9.0 TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

Comment 9-1 (Mr. John White, Public Hearing, June 11, 2008): We manage without traffic lights, we may have an intersection that goes level D, but it's only for a very short period of time. And I just want to make sure that when the studies are done, I think it's an important, to look at the traffic hours, not just whether the intersection fails or not, but the individual times.

> ***Response 9-1:*** *Based upon a review of current and future traffic conditions, there is no need for traffic signals at any of the network intersections reviewed in the Traffic Study during peak hours. The DEIS traffic study analyzed six intersections, agreed upon by the Town's traffic consultant. All six of these intersections were unsignalized.*
>
> *Peak hour delays were calculated to establish the quality of operation (level of service) of the intersections studied under the existing condition, future condition without the project and the future condition with the project. Traffic counts were taken between 6:30 a.m. and 9:30: a.m. and 2:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. The a.m. and p.m. commutation hours are the most critical times for evaluating traffic conditions. The counts were taken over a relatively longer period to establish the "peak" periods and to include the influence of school related traffic.*
>
> *The proposed project will result in a minor change to existing levels of service. Level of service is a measure of the operational quality of an intersection and is related to delay. During the p.m. peak hour the minor road approaches of the Site Access and Starlea Road will operate at level of service B (instead of A), one of the most efficient levels of service. The traffic study determined that there would be no other changes to the operating level of service as a result of the Salem Hunt Project.*

Comment 9-2A (Mr. Mike Cindrich, Public Hearing, June 11, 2008): I have two concerns with respect to traffic. One is short term, one is a more long term. The obvious short term concern is the construction traffic. Regarding the excavation and the clearing of the property, the report identifies 1,118 trucks that would be required to remove -- to excavate and properly clear that site. The report also identifies Starlea Road to Star Ridge Road as an alternate construction approach or means of a way out. Now, obviously, that's not going to happen all in one day, but 1,118 trucks, a good percentage of which I have to assume will be (indiscernible) if they're going to be traveling on Starlea Road is obviously a big concern for me for a number of reasons. Number one, there are seven houses on that street, with the number 1 building lot for sale, I believe. Of those seven houses, six of them have mailboxes on the other side of the street which require daily trips across the street to get your mail. Also the bus stops, there are a number of children on the block; it's actually increased over the last several years. And currently, the bus picks up on one side of the street and drops off on another. Now, the issue I have here is that the report does spend a pretty good amount of time talking about the approaches to the intersection of Starlea Road and June Road. And saying that there's sufficient stopping distance there. What the report does not address is Starlea Road itself, and anybody that's traveled down that road knows that when you approach June Road that there's a pretty good line of sight. But coming up over the hill between Star Ridge and June Road, you don't have any time to stop. And it's been a number of close calls personally for me I can't speak for anybody else, pulling out of my driveway, crossing my children, bringing small kids across the street to pick the older ones up for school from the school bus, walking to the neighbor's house. The stopping distance just is not there. And that's assuming the 30 mile-an-hour speed limit is that's not even posted, I believe. Personally, I would be in favor of

closing that road and making it a dead end, but obviously that's for another time. The stopping distance is not there. The safe approach distance is not there. The line of sight is not there Now, that's the immediate concern, especially when you're talking about a good percentage of a thousand dump trucks that are going to be on the property in and out of there, not to mention the heavy construction equipment that's also going to have to be moved in and out of that property. The fact that the report indicates Starlea Road as an alternate, I have to assume that to a certain degree, that is going to be used.

Comment 9-2B (Mr. Irvin Raboy, Public Hearing, June 11, 2008): I'm pretty sure there's actually a weight limit on that road. There's no way they'll be able to get construction trucks on that road. I don't know if it's four tons, [indiscernible] Star Ridge. So that's 8,000 pounds. There's no construction vehicle I know of that's going to be able to drive on Star Ridge, so I don't believe you're going to be able to use it.

