

**COMMENT J-1 (Utilities):**

The other question I have is, back in November when the public was given an opportunity to make suggestions, I had raised a question of the possibility of Glen Isle incorporating a cogeneration plant in their production of this whole complex so that they could actually produce electricity and alleviate some of the drain that we will be having on our electricity grid. On Long Island with a lot of new projects being proposed, I don't see where LIPA is planning to expand their network to provide additional electricity for the region, and I would like to see that explored a little further. And it would also help them with their qualifications as far as LEED qualifications for building as a green building.

*Theresa Hauck, 18 Edward Street, Roslyn Heights, NY, Public Hearing Transcript, City of Glen Cove Planning Board Meeting, June 25, 2009; Section 122, lines 4-25, p.109*

**RESPONSE J-1 (Utilities):**

LIPA has indicated that they will provide service to the development. Final design for electric service will be included as part of the Site Plan Approvals Phase of the project.

**COMMENT J-2 (Utilities):**

Section J. 1(a). Existing Conditions. Water Services (page III.J-1). The DEIS reports that: the City can deliver 9.0 million gallons of water per day (MGD), the average water demand is 5.1 MGD, the peak demand is 7.5 MGD, the peak hour demand is 9.6 MGD, and the current fire flow requirements are 5.0 MGD (for a maximum daily demand plus fire flow of 12.5 MGD). The DEIS also points out that if the industrial uses that have recently closed were reactivated, the City would not be able to meet its water demand in the event of the loss of one well pump.

The "Recommended Standards for Water Works", which is used as the basis for water supply plan approvals in New York State requires that the total developed source capacity shall equal or exceed the design maximum day demand with the largest producing well out of service. Based on this requirement, the City of Glen Cove capacity would be reduced by the 2.0 MGD capacity of one of the largest producing wells to 7.0 MGD. This would create a maximum day demand deficit of 0.5 MGD (7.5-7.0 MGD). This deficit would increase by the 0.66 MGD to 1.16 MGD as a result of the completion of the proposed development.

The City of Glen Cove has a reported supply well capacity of 9.0 MGD, and Department records indicate a storage tank capacity of 4.25 MGD for a total 24 hour capacity of 13.25 MGD. The City would be able to meet the current maximum day plus fire flow demand of 12.5 MGD and additional 0.66 MGD development demand, but would have an approximate 2.0 MGD deficit if the City lost the use of one of its largest capacity wells during a peak day plus fire demand event.

The City should prepare an engineering report and adopt a plan, as may be needed, to eliminate the projected maximum day, and potential maximum day demand plus fire flow deficits by the installation of a new supply well before the proposed development is completed.

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

**RESPONSE J-2 (Utilities):**

As discussed in the DEIS, the City has indicated that, of the previously investigated sites for a new supply well to address the projected maximum day and potential maximum day demands plus fire flow deficits due to the proposed project and other proposed developments in the City, the existing Kelly Street well site appears to be the most viable location for a new well. According to the City's DPW Director, recent improvements to the Kelly Street well have addressed prior water quality issues and the well has been "clean" for several years. The addition of a second well at the Kelly Street site needs to be studied to confirm the yield / capacity of an additional well, the impact that a second well may have on the existing well and on the aquifer, the possibility for migration of on-site or off-site contaminants, and the potential to induce saltwater intrusion. The need for this study was not solely created by the proposed project, but is part of the City's need to identify additional water sources to support potential residential, commercial and industrial growth throughout the City, especially at the Konica-Minolta and PhotoCircuits sites.

The Applicant is willing to prepare or fund this study for the City prior to submittal of the detailed site plans for the first phase of the project. A study of this level will take several months to complete and will identify potential impacts of, and mitigation solutions for, a new supply well to address potential water deficit issues in the City in the event that one well is out of service.

