the residents in the communities that will be impacted? Yes, there is transparency, but not by the MTA, LIRR or governor's office; only because one can clearly see that this is a ludicrous expenditure of taxpayer dollars. I am a registered Democrat, but I will definitely cross party lines over this issue.</p>
J. Whalen	<p>Where is the funding for this disruptive and unnecessary project coming from</p>
Sam Khoury	<p>For future reference, if you're going to ask people to enter their private information on a web page, you should use secure http (i.e. https) instead of http because http is not secure. Please pass this message onto the webmaster of the website. Here are my comments about New Hyde Park Road at grade crossing replacement options and the changes to the New Hyde Park Station. I live on Herkomer St, one block away from New Hyde Park Rd so I will be impacted by any changes to the traffic patterns with the elimination of the at grade crossing at New Hyde Park Rd. I'd obviously prefer that the changes to the traffic flow should not encourage more cars to drive on Herkomer St because traffic will get backed up where Herkomer St meets Jericho Turnpike. I have mixed feelings about both options 1 and 2 for the replacement of the New Hyde Park Rd at grade crossing because I think both options will increase traffic on Herkomer St where I live. The big issue I see with option 1 is that drivers are currently dropping off people all along 2nd Ave will continue to drop them near the part of the platform where the passenger wants to get on the train because the proposed kiss and ride area is at the eastern most part of the station, basically where the back of the westbound trains will stop. In other words, people who want to be at the front or middle of the westbound train will not want to be dropped off at the kiss and ride area near the rear</p>

	<p>of the platform especially when it's really cold or hot outside since it will force them to walk a long distance to the middle or front of the train. In fact some people who are driven to the train station wait in their car until the train arrives before getting out and going to the platform. I think option 1 will also increase traffic on Herkomer St because of the ramps to/from the parking lot on both 2nd Ave and Plaza Ave will cause people to take Herkomer St to get to eastbound Jericho Tpke since there is no traffic light at Herkomer St and Jericho Tpke. If they use Plaza Ave to exit the parking lot, they will have to wait for the traffic light to make the left on New Hyde Park Rd to get to Jericho Tpke to make the right to go eastbound on Jericho Tpke so Herkomer St will be a faster option. The big issue I see with option 2 for the replacement of the at grade crossing at New Hyde Park Rd is that the kiss and ride area will be farther away from the westbound platform and basically almost in the village of Garden City. In the morning I think drivers of LIRR passengers who want to take the westbound trains will continue to drop people off on 2nd Ave, especially when it's really cold or hot outside. I think option 2 will also increase traffic on Herkomer St because 2nd Ave will be a dead end so everybody dropping people off along 2nd Ave will use Herkomer St to get to back to New Hyde Park Rd or Jericho Tpke. In addition option 2 allows 2 way traffic on Plaza Ave which means more people will use Herkomer St to get to Plaza Ave to get to New Hyde Park Rd. If you're going to make 2nd Ave in New Hyde Park a 2 way street between Herkomer St and New Hyde Park Rd because of the dead end at New Hyde Park Road, then you will have to figure out how to widen it by the New Hyde Park station building because it is only wide enough for one car next to the building. If you're going to put a pedestrian bridge with elevators near S 12 St in New Hyde Park then that's at the West end of the station. You should also put a pedestrian bridge with elevators on the East end of the station between Herkomer St and New Hyde Park Rd. Asking handicap people to use the ramps and underpasses at New Hyde Park Road to cross from the North side of the tracks to the South side of the tracks is going to be very inconvenient for them and will take them a lot of extra time to cross over and they certainly won't travel to the other end of the platform to use the pedestrian bridge elevator at S 12 St.</p>
<p>Anne Marie Brancella McGeever</p>	<p>I would like to voice my opposition to the proposed Third Track of the Long Island Rail Road based on the increased construction noise and change in air quality in the Villages of Floral Park and Garden City and other communities along the proposed Third track. As a lifelong resident of Floral Park I am very concerned about the increased construction noise and that the construction will go on for all hours day and night. Will the local law noise ordinances be adhered to by the construction company? I am also very concerned that the continued vibrations from construction will destroy buildings such as business establishments and the pool and recreation complex, and resident's homes. As a licensed certified teacher in the State of New York I am very concerned for the students in Our Lady of Victory School, Floral Park Bellerose School, and John Lewis Childs School. The constant construction and quality of air quality would affect the student's intellectual, emotional, social, and psychological growth and development in the above mentioned schools. Where will the construction equipment be staged? Will it be staged at John Lewis Childs School? This staging of construction equipment will present a hazardous situation to the faculty, students, and residents of Floral Park. The elimination of at grade level crossings should be completed immediately for the safety of all residents for example at Covert Avenue. The updating of the Floral Park and Bellerose train stations to be ADA complaint can be completed</p>

