

Kevin M Fitzgerald
Deputy Mayor
Inc Village of Floral Park

Good evening I am Kevin Fitzgerald Deputy Mayor of the Inc Village of Floral Park. Thank you for allowing me and our residents to comment on this potentially significant intrusion in our daily lives. Approximately a decade ago the same project was presented to us and, as is style of the people of Floral Park, all documents were reviewed to weigh the impacts and benefits. Throughout the scoping process our residents along with our business community has voiced and written their opposition to the project. The opposition has been one that has been vocal for the past decade. As there will be many comments from our residents on various impacts I would like to this evening/morning focus on the alternatives and the responses that are in the DEIS. It would seem that the project could achieve a few of the goals if more analysis was done on the alternatives, specifically around Chapter 18 of the DEIS

- Why is intra island service and reverse commute service so critical? What studies have been done that show these types of commuters have been growing or will grow in the future? Which major employer(s) have committed to expanding businesses in eastern Nassau or Suffolk counties? If they have committed why would they not try to hire from the local communities in Suffolk.
- One of the alternatives that has been dismissed in the DEIS is the previous Main Line Corridor Improvements Projects. In this DEIS, it was dismissed and amongst the reasons was that there would be a lengthy construction schedule within the Village shopping areas. This will still be true within Floral Park especially with the proposed work around of South Tyson Avenue for 320 days and Plainfield Avenue for 180 days (both concurrently in 2018)
- The bi-level train alternative was dismissed for reasons such that the Atlantic Ave Branch cannot support bi-level trains. I do not understand why

that would be a reason as in the near future all trains to/from Atlantic Terminal will be via shuttle from Jamaica and would not have to use bi-level trains

- There is only one, four, sentence paragraph on the use of sidings and the incremental use(s) of these seems to be dismissed without any fact based discussion
- There are no references to any expert consultants used to review the alternatives. Who at the LIRR, which is lead agency, made these determinations and what are their qualifications in doing so?

As a taxpayer, a project with a the \$2billion proposed price tag deserves more than a few paragraphs, which amount to 9 pages of a 2,500 document, on each alternative.

Additionally, I look forward to submitting additional written comments before the deadline that will be put forth once our outside counsel and engineering firm have studied the DEIS along with providing written comments on behalf of my family