Generic impacts of a new well at the Kelly Street site or elsewhere in the City and possible mitigation solutions include:

- Well capacity or yield – A test well would be drilled to determine the yield of the well. If the initial testing in the upper reaches of the aquifer indicate low yield, the well would be extended to greater depths and tested to determine the yield. If further testing indicates that the test well does not have the required capacity, other locations in the City would need to be tested. Prior studies prepared for the City indicate that the existing Kelly Street well is approximately 300 feet deep and has an effective well capacity of 1390 gpm (2.0 MGD). The other active wells within the City are between 235 and 280 feet deep and have an effective capacity of between 1200 gpm (1.7 MGD) and 1400 gpm (2.0 MGD). Based upon this information, it is likely that an additional well located in the City that will withdraw water from the same aquifer (Magothy) will also yield between 1200 gpm and 1400 gpm (1.7 MGD and 2.0 MGD).
- Impact of new well on existing wells and aquifer – Results of new well tests will be reviewed together with existing well data provided by the City to determine if a new well at the proposed location will adversely impact the capacity of the existing well to withdraw water from the aquifer. If adverse impacts are determined, the magnitude of the impact(s) must be considered. If significant, a new well location would need to be tested. The testing may not completely rule out adding a well at the Kelly Street location. The results may show that a well of lower capacity would not adversely affect the current well or the hydrogeologic parameters of the contributing area. If this was the case, the solution to the water supply deficit could be to add two wells of lower capacity. The beneficial effect of this approach would be to spread the effect of the pumpage over a larger area.

- The presence of on-site or off-site chemicals and interaction of the pumpage on their movement – The presence of on-site or off-site contaminants would be reviewed to determine the possibility of migration of contaminants into the well, water system and / or aquifer. If the possibility exists for migration of contaminants which can not be treated / removed from the water prior to distribution, another location would be selected for the new well and testing of that location would begin.
- Contamination of existing water source – If testing reveals that certain contaminants exist within the water source, treatment of the water prior to conveyance into the water distribution system would be required. The type and level of contamination would determine if treatment is a viable solution at that location. A treatment system is currently operating at the existing Kelly Street well and expansion of this treatment facility may be possible if the same type and levels of contamination are detected at the proposed second well.
- Possibility of saltwater intrusion due to proximity of the well site to the coast – The potential for the additional pumpage to induce saltwater intrusion into the aquifer will be evaluated in the study. The evaluation will not only include the potential for saltwater to reach the new and existing well fields, if intrusion is anticipated, the existence of other wells closer to the saltwater bodies will be studied to see if those wells could be in jeopardy. While reverse osmosis treatment will address saltwater intrusion issues, it is expensive to install and maintain. Therefore, if saltwater intrusion is determined to impact a new well, or if the drilling of a new well will create intrusion issues for the existing well, it is likely that recommendations would include finding an alternative location for the well. However, if saltwater intrusion remains an issue, treatment options are available.

The Applicant will work closely with the City on the study to obtain historical data and prior studies, as well as to discuss potential additional options which may have been previously considered by the City.

As described above, the City's existing water supply wells do not have sufficient capacity to serve the full build-out of the project. There is, however, sufficient water capacity to develop one or more portions or phases of the project. The City has issued a new Water Availability Letter dated July 21, 2011 which indicates that the City can provide 0.22 MGD of water to one or more phases of the Glen Isle project until such time as some improvements to the City's water system are complete and a new / additional source of supply is made available. Subject to continued availability at that time, the early phases of the project may be developed relying on the existing system. The City is currently studying improving its water infrastructure to support all potential residential, commercial and industrial growth throughout the City, including the Glen Cove Creek waterfront, and the Konica-Minolta and PhotoCircuits sites, and other proposed developments.

To ensure that there is sufficient water supply for each phase of the development, with each application for PUD Site Plan Approval, the Applicant will provide a water availability letter from the City confirming that there is adequate water supply and conveyance for each use(s) proposed as part of that PUD Site Plan. As a result, future project phases having water usage demands which exceed the available water supply cannot be approved by the Planning Board

until the City's water supply system has been upgraded to increase supply. Since the adequacy of water supply for a particular project phase can be sufficiently monitored by the Planning Board through the site plan review process, there is no need for the Applicant and the City to enter into an agreement or memorandum of understanding that establishes a timeline for addressing water needs for the various phases of the project.