> ***Response 9-2A-B:*** *The designated route for construction traffic will be from 1-684 to Fields Lane, which currently handles significant truck traffic, to North Salem Road /June Road approaching the site from the north. In the DEIS, Starlea Road was described only as an occasional alternate. There is a limit on through truck traffic weighing over four tons on Star Ridge Road. This would exclude 25 tons tri-axel dump trucks and any other vehicles in this weight class from using the alternate construction route of Starlea Road to Star Ridge Road.*
>
> *However, based upon comments received during the public hearing and after further consideration, the applicant will limit large construction vehicles destined to Salem Hunt to June Road/North Salem Road and Fields Lane. Construction traffic, including all dump trucks, concrete trucks, and material delivery, is no longer contemplated on Starlea Road and Starr Ridge Road.*

Comment 9-3 (Mr. Mike Cindrich, Public Hearing, June 11, 2008): With respect to the longer term concern that I have, it's the traffic that's going to be generated. We talk about 55 cars during the p.m. peak, 47 cars, I believe, during the a.m. rush, a good percentage of which are going to be going down Starlea Road and that increases the chance -- increases the potential that there is going to be some type of accident, whether it be one vehicle against another or even worse, a vehicle with pedestrian. Somewhere in the report, it identifies also that -- it talks about road dimensions. It talks about a one-foot shoulder on either side of Starlea Road. And if you take a look out there, there is no shoulder. The road is barely wide enough for cars, let alone construction equipment. And crossing the double yellow line is an everyday occurrence not only for cars, but for the larger trucks that travel as well. The indication of a one-foot shoulder does not gives the reader, maybe, the impression that there is room for walking on the side of the road when the fact of the matter is, there's no room at all. So 55 cars, the percentage of which are going to be going across Starlea Road, the people that are going to be coming to these units if they're approved and ultimately built will increase that number, increase the traffic, increase the potential that there is going to be a serious accident, not only on Starlea Road but on the surrounding roads as well. And I don't see how that is of any benefit to the community.

> ***Response 9-3:*** *The DEIS Study originally evaluated traffic for 90 units. The project has since been reduced to 65 units. Table 9.9 of the DEIS shows that as a result of this reduction, the projected traffic peak hour trips have been reduced to 36 a.m. peak hour trips and 42 p.m. peak hour trips. Of these trips, 30 percent or 11 a.m. peak hour trips*

and 13 p.m. peak hour trips are projected to use Starlea Road. The intersection of Starlea Road and June Road is anticipated to operate at Level of service B or better. As stated in Response 9-2A-B, construction vehicles are no longer anticipated on Starlea Road or Star Ridge Road. The likelihood that the minor increase in traffic will significantly increase the potential for a serious traffic accident to occur appears to be low. Particularly in view of the fact that existing local traffic volumes are very low.

Comment 9-4 (Mr. Mark Hollister, Public Hearing, June 11, 2008): My name is Mark Hollister. I'm also a resident of Starlea Road. I will just say that part of my concerns are traffic, just like Mark had mentioned. We happen to be neighbors and everything I would just be on the record to say that I have all the same concerns as far as traffic goes as he does, because of the probability that these trips will travel back and forth across that street at my house and with my young kids.

Response 9-4: *Comment noted. See Responses 9-2A-B and 9-3.*

Comment 9-5 (Chairwoman Curtis, Public Hearing, June 11, 2008): On transportation, that to me that is another area where we have to re-look at our roads and the level of control that may be needed at some of the intersections. As someone stated, we're not a town that likes traffic lights and we tend to fight traffic lights in this town. And we should be looking harder at just what the traffic flows are going to be. And what we really need to know is, if we had that crystal ball, what kind of community this is going to attract. And I think, the design dictates that, because then we know whether or not we're going to have everyone going out during the morning peak hours or there's going to be constant transportation issues all day long. If this is going to attract empty nesters as opposed to starter homes, I think, the traffic analysis has to be adjusted accordingly.

Response 9-5: *There is no recommendation for signalization of any of the studied intersections as part of this project.*

The traffic analysis assesses the maximum impact that may occur, to properly plan for future conditions. The fact that all units are two bedroom units will lend itself to a specific segment of the market that is likely to include mature couples and young families.

Comment 9-6 (Mr. Irvin Raboy, Public Hearing, June 11, 2008): My name's Irvin Raboy and I run Pleasant View Farms which is right north in Southeast. And first right off the bat, the trails are really, really important, especially to us. One thing I would like to say about the roadway, the road is, I believe, 45 miles per hour as June Road. I believe it's even higher as North Salem Road and Southeast. I've seen in my brief time, three accidents already on that road from people speeding on it. And so something needs to be addressed, whether you guys want to lower the speed limit or you need to put in a light, that's very important. For the guys on Star Ridge, Starlea.

