

This chapter describes the public review process for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and summarizes City Planning Commission (CPC) questions raised during the April 5, 2017 public hearing on the DEIS.

The DEIS for the proposed actions was accepted as complete by the New York City Department of City Planning (DCP), and the City Planning Commission (CPC) issued a Notice of Completion for the DEIS on January 27, 2017 in accordance with Article 8 of the Environmental Conservation Law. On March 7, 2017 DCP issued a Notice of Public Hearing on the DEIS, which on March 20, 2017 was published in the Staten Island Advance, a newspaper of general circulation in the area of potential impacts and effects of the proposed project.

Publication of the DEIS and issuance of the Notice of Completion signals the start of the public review period. During this period, which must extend for a minimum of 30 days, the public may review and comment on the DEIS either in writing or at a public hearing convened for the purpose of receiving such comments. For this project, the public was provided opportunity to provide oral and written comments on the DEIS during the period leading up to and through the DEIS public hearing, which was held on April 5, 2017 at 10:00 am in Spector Hall, at 22 Reade Street, New York, New York, 10007. The public also was provided opportunity to submit written comments through the close of the DEIS public comment period, which ended at 5 PM on April 17, 2017.

At a March 21, 2017 Staten Island Community Board 2 full Board meeting, the Board voted in favor of a resolution to recommend approval of the proposed actions by the City Planning Commission. (See **Appendix B**)

There were no public comments made on the DEIS prior to, or during the April 5, 2017 public hearing, nor were any public comments received during the subsequent DEIS comment period ending April 17, 2017.

At the April 5, 2017 public hearing, various CPC members raised questions relating to the proposed project. Some of these questions related to the proposed project's site plan rather than the DEIS analyses. Site plan questions raised by CPC members included: request for clarification related to the portion of the existing Hylan Plaza Shopping Center that is proposed to be demolished; the relocation plans for current tenants; a question relating to the positioning of curb cuts along Hylan Boulevard and how this affects the entrance of traffic to the site; and whether the greening of sidewalks shown in project renderings would be required.

Several questions relating to the DEIS analysis were raised by CPC members. A CPC member inquired as to whether smart traffic signal technology, such as has been implemented on Victory Boulevard, had been, or could be explored and implemented to mitigate traffic. During subsequent discussions with the NYCDOT Streetlight and Traffic Signal Division, it was

¹ This entire chapter is new to the FEIS.

The Boulevard at Hylan Plaza

determined that smart traffic signals are indeed deployed at certain locations including on Victory Boulevard at the Staten Island College. These traffic signal systems are generally designed to detect traffic demands on minor street approaches, and interrupt the green time on the major approaches in order to clear the minor approach demands. These are particularly effective at locations that have intermittent demand on minor street approaches such as the exiting Staten Island College traffic during certain times. According to NYCDOT, the traffic signals on Staten Island are on a computer network that allows signals to be optimized based on traffic demands. However, smart traffic signals, as defined herein, would not be effective at locations along Hylan Boulevard where traffic demands are near the overall intersection capacities.

Another CPC member inquired about existing poor traffic conditions, specifically at the intersections of Hylan Boulevard, and the relative contribution of the project to those conditions. The applicant's traffic planner explained that given the existing poor conditions at certain intersections, at some intersections even adding five more vehicles during the peak hours will trigger a significant adverse impact as defined under CEQR. Because of these existing conditions, the relatively modest increments projected for the proposed project trigger impacts that in some cases are difficult to fully mitigate.

Another CPC member asked if the proposed parking ratios would be sufficient to meet the requirements of present and future tenant leases, and received the response that the ratios are sufficient for current leases. While future leases may have parking requirements, those requirements would anticipate the project as proposed and thus the parking ratios would be compliant. Based on the applicant's parking analysis, parking ratios would be more than sufficient to meet individual tenant's requests even with the requested reduction.

A question was also asked regarding public transport, the degree to which usage was anticipated, and whether service was adequate. The applicant team noted the presence of a bus stop within close proximity of the project site entrance, and explained that the analysis conservatively assumed that only 5 percent of visitors would be expected to use public transportation; consistent with existing area trends, most people are assumed to drive personal vehicles. *