**COMMENT J-3 (Utilities):**

Section J I (b). Sanitary Disposal Service (page III.J-2). The report states that NCDPW personnel have advised there is insufficient capacity in the existing pumping station or force main to handle any additional flow; and that the City of Glen Cove's engineering consultant has advised that Nassau County has begun a study of all of the existing pumping stations and infrastructure within the City to ascertain their conditions and determine the improvements needed to these facilities. This study should be completed and improvements implemented as necessary to assure that the proposed development will have adequate sanitary sewer service available.

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

**RESPONSE J-3 (Utilities):**

The DEIS presents three engineering solutions for improving the pump station and force main capacities. All are technically feasible and would ensure adequate sanitary sewer service. The Applicant will comply with whichever alternative is ultimately selected by the County.

The Applicant has agreed to provide a study of the existing pumping station located on the site and the force main under Glen Cove Creek as part of the first Site Plan application for the development. Since the former industrial uses (Konica and PhotoCircuits) are no longer generating large volumes of wastewater, the study may show that the existing pumping station and force main have the capacity to convey the first proposed phase of the Glen Isle development. This study may also show that the existing facilities have the capacity to convey additional phases of the proposed development. Conversely, the study may indicate that the existing pump station and force main have no available capacity and the first phase of the development must include improving these facilities. As described above, there is a technical / engineering solution to address this concern, which will be designed and detailed as part of the detailed Site Plans prepared for the first phase of this project. The design of the pumping station will likely include incremental design solutions for pump selection, as well as for the ultimate build-out of the development, so as to be able to convey the wastewater from the proposed development as each phase of the development is constructed.

As described in the DEIS, regardless of the engineered solution selected by the County, there are no detrimental environmental impacts due to the rehabilitation or upgrading of the pumping station and force main. The force main beneath the creek would be installed by either a jack and bore method or by directional drilling. Other than jacking and receiving pits which would be located behind the bulkhead on either side of the Creek, these methods do not require open cut or trenching to install the force mains. Therefore, there would be no impact to the creek as part of this work.

**COMMENT J-4 (Utilities):**

Section J 2 (a). Potential Impacts. Water Services (page III.J-3). The report indicates that the projected increase in water consumption would not be expected to have a significant adverse impact on water services, assuming that the City proceeds with its current plans to expand water pumping capacity. This statement is not consistent with information provided on page III.J-2 that the City has only begun to study improving its water infrastructure. Also no information has been presented that the City has a current plan to expand water pumping capacity. Finally, absent an engineering report that documents a proposal for the elimination of the maximum day demand deficit, and potential 1.25 MGD maximum day plus fire flow demand deficit with the largest producing well out of service, the proposed 0.66 MGD additional development demand must be considered to pose a significant adverse water supply impact.

Section J 2 (b). Sanitary Disposal Services. As previously commented under subsection 1. b) above, the report advises that NCDPW personnel indicate that there is insufficient capacity in the existing pumping station or force main to handle any additional sewage. NCDPW should complete the study of infrastructure needs, and implement necessary improvements to assure that the proposed development will have adequate sanitary service before a letter of sewer availability is issued by NCDPW.

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

Section C 2(h) - Public Water and Sewer (page III.C-39). The report states that at full completion, the proposed development would increase water demand by approximately 662,000 gallons per day (GPD) and average daily sewage demand by 507,000 GPD over the City's existing levels. The report refers to more detailed discussions in Section III.I Utilities; and states that the proposed development would not negatively affect sanitary wastewater disposal.

The statement that the City has begun to study improving its water infrastructure to accommodate the increased water demand from its desired future growth and various proposed developments in the City, including the proposed project does not provide assurance that the City of Glen Cove will be able to provide an adequate supply of potable water to meet the increased water demand needs of this project. Absent this assurance, the City of Glen Cove should not issue a letter of Water Availability that the Department of Health requires before approving a realty subdivision development.

Also, the statement that the proposed development would not negatively impact sanitary disposal, is not consistent with the statement made in subsection J. Utilities, 1. Existing Conditions b) Sanitary Disposal Services on page III.J-3 that there is insufficient capacity in the existing pumping station or force main to handle any additional flows.