Response 9-6: *Enforcement of the speed limits on the roadways mentioned, is a matter for the local police. The DEIS reveals that there is sufficient sight distance, not only for vehicles traveling the speed limit, but also for the prevailing operating speeds that vehicles are currently traveling. The speed study indicates that the prevailing speed is up to 50 miles per hour. Changes to posted speed limits is a matter to be addressed by the Town Board.*

Comment 9-7 (Mr. Irvin Raboy, Public Hearing, June 11, 2008): Starlea's going to be a big problem. They're going to get the majority of this traffic. Those people are going to be going on 84 from Starlea through Star Ridge. And one, you have that bridge there which has that's the reason I believe the weight limits on. It's very, very dangerous, especially in the wintertime. That's a low traffic road. It's got a low speed limit and people speed all the time on Star Ridge. And it's not going to be good to increase the number of cars that go over it.

> ***Response 9-7:*** *Based upon the current development plan of 65 units, it is anticipated that 11 a.m. peak hour trips and 13 p.m. peak hour trips are expected to use Starlea Road to Star Ridge Road. The intersection of Starlea Road and June Road is anticipated to operate at Level of service B or better. As stated in Response 9-2A-B, Starlea Road is no longer designated as an alternate construction route.*

Comment 9-8A (Mr. Irvin Raboy, Public Hearing, June 11, 2008): So I think you'll probably be needing a light there. You guys can do the statistics on the number of cars that go through there right now. But just in the last three years, I've seen a number of cars on the Star Ridge itself increase and the road's in terrible condition as a result because there's so many trucks going through it.

Comment 9-8B (Letter #22 Chairman Michael Palma, Edward Isler, Donald Raskopf & David Wilklow, Architectural Review Board, July 30, 2008): Will traffic signal at the June Road entrance be required? I understand that there is a large amount of traffic on June Road during certain times of the day that would hinder incoming traffic.

> ***Response 9-8A-B:*** *The traffic volumes at this intersection are not likely to meet the warrants for consideration of a traffic light. There is no traffic light proposed as part of this project. Traffic signal warrants in the National Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices as noted in Section 4B.02 are intended to "... define the minimum conditions under which installing traffic control signals might be justified" (emphasis added). The table below shows the site peak traffic volume is projected to be insufficient to meet the minor street volume requirements.*

Table 9-1 Minimum Requirements for Minor Approach Traffic to Meet Traffic Signal Warrants	
Condition	**Minimum Minor Approach Volume* vs. Projected Volume**
Warrant 1 Condition A	Eight hours of 105 vehicles per hour
Warrant 1 Condition B	Eight hours of 53 vehicles per hour
Warrant 1 Condition A and Condition B (Both)	Eight hours of 84 vehicles per hour
Warrant 2	Four hours of 60 vehicles per hour
Warrant 3	One hour of 75 vehicles per hour
Warrant 7	Eight Hours of 42 vehicles per hour
Projected Traffic Exiting	***One peak hour of 30 vehicles per hour***
Source: Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Highways and Streets, United States Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration, 2003 with 2004 revisions. * In addition minimum volumes for major streets would need to be met. Volumes shown are based on major streets with operation speeds in excess of 40 miles per hour.	

Coordinated Signal System Warrant 6 and Roadway Network Warrant 8 would not apply. Warrant 7 also has a crash history requirement which would not be met as the access does not exist. The Pedestrian Volume Warrant 4 would require 100 crossings in each of four hours which given the 65 units would be more than 1.5 crossing per unit. The School Crossing Warrant 5 requires 20 students in an hour crossing a street. Since Salem Hunt is on the same side of June Road as the North Salem Middle School/ High School, school crossings are not anticipated for June Road.

Comment 9-9 (Letter #8 Mr. Frank Annunziata, Hahn Engineering, July 25, 2008): As previously mentioned, the design consultant should address the proposed entrance encroachment within the adjoining County right-of-way. This should be reviewed by the Putnam County Highway Department and Southeast Planning Board.

Response 9-9: *The Putnam County Highway Department and Southeast Planning Board have received all plans, notices and documents for review and comment. No comments have been received to date on the plans, however, the applicant will continue to coordinate with those agencies.*

Comment 9-10 (Letter #8 Mr. Frank Annunziata, Hahn Engineering, July 25, 2008): In accordance with Section 200-23(J), a waiver is needed from the Planning Board to approve permanent-dead end streets that exceed 1,000 feet in length.

