

Statement by Gerard M. Bambrick
Village Administrator, Inc. Village of Floral Park
At Long Island Rail Road Scoping Hearing
May 24, 2016

Good evening. Gerard Bambrick, 318 Carnation Avenue, Floral Park, NY. 11001. I am the Village Administrator for the Village of Floral Park. Also, I am a former Trustee of the Village and formerly I served as a member and Vice Chairman of the Nassau County Planning Commission.

I would like to address the alternatives that the MTA/LIRR has considered and will consider, as opposed to proceeding with the Third Track Proposal. At page 29 of the Scoping Document, you correctly state that SEQRA requires that the LIRR “describe and evaluate ‘the range of reasonable alternatives to the action that are feasible, considering the **objectives** and capabilities of the project sponsor.’”

Based on that statement in the SEQRA regulations and in your scoping document, before you can inquire into alternatives to be considered, first you must define what your objectives are. Here there seems to be some confusion on the part of the proponents of this Mega Project as to what the objectives of this Mega Project are. The Governor has informed the Mayors along the Third Track that the project has nothing to do with the reverse commute and nothing to do with increased freight. Yet many of the most vocal proponents of this plan say it will lead to a new era of reverse commuting.

So which is it? Is the Governor incorrect, and this project is, in fact, being undertaken for purposes of fostering a reverse commute? If so, what studies and analyses and data can you provide for the conclusion that there is a justification for this project based on the demand for a reverse commute?

If the Governor is correct, and this project has nothing to do with the reverse commute, and nothing to do with increasing freight capacity, then the only remaining rationale for this

project would be to reduce service disruption and delays on the Mainline. That certainly is a worthwhile goal, but, as you acknowledge, SEQRA requires that you consider less disruptive alternatives as a means of obtaining that goal.

If that is the case, then we can address alternatives to be considered, and the questions become:

- (1) What other, less disruptive, alternatives has the LIRR considered to the Third Track Project to reduce service disruptions and delays on the Mainline?
- (2) What studies have been done and what professionals, such as engineers, have been retained to evaluate these alternatives?
- (3) Why do these alternatives fail to adequately address the service disruption and delays on the Mainline so that there is a need for this Third Track Mega Project?

Specifically, before the 3rd Track Plan was resurrected, LIRR President Nowakowski had set forth 7 very specific proposals to address service improvements along the Mainline . (President Nowakowski's 7 points are set forth in the Mainline Mayors' February 3rd letter, a copy of which is submitted with these comments). In fact, at pages 4 and 5 of the Scoping Document, you state that the LIRR is "moving forward" with these 7 points of President Nowakowski's Plan.

If so, then:

What studies/analyses have you done to determine that implementation of these projects at pages 4 and 5 of the Scoping Document are insufficient to address the service disruption and delays along the Mainline?

Why is it not advisable or feasible to implement these already identified projects by President Nowakowski first, and then evaluate their effect on service disruption and delays along the Mainline before subjecting residents and businesses along the 7.8 mile stretch of this Third

Track Mega Project to the years of disruption to their lives and businesses that the Third Track Project will necessarily entail?

Also, your introductory film at the beginning of this presentation acknowledges that grade crossing eliminations would have a positive effect on service disruptions and delays along the Mainline in and of themselves and separate and apart from the balance of the Third Track Project. Why is it not advisable or feasible to complete the grade crossing eliminations as a separate project first and then evaluate need of the Third Track Project before the LIRR subjects the residents along the Mainline to years of disruption?

Finally, I want to address the “No Action Alternative” that you state will be considered at page 29 of the Scoping Document. The Scoping Document states that the “No Action Alternative” “serves as the baseline condition against which” the potential benefits and impacts of the Third Track Project will be evaluated.

The No Action Alternative should include as its baseline an analysis of the positive impact that will result from implementation of President Nowakowski’s 7 Point Plan (which are essentially those projects set forth at pages 4 and 5 of the Scoping Document). In other words, the No Action Alternative should be an analysis of the positive impact, if any, of the Third Track Project over and above the positive impacts that can be achieved from implementation of President Nowakowski’s 7 Point Plan. The No Action Alternative cannot, and should not be, a comparison of the services provided now, before implementation of President Nowakowski’s Plan, and then subsume the benefits resulting from Nowakowski’s Plan into an analysis what can be achieved if you proceed with the Third Track Project. That would unduly inflate the analysis of what can be achieved if you proceed with the Third Track Project.