Section C 3 0 Mitigation Measures (Page III.C-40). The report states (Pages III.C-41 to 47) that all redeveloped properties and the Proposed Action would be connected to or serviced by the Glen Cove Wastewater Treatment Plant. The report however does not confirm that Nassau County has agreed to permit the connection of the proposed development to the Wastewater Treatment Plant.

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

**RESPONSE J-4 (Utilities):**

See Response J-2 for information regarding the water system and future water study. The NCDPW has issued an availability letter indicating that there is available capacity at the Glen Cove Wastewater Treatment Plant to treat the effluent proposed to be generated by the Glen Isle development. The letter also indicates that there is insufficient capacity in the existing pumping station on the north side of Glen Cove Creek and the force main which conveys the flow from this pumping station to the Plant to serve the full buildout of the development. However, there may be capacity available in the conveyance system for the initial phases of the development. The County is currently reviewing the Applicant's request to study the available capacity within the conveyance system. Several options for addressing the pumping station and force main capacity issues were presented to the County and are pending review and approval. See section III.J of the DEIS and Response J-3.

**COMMENT J-5 (Utilities):**

Section J 3. Mitigation Measures (page III.J-6). The conclusion that the proposed development would not impact sanitary disposal is not correct because the report indicates that NCDPW personnel have advised that there is no capacity in the existing pumping station or force main to handle any additional sewage flow. Therefore, if these sewage conveying facilities are deficient then sewage will not be properly conveyed to the plant for sewage treatment and disposal.

In addition, although the report indicates that the City has begun to study improvement of its water supply infrastructure to accommodate increased water demand, the proposed action, would increase the maximum day demands or potential maximum day plus fire demand water supply deficits with the largest pumping supply well out of service, and should therefore be considered to pose an adverse environmental impact to the City of Glen Cove water supply system until such time as an additional supply well is constructed.

*Similar comment for Executive Summary – Summary of Mitigation Measures table*

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

**RESPONSE J-5 (Utilities):**

The NCDPW has issued an availability letter indicating that there is available capacity at the Glen Cove Wastewater Treatment Plant to treat the effluent proposed to be generated by the Glen Isle development. The letter also indicates that there is insufficient capacity in the existing pumping station on the north side of Glen Cove Creek and the force main which conveys the flow from this pumping station to the Plant. However, there may be capacity available in the conveyance system for the initial phases of the development. The County is currently reviewing the Applicant's request to study the available capacity within the conveyance system. Several options for addressing the pumping station and force main capacity issues were presented to the County and are pending review and approval. See Section III.J of the DEIS.

See Response J-2 for discussion regarding the water system and future water study.

**COMMENTJ-6 (Utilities):**

In addition to issues of placemaking and walkability, there are a few other concerns that Vision Long Island has regarding this project. In the executive summary, under potential impacts, it is mentioned that water capacity cannot be met in the event of a major well being closed down. If this is the case, will the development use water saving measures to the buildings and site to reduce water usage levels? Dual flush toilets, low flow showerheads, waterless urinals and drip irrigation systems can help to dramatically reduce water usage within the development.

*Eric Alexander and Elissa Ward, Vision Long Island, 24 Woodbine Ave., Northport, NY, letter dated June 25, 2009, p.4*

**RESPONSE J-6 (Utilities):**

The development will employ water saving measures as part of the design, including but not limited to dual flush toilets and low flow showerheads, waterless urinals, drip irrigation systems and water reuse in the form of collecting stormwater runoff and using for irrigation, use of native landscape plant materials and Xeriscape techniques.

**COMMENT J-7:**

g. Utilities

"The project would not result in the physical alteration or displacement of any existing utilities, other than an upgrade of the existing sanitary pump station." COMMENT: Sanitary services now belong to Nassau County and any upgrades required by this project will come at the expense of an imposed Sewer Tax that citizens of Glen Cove will pay to the County in the future. How is this not an impact? Elsewhere in the document, the increase in potable water usage takes into account a study by the City of adding a new water well, but the cost of that will be borne by the taxpayer and may not be needed if this and other large-scale residential projects are not built. How is this not a "physical alteration... of existing utilities"?