Response 9-10: *Comment noted. All Town approvals will be secured as a condition of final site plan approval.*

Comment 9-11 (Letter #8 Mr. Frank Annunziata, Hahn Engineering, July 25, 2008): In accordance with Section 200-23(L)(1), a Planning Board waiver is needed to approve new street intersections less than 150 feet apart.

> ***Response 9-11:*** *There is only one curb cut onto June Road proposed for the site access, and the access is aligned directly across from Starlea Road to form a full four way, right-angle intersection. As stated above, Planning Board approval, including any necessary waivers, will be secured as a condition of site plan approval.*

Comment 9-12 (Letter #11 Mr. Edward Burroughs, Westchester County Planning Department, July 28, 2008): County permits required. June Road is a County road (CR 310). The draft EIS and site plans indicate that a new driveway curb cut is proposed on June Road. Approval for this work from the Westchester County Department of Public Works under Section 239 F of the General Municipal Law is required. Pertinent drainage, utility, erosion control and curb cut details need to be provided at the time of Section 239 F submittal. The driveway must also be designed in accordance with current County, State and AASHTO standards.

> ***Response 9-12:*** *The proposed site access will be designed to meet all applicable Westchester County, New York State and American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) standards. Approval from the Westchester County Department of Public Works will be obtained as part of the site plan approval process. Westchester County Department of Public Works is an involved agency and thus has received all plans, notices, and documents for review and comment.*

Comment 9-13 (Letter #14 Ms. Fay Muir, CWCWC, July 28, 2008): There is only one access road to the property. According to the plan submitted by the applicant, it will be embellished and lined with trees. Trees uprooted during storms are not uncommon. What would happen if an emergency arose at such a time? With, at least 135 residents on the property, such an occurrence cannot be dismissed. By removing some of the buildings near the entrance and moving the two detention ponds, it could be possible to have a road branching off from the main road and providing an alternative.

> ***Response 9-13:*** *The main access road has been redesigned as a two lane road, with a width of 20 feet. In response to concerns about emergency access, the FEIS Plan includes an emergency access road approximately 140 feet west of the June Road entrance. (see Figure 1-3 Proposed FEIS Site Plan and Drawing SP-1 Overall Preliminary Site Development Plan). The emergency access is further described in Section 1.3 Summary of Proposed Action.*

Comment 9-14 (Letter #16 A. Peter Russillo, John Collins Engineers, July 28, 2008): The actual proposal before the Board is a 65 dwelling unit development. However, the transportation section of the DEIS was completed utilizing a 90 unit development therefore, the results of the analyses contained in the DEIS are likely to be conservative.

> ***Response 9-14:*** *Tables 9.8 and 9.9 in the DEIS show the reduction in trips as a result of the project being modified to 65 units. It is anticipated that the project will result in a reduction of 11 a.m. peak hour trips and 13 p.m. peak hour trips compared to the traffic volumes used for the traffic analysis.*

Comment 9-15 (Letter #16 A. Peter Russillo, John Collins Engineers, July 28, 2008): On Page 9-2, it is indicated that June Road has a posted speed limit of 40 mph. However on Page 9-13, in the last paragraph, it is indicated that the posted speed limit on June Road is 45 mph. This discrepancy should be corrected.

Response 9-15: *The posted speed limit on June Road from Hardscrabble Road to the North Salem High School/Middle school is 40 miles per hour. The speed limit on June Road near the proposed site access is posted at 45 miles per hour. As the roadway crosses the County line to the north, and becomes Putnam County Route 55, it is unposted and is thus, by default 55 miles per hour.*

Comment 9-16 (Letter #16 A. Peter Russillo, John Collins Engineers, July 28, 2008): On Page 9-2, under Starlea Road it is indicated that the posted speed limit is 30 mph. However, on Table 9-1 on Page 9-3 the speed limit for Starlea Road is indicated as "not posted." This discrepancy should be corrected.