	along with the elimination of the grade crossings without the Third Track and proposed construction and disruption of our communities. How will the Hempstead line be affected? Will the commuters of Floral Park and Bellerose have no incoming or out coming trains to complete their commute? Will these commuters be forced to be bused daily to Jamaica Station? Will freight trains and dead head trains come through our community without any concern for health and welfare of all the residents of Floral Park?
Michael Tassone	I wish to comment that this plan in its current state does not have enough details. There are too many unanswered questions about how we who live near the tracks will be affected during the construction. We need a lot more detail to be made public. Your website makes everything seem really nice, but we need to know real details about the actual construction. Details about the actual raising of the tracks and the closing of crossings while this is going on. You should already know that the 3 New Hyde Park crossings are already backed up every day during morning and evening rush hours. I would like to hear about the plans to deal with rush hour traffic in NHP while the construction is under way. This is only one of many unanswered concerns that I and my neighbors are still waiting for answers on.
Bernard Schwarz	We ask that the proposed third Line project be rejected. It will destroy the area and cause major noise, dirt, and pollution. Please don't destroy our quality of life. Thank you.
Robert Scaramuccia	I am a lifelong resident pf Floral Park and totally 100 % against this project. It will interrupt our lives for years. Your plan calls for some simultaneous work at Covert Ave and New Hyde park Road. How are the tens of thousands of people who travel north and south over these crossings supposed to get through? What about emergency vehicles? Fire Trucks? Police cars? Ambulances? All so the LIRR can run freight through our villages? No thank you. This project was voted down a few years ago and now we have a governor who is over-reaching. Leave well enough alone and stop this project.
Mark DiPietro	We build precast parking structures, and provided the precast for Mineola and Wyandanch parking structure. Be glad to answer any questions or help out in any way.
Buchari Cheung (Mr)	This is a three to four year project. The resident of the village of New Hyde Park needs to be informed about the progress and movement of the project, every three or four months, especially those related to the Village of New Hyde Park... This will provide local residents with an up dated situation of the construction of the third railroad track and release the anxiety of local residents. And local residents can figure out how much longer the project will be completed in their community. Thank you.
Parul Patel	We are very excited about this project. But at the same time lengthy construction will affect our daily routine life. We are very concerned and would demand for a detail plan on how below concerns will be handled. As of now no one from the Project Team has contacted us explained anything. 1. Disruption of routine life.2. Dust/debris as we are allergic to dust.3. Have elderly (over 90) parent with heart condition.4. Blocked roads & Driveways will cause tremendous inconvenience and unsafe conditions.5. Digging tunnel to build underpass for cars will cause lots of vibration and it will affect safety of existing construction of our home. Who will be responsible for damage? 6. Construction and construction vehicles will cause air pollution in immediate vicinity.7. Please advise detail plan of our driveway and front of our property. We strongly believe that it will be very unsafe of our health physically and mentally and as of now it sounds

	like it will be impossible to reside at our current residence during this lengthy construction period. We will be directly affected physically, mentally and financially.
Estephania Young	Good evening. I would like concrete examples in how New Hyde Park residents will financially benefit from the addition of the 3rd rail...because if we lose businesses in my village that would definitely increase taxes. I also do not see how my fellow neighbors will benefit during the construction period...any breaks in taxes for the 2 year inconvenience???? My husband and I have discussed this matter...we don't see how our property value will increase. Is there a guarantee in the DEIS? Finally, I am growing concern of our health during the construction phase and the future increase of freight trains. Currently, my youngest son has asthma...dust is a trigger for his attacks. Will there be medical compensation if his asthma attacks increase during this time? I also get coughing fits from excessive dust...is it proposed to provide medicine free of charge to those that will suffer as a consequence?
Estephania Young	One final thought...will there be professional exterminators to deal with rodents and other pests that will roam around freely once construction begins?
Robert Wisnewski	I am writing this email to ask the third rail project to stop. My house is about 250 feet from the rails. I already get enough noise from conductors blaring their horns. Freight trains rattle my house when they come by. I also have to deal with planes and helicopters flying over my house. Just not fair and right. Now I hear more freight trains with hazardous waste will also come by my house. I have remodel my home and now the value will drop. Maybe the LIRR can pay the rest of my mortgage if this goes through. My taxes go up but my value goes down. Maybe the LIRR can also pay my real estate taxes. I am just disgusted with all this. I work real hard every day and expect to come home to a peaceful house. Yeah if LIRR gave me my fair value of what I think my house is worth and could move maybe I wouldn't be so upset but that won't happen. I think the train should only go through MTA and LIRR employee's yards. If that was the case this would not be happening. STOP THE 3rd RAIL!