*David S. Nieri, letter dated July 18, 2009.*

**RESPONSE J-7:**

The project will not generate additional flows beyond the capacity of the wastewater treatment plant that would necessitate upgrade of the plant. Required pump station improvements would be borne by the redeveloper. In addition, residents of the project, like all other citizens in the sewer district, would pay the County sewer tax, which provides revenue for operation of the system.

**COMMENT J-8:**

Page J 1-2

With regard to drinking water, the DEIS states that Glen Cove does not have enough well capacity to support the development project or future growth. In addressing this DEIS states only that Glen Cove has begun to study its water infrastructure to accommodate future growth. This does not suffice as a mitigation measure as describe at J-6. Further the DEIS should address the potential for salt-.water intrusion as demand for drinking water increases.

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

**RESPONSE J-8:**

See Response J-2 for discussion regarding the water system and future water study.

**COMMENT J-9:**

Page J 4-5

In the description of sanitary services, the DEIS states that even with the increased demand created by the development project, the now county-owned sewage treatment plant would still have significant capacity. The DEIS does not address the demand created by other development projects proposed in Glen Cove and neighboring communities. For example, the Glen Partners project that is planned in Glenwood Landing would tie into the Glen Cove sewage treatment plant, and there are proposals for other projects to tie into that line as well. In addition to recalculating the capacity of the sewage treatment plant by accounting for all proposed development projects that would tie into the plant, the DEIS should specifically address the plant's ability to meet the nitrogen TMDL limits.

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

**RESPONSE J-9:**

The Cumulative Impacts section of the DEIS evaluated the impacts from several other pending developments (e.g., The Villa at Glen Cove, Glen Cove Mews, Lee Gray Court) that were identified in the Final Scope prepared for this project, as well as the potential future redevelopment of the remainder of the MW-3 district. The conservative total flows from these projects were estimated to be approximately 544,500 gpd. This load, when added to the existing 3.8 million gpd currently processed by the City's treatment plant and the projected volume from the proposed project (approximately 647,545 gpd), would be well below its rated capacity of 5.5 mgd.

With recent upgrades and system overhauls to the Glen Cove Wastewater Treatment Plant, the plant achieves a high rate of removal for BOD, TSS and nitrogen. Nassau County has indicated in their February 25, 2009 availability letter that the plant has sufficient capacity for the anticipated flow from the project, and therefore would have the ability to treat the wastewater to their required permit limits / levels. In 2001, New York State and Connecticut established a total maximum daily load (TMDL) for the discharge of nitrogen to the Long Island Sound in order to reduce the magnitude and frequency of hypoxic events in the Long Island Sound by 58.5% by the year 2014 (*Long Island Sound Study 2000*). Upgrades to the treatment plant have enabled the plant to reduce its effluent nitrogen levels by 74% to meet its 2014 permit limits. As described in the DEIS, these upgrades include modification to the plant's biological nitrogen reduction process in 2003 and installation of an ultraviolet light disinfection system in 2006. The ultraviolet light disinfection system has a capacity of 10 MGD and therefore has sufficient capacity to accommodate the effluent load resulting from the City's current flows, loads from pending developments, and loads from the proposed action.

**COMMENT J-10:**

Have letters of availability been obtained for all utilities?

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

Have letters of service availability been obtained from the utility providers? Have any of the providers expressed a requirement to modify the project layout or configuration to accommodate the proposed utility infrastructure?

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

**RESPONSE J-10:**

Letters of availability have been obtained for all utilities. See Appendix M of the DEIS for copies of the letters. The applicant has coordinated with the utility companies as recently as September 2010 in conjunction with the City and its consultants who are working on the design of Garvies Point Road. None of the providers have indicated any need for specific project layout adjustments to accommodate their infrastructure.

**COMMENT J-11:**

Page IV-16: NCDPW has indicated that the pump station and/or the force main has to be upgraded. The Applicant needs to discuss any potential impacts of this action, including impacts to the anticipated project schedule.