Response 9-16: *The speed limit on Starlea Road eastbound is posted at 30 miles per hour. The Town of North Salem town wide speed limit is 30 miles per hour, per Section 220-9 of the Town Code. The speed limit on Starlea Road westbound is not posted, thus the speed limit defaults to the overall Town speed limit of 30 miles per hour.*

Comment 9-17 (Letter #16 A. Peter Russillo, John Collins Engineers, July 28, 2008): On Page 9-4, under the traffic accident data it indicated that the three-year period from January 1, 2000 to December 1, 2002 was collected and used in this evaluation. It is further indicated in the DEIS that the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) has been implementing a new program for recording and transferring accident data. Also, it is stated that the data provided will be supplemented with the most recently available incomplete data from the New York State system and that the additional data has been requested from the NYSDOT but has not yet been received. We recommend that the latest three-year period for which complete data is available be incorporated into the Final Environmental Impact Statement. We also suggest that Table No. 9-3, which is a summary of the June Road collisions that occurred during the above mentioned three-year period include a likely contributing factor, i.e., human behavior such as alcohol influence, driver inattention, failure to yield, excessive speed, etc. As such, it might give a better indication as to the probable cause of these accidents.

Response 9-17: *Table 9-2 below shows the number of collisions that occurred on June Road between Titicus Road and the County Line in the three-year between November 1, 2004 and October 31, 2007. Table 9-3 following shows the reasons reported for the 21 collisions on June Road.*

Of the 21 accidents, eight were at stop sign controlled intersections; one was in a no passing zone; one was at a yield sign controlled intersection; nine were in areas with no specific traffic controls; and two were unknown or not reported. Most of the accidents involved driver error, most frequently failure to yield. Four of the 21 accidents involved collisions with deer. One involved alcohol impairment and two involved excessive speed.

The Salem Hunt DEIS reported June Road collision data for the three-year period January 1, 2000 to December 31, 2002. During this period, there were fewer accidents (16) than recorded in the most recent available data reported below, but there were more accidents involving injury (7) than in the recent analysis.

Table 9-2
June Road Collision Summary Table
November 1, 2004 to October 31, 2007

Road Section or Intersecting Street	*Number of Collisions*							
	June Road Intersection Collisions	*Injuries*	*Property Damage Only***	*Non-Reportable*	*Wet Road**	*Fixed Object**	*Light Conditions **	
							Day	*Night*
Titicus Road to Deveau Road	8	2	4	2	0	0	4	0
Deveau Road to Baxter Road	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Baxter Road to Hardscrabble Road	4	1	2	1	2	1	3	0
Hardscrabble Road to County Line	8	2	4	2	2	1	2	3
Total	21	5	11	5	4	2	9	3

**Excludes non-reportable collisions.*
*** No fatalities, no pedestrian or bicycle collisions, no truck collisions.*
Source: New York State Department of Transportation, November 1, 2004 to October 31, 2007.

Table 9-3
Reasons for Collisions on June Road
November 1, 2004 to October 31, 2007

Road Section or Intersecting Street	**Number of Collisions**								
	Failure to Yield	*Following too Closely*	*Driver Inattention*	*Fell Asleep*	*Alcohol Involved*	*Collision with Deer*	*Speed*	*Improper Turning*	*Other*
Titicus Road to Deveau Road	4	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0
Deveau Road to Baxter Road	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Baxter Road to Hardscrabble Road	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0
Hardscrabble Road to County Line	2	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	2
Total	6	2	1	1	1	4	2	1	3

Source: New York State Department of Transportation, November 1, 2004 to October 31, 2007 and Tim Miller Associates, Inc., 2008.

Tables 9-4 and 9-5 below report similar data for NYS Route 121. There were 12 collisions during the three-year period. Half of these involved injuries, one involved property damage only, and five were non-reportable. Speed was the most reported cause of the accidents, with five of the twelve involving excessive speed.

Table 9-4
NYS Route 121 Collision Summary Table
November 1, 2004 to October 31, 2007

Road Section or Intersecting Street	Number of Collisions							
	NYS Route 121 Intersection Collisions	Injuries	Property Damage Only**	Non-Reportable	Wet Road*	Fixed Object*	Light Conditions *	
							Day	Night
Vail Lane to County Road 39	2	2	0	0	0	1	1	1
NYS Route 121 at County Road 39	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	2
County Road 39 to Dingle Ridge Road	2	2	0	0	1	1	0	2
NYS Route 121at Dingle Ridge Road	3	1	1	1	0	1	1	2
Dingle Ridge Road to **County Line**	3	1	0	2	1	3	3	0
Total	12	6	1	5	3	6	5	7

