Section 3.7 Transportation

**Comment 3.7-1-PHT:** What has been done to mitigate traffic impacts not only on Route 22 but also on Old Route 22? Assuming there will be major impacts on Route 22, what is done there? And if this traffic is funneled to Old Route 22, what's being done to measure and mitigate those impacts? [Michael Peek, November 17, 2007 Public Hearing Transcript, page 87]

> **Response 3.7-1-PHT:** Mitigation for Route 22 is proposed in the DEIS and will be implemented under the NYSDOT Highway Permit process. It is not anticipated that project generated traffic will utilize Old Route 22 (CR 81) to any extent, and, thus, no mitigation is proposed for that roadway. Please see Response 3.7-13-19A regarding the intersection of CR 81 and Dunn Road.

**Comment 3.7-2-PHT:** Several commentators voiced concern about the safety of the winery entrance on DeLavergne Hill (Rt. 44). Sight distance from the winery intersection, speed of heavy trucks traveling down the hill, and frequent accidents were commented on. [Bart Wu, November 17, 2007 Public Hearing Transcript, pgs. 97-98; Dean Kaye, November 17, 2007 Public Hearing Transcript, pgs. 153-154; and Sharon Kroeger, November 17, 2007 Public Hearing Transcript, pgs. 59-60]

> **Response 3.7-2-PHT:** Access points will be properly designed in accordance with NYSDOT requirements as part of the NYSDOT Highway Work Permit process. NYSDOT will review and approve all work to be performed within the State right of way, including project access locations on State highways, prior to granting approval for the work to be done under the permit process.

**Comment 3.7-3-PHT:** What's been done to increase or augment parking at the Metro North train station to accommodate what's sure to be a pretty significant increase in demand there? I'm a full time resident and I don't commute every day, but I hop on the train a couple of times a week and if I don't get there for the first train, sometimes I'm lucky if I can find a parking spot. [Michael Peek, November 17, 2007 Public Hearing Transcript, pgs. 87-88]

> **Response 3.7-3-PHT:** MTA is an Interested Agency. They were sent a DEIS for review and comment; however, no comments were received. The Applicant is also providing a shuttle between the resort and the train station so it is anticipated that some project users will not necessarily be parking at the train station. The Applicant spoke with representatives of Metro North in July 2008, who indicated that there are plans being developed to expand the parking lot at the Wassaic train station. However, the size and timing of the expansion have not yet been decided; it is thought that the expansion could accommodate an additional 400 cars. Please also see Response 2.1-4-GP17.

**Comment 3.7-4-PHT:** Will there be a shuttle bus to and from the train station? I assume so, but I can't find it in the DEIS. [Michael Peek, November 17, 2007 Public Hearing Transcript, page 88]

> **Response 3.7-4-PHT:** The Applicant is proposing to run a shuttle from the resort to the train station and from the resort to the hamlet of Amenia. A specific schedule has not yet been developed.

**Comment 3.7-5-PHT:** I have commuted by train; on Friday nights trying to get a seat on the train coming up from Manhattan is a nightmare. There are almost