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

**RESPONSE J-11:**

The need for upgrade off the pump station and force main is acknowledged and the DEIS identifies three potential options for increasing their capacity. Regardless of the option that is ultimately selected by the County to address the reported pumping station and force main capacity issue, if new or additional force mains are required, they will be installed by either a jack and bore method or by directional drilling. Other than jacking and receiving pits which would be located behind the bulkhead on either side of the creek, these methods do not require open cut or trenching to install the force mains. Therefore, there would be no impact to the creek as part of this work.

This work would not be expected to affect project phasing or scheduling, as this infrastructure work would be performed at the beginning of the construction process.

**COMMENT J-12:**

Will transformers as well as other surface-mounted utility equipment be needed? If so, have their locations been discussed and can they be installed in vaults?

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

**RESPONSE J-12:**

Electrical service requirements and design will be coordinated with LIPA as part of the Site Plan Approvals Phase of the project. Locations of transformers and other utility equipment will be finalized as the design progresses.

**COMMENT J-13:**

Cumulative Impacts  
Page 13-15

We believe that the DEIS underestimates the future demand on water and sewage services for reasons described previously.

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

**RESPONSE J-13:**

As described in Response J-9, the Cumulative Impacts Section quantified and evaluated the potential utility impacts from the other pending developments that were identified in the Final Scope prepared for this project, as well as the potential future redevelopment of the remainder of the MW-3 district. Water and sewer demand projections for the project are based on the Nassau County Department of Health "Manual of On-Site Sewage Disposal", which is a standard and conservative source.

**COMMENT J-14 (Utilities):**

The development will put an additional burden on our utilities and power grid.

*Debra Dumas, 4 Preston Ave., Sea Cliff NY, electronic mail dated July 10, 2009*

We live here, we know that this proposed City unto itself will only damage our environment as a whole, adding nothing but long lasting strain to the City's infrastructure.

*Mary Normandia, letter dated July 20, 2009.*

**RESPONSE J-14:**

Section III.J of the DEIS studies and discloses the potential impacts from the project on the City's utilities. As noted in the DEIS, and discussed in the Responses above, some improvements to increase pump station and force main capacity will be necessary. In addition, the City currently has a growing need to increase water capacity to provide a safeguard in the event a well goes out of service. No other significant impacts related to the utility systems are anticipated.

In addition, letters of availability have been obtained for all utilities. See Appendix M of the DEIS for copies of the letters. None of the service providers indicated that the project would create such a significant burden as to overtax their utility systems.

The project will also produce numerous positive impacts for the community. For example, the increase in population adjacent to the City's core is expected to have a positive impact by increasing the vitality of the downtown. The project will also create approximately 19 acres of

publicly-accessible open space. Publicly-accessible open space on the waterfront is a significant and invaluable public amenity. This is particularly true for inner-ring suburban communities, such as Glen Cove, that are highly developed and where most of the shoreline is in private control and access restricted and where opportunities for park expansion are limited. As outlined in the State Environmental Quality Review Act (6 NYCRR Part 617.11.d), in making a decision, the Lead Agency must “weigh and balance relevant environmental impacts with social, economic and other considerations.”

**COMMENT J-15:**

We request that gas and sewer lines be located close to the entrance to our property so that we may connect to them if we desire.

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

**RESPONSE J-15:**

Comment noted. As indicated on Sheet C-11 of the PUD Master Development Plan Drawings, the gas and sanitary sewer lines would be in the Garvies Point Road right-of-way and extend to the Hempstead Harbour Club entrance.

**COMMENT J-16:**

We request during construction, there is no prolonged interruption of electric or telephone service. Our Fire/Burglar Alarm System is dependent on these services.

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

**RESPONSE J-16:**

Comment noted. In addition to the Hempstead Harbour Club, there are several other businesses along Garvies Point Road that will continue to be active during the construction period. Construction and utility work will be managed to maintain service and limit outages to the minimum extent necessary in order to avoid affecting the operations of neighboring uses.