*Excludes non-reportable collisions.
** No fatalities, no pedestrian or bicycle collisions, no truck collisions.
Source: New York State Department of Transportation, November 1, 2004 to October 31, 2007

Table 9-5
Reasons for Collisions on June Road
November 1, 2004 to October 31, 2007

Road Section or Intersecting Street	Number of Collisions								
	Failure to Yield	Following too Closely	Driver Inattention	Fell Asleep	Alcohol Involved	Collision with Animal	Speed	Improper Turning	Other
Vail Lane to County Road 39	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
NYS Route 121 at County Road 39	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
County Road 39 to Dingle Ridge Road	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
NYS Route 121 at Dingle Ridge Road	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
Dingle Ridge Road to County Line	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
Total	1	0	1	0	1	1	5	1	2

Source: New York State Department of Transportation, November 1, 2004 to October 31, 2007 and Tim Miller Associates, Inc., 2008.

Comment 9-18 (Letter #16 A. Peter Russillo, John Collins Engineers, July 28, 2008): Trip Generation and Distribution Estimates are found to be acceptable. However, of the 40% of the traffic that is anticipated to turn left out of the site, 30% turn left onto Fields Lane towards 1-684.

Some or all of this traffic may in fact turn right out of the site towards Hardscrabble Road then right again to access the 1-684 interchange. The same may be true, but in the opposite direction, for the arrival traffic.

We suggest a sensitivity analysis be completed by reassigning the 30% from Fields Lane to Hardscrabble Road (both for arrivals and departures). The capacity analysis should be rerun with this alternate arrival/departure distribution for the AM and PM Build Peak Hour conditions.

> ***Response 9-18:*** *A sensitivity analysis was conducted at the intersection of Hardscrabble Road and June Road. Twelve outbound trips and 2 inbound trips during the a.m. peak hour and 5 outbound and 11 inbound trips during the p.m. peak hour were added to the intersection volumes. There is no change to the level of service at this intersection as a result of these additional trips. The per vehicle eastbound delay at Hardscrabble Road increases by 1.5 seconds per vehicle during the a.m. peak hour and by 1.5 seconds per vehicle during the p.m. peak hour. The highway capacity sheets for the sensitivity analysis have been included in the FEIS Traffic Appendix I.*

Comment 9-19 (Letter #16 A. Peter Russillo, John Collins Engineers, July 28, 2008): On site circulation data has been provided and is found to be acceptable.

> ***Response 9-19:*** *Comment noted.*

Comment 9-20 (Letter #16 A. Peter Russillo, John Collins Engineers, July 28, 2008): A review of the intersection capacity analyses indicated that the truck factors at certain intersection locations and approaches are quite high, ranging between 13% and 41%. It is likely that this high value may reflect the high number of school buses in this area. However, we request a clarification be made as to the appropriateness of these high truck percent values. The analyses have been completed using recognized Traffic Engineering Standards and are acceptable.

> ***Response 9-20:*** *These high truck factors occur at the movements approaching the North Salem High School/Middle School, during the a.m. peak hour period. The 41% specifically is on the eastbound movement on Bloomer Road directly across from the school driveway. The low overall traffic volume of only 41 vehicles, with the 16 buses/trucks at this location results in the very high percentage of 41 percent.*

Comment 9-21 (Letter #16 A. Peter Russillo, John Collins Engineers, July 28, 2008): A sight line evaluation has been completed and is acceptable.

> ***Response 9-21:*** *Comment noted.*

Comment 9-22 (Letter #16 A. Peter Russillo, John Collins Engineers, July 28, 2008): It is indicated on Page 9-16, 3rd paragraph, "The primary construction route as well as the secondary routes appear to have adequate pavement to support the anticipated project construction traffic." Furthermore, it also states "Project construction traffic is not expected to result in damage or negative impacts on the local roads" (emphasis added). We suggest a more definitive evaluation be conducted. This might include, for example, a core sample of local roadways indicating the pavement structure that is available to support heavy construction vehicles.

Response 9-22: *Core sampling has not been done. There is a limit on through truck traffic over four tons on Star Ridge Road, which thus, excludes 25 ton tri-axel dump trucks, and any other vehicles in this weight class from using the alternate construction route of Starlea Road to Star Ridge Road.*

Based upon comments received during the public hearing and after further consideration, the applicant will limit large construction vehicles destined to Salem Hunt to June Road / North Salem Road and Fields Lane. Construction traffic is no longer contemplated on Starlea Road and Starr Ridge Road. This includes, but is not limited to dump trucks, concrete trucks, and all materials and equipment deliveries.

The designated construction traffic route will be I-684 to Exit 8 accessing Fields Lane, to North Salem Road/June Road, southbound to the Salem Hunt site. Existing businesses on Fields Lane include the following facilities which currently utilize heavy construction vehicles and 18 wheel trucks on Fields Lane:

- *Collins Brothers Moving and Storage*
- *Transit Mix Cement Package Plant*
- *EnviroStar Soil Remediation Facility*
- *Carrier Air Conditioning*

Access to and from the site for vehicles travelling via I-684 to Fields Lane will primarily travel on North Salem Road, which is Putnam County Route 55, also known as Deans Corner Road. This roadway is constructed to Putnam County Road specifications which call for 6" of Item 4 subbase and 6" of fine course asphalt concrete.[1] These roadway specifications are equal to or exceed the roadway specifications for Fields Lane.

Comment 9-23 (Letter #17 Hilary Smith & Joe Bridges, MDRA, July 30, 2008): On-site turning radii graphics for vehicles exiting garages / secondary parking spaces uses a "passenger vehicle." However, in this area many people drive much larger vehicles, including full-size pick up trucks and SUVs. Appropriate turning radii for these vehicles should be demonstrated.

Response 9-23: *Revised Drawing TR-1 (attached) shows single unit truck turning radii within the site. Turning radii for a sport utility vehicle and a light truck have been added to Drawing TR-1. Secondary parking spaces are 9 feet wide which meet town standards for typical parking spaces. Driveways allow for a 10 foot width or larger than required. A suitable number of garages have been provided which require no turning to access and the remainder are double wide garages.*

Comment 9-24 (Letter #17 Hilary Smith & Joe Bridges, MDRA, July 30, 2008): It is expected that the site's entrance will serve as the designated school bus stop for residents of Salem Hunt. Even though the location will be easily walkable for residents, it should be expected that care givers will be waiting for the bus in vehicles - either because of younger children or inclement weather. Consideration should be given to incorporating related site planning measures (e.g., provide for queuing of vehicles, a bus stop shelter, etc).

Response 9-24: *The FEIS Plan includes an area on the south side of the entrance road for 5 vehicles to park while waiting for school bus pick-ups and drop-offs. This school*

[1] Refer to Putnam County Department of Highways and Facilities Highway Standards, Figures B and C.

bus waiting area is shown in Figure 1-3 Proposed FEIS Site Plan and Drawing SP-2.1 Layout and Landscape Plan East.

Comment 9-25 (Letter #20 Edward & Ervin Raboy, E&Y Operating Corp., July 31, 2008): We ask the Board to carefully consider and study the issue of safety — the chance for accidents — at the intersection of June and Starlea Roads where cars and trucks will enter and exit from the development's sole access road. As stated in the Plan, drivers tend to drive close to 50 mph along June Road at this point (Note: the speed limit on June Road after the Putnam County line seems to be 55 mph).

If every driver were careful and patient, there would be no problem, but that is not the reality. In particular, because of proximity to the High School, there is an unusually large number of young, relatively inexperienced high school drivers on this road. With all the new traffic from the development, this may well become a very dangerous situation. We strongly urge the Board to require that a traffic signal light be installed at the intersection to ensure safety.

Response 9-25: *The current and projected traffic volumes will not meet traffic volume warrants for a traffic signal. A safety or engineering judgment warrant could be considered by the Town of North Salem and/or the Westchester County DPW after construction is complete. See Response 9-8, above.*

Comment 9-26 (Letter #20 Edward & Ervin Raboy, E&Y Operating Corp., July 31, 2008): We also suggest that the Board contact the Putnam County Highway authorities to let them have input into this matter.

Response 9-26: *Putnam County Highway Department is an involved agency and thus has received all plans, notices and documents for review and comment.*

Comment 9-27 (Letter #22 Chairman Michael Palma, Edward Isler, Donald Raskopf & David Wilklow, Architectural Review Board, July 30, 2008): Due to the large number of new residents the development will bring to North Salem, it seems wise to encourage traffic leaving the development to turn left (north) onto June Road away from the more populated and residential portion of the community. Use of Fields Lane should be encouraged.

Response 9-27: *The applicant and the future Homeowners Association will not be able to encourage or dictate which routes future residents of Salem Hunt will travel since destinations will vary.*

Comment 9-28 (Letter #22 Chairman Michael Palma, Edward Isler, Donald Raskopf & David Wilklow, Architectural Review Board, July 30, 2008): Star Ridge Road is a nearby road that seems likely to bear the brunt of increased traffic heading to Connecticut or northern NYS/Putnam County. Star Ridge Road is residential in nature and will be adversely affected with a substantial increase in traffic. How can Salem Hunt minimize its impact on this road?

Response 9-28: *Future residents of the project would travel on Starlea Road to Star Ridge Road to travel north to Connecticut, Interstate 84 or northern Putnam County. The traffic study in the DEIS indicates that approximately 11 additional vehicles from the project would travel on Starlea to Star Ridge Road during the a.m. and p.m. peak periods. This volume equates to one additional vehicle every five minutes. While the*

project would add to traffic on Starlea and Star Ridge Roads, it would not be substantial. No mitigation is proposed for the additional traffic.

Comment 9-29 (Letter #22 Chairman Michael Palma, Edward Isler, Donald Raskopf & David Wilklow, Architectural Review Board, July 30, 2008): Similarly, Staff Lea Road is directly opposite the proposed Salem Hunt entrance. Starr Lea leads to Star Ridge and will most likely be employed by any new resident intending to travel to Connecticut or to northern/western New York State. Starr Lea Road is narrow, steep and residential nature. It seems any increase in traffic will severely impact this road. How can increase in traffic on this road be avoided? What measures can be taken to mitigate any damage to the road/adjacent residences.

Response 9-29: *See Response 9-28, above for traffic impacts to Starlea Road, which relates to Star Ridge Road.*

Comment 9-30 (Letter #22 Chairman Michael Palma, Edward Isler, Donald Raskopf & David Wilklow, Architectural Review Board, July 30, 2008): It seems that with numerous multicar garages, the development could add as many as 130 cars to local traffic. This will have an adverse impact on North Salem. Can a better understanding of the total number of vehicle be provided?

Response 9-30: *The traffic study provided in the DEIS indicates that the project would generate a total of 36 trips in the a.m. peak hour and 42 trips in the p.m. peak hour (see Page 9-11 of the DEIS).*

Comment 9-31 (Letter #23 Ms. Ashley Ley, AKRF Environmental and Planning Consultants, August 13, 2008): We note that the proposed route for construction vehicles to access I-684 from the project site is Fields Lane and that approximately 1,100 trucks would use that route over a four month period. While this amount of traffic should not present any issue with Fields Lane, we question why this amount of fill needs to be exported. The applicant should seek to balance the cut and fill on the site.

Response 9-31: *The project engineer has modified the grading plan and essentially balanced the cut and fill required for the on-site grading. No material will require export from the site. Select fill material, in the estimated amount of 5,000 cubic yards, will need to be imported for the wastewater SSDS system. This volume will result in an estimated 260 trucks delivering fill material to the site.*

Comment 9-32 (Letter #23 Ms. Ashley Ley, AKRF Environmental and Planning Consultants, August 13, 2008): Page 9-14 of the DEIS indicates that the intersection of June and Starlea Roads has sufficient sight distance. However, the text references Drawing EP-1 which was not provided within the DEIS. This drawing should be included as a figure in the FEIS.

Response 9-32: *Drawing EP-1 is provided with this FEIS. Stopping sight distance is the distance a vehicle would require to be able to stop on wet pavement to avoid a collision with a vehicle entering the traffic stream. Intersection sight distance provides an additional margin of safety above stopping sight distance.*

Intersection sight distance is defined as the sight distance that is necessary for a vehicle to safely enter the traffic stream requiring only minor speed adjustments by vehicles in the traffic stream. The posted speed limit on June Road is 45 miles per hour. As discussed earlier the prevailing 85th percentile of vehicle operating speed for vehicles on June Road in the vicinity of the site access is 50 mph for vehicles traveling northbound and 49 mph for vehicles traveling southbound.

As shown in Drawing EP-1, the available sight distance measurements for each approach at the proposed site access is more than 555 looking to the north and more than 555 feet looking to the south (see attached drawing). There is sufficient intersection sight distance in both directions at the proposed site access to meet the AASHTO recommendations for the prevailing operating speed of 50 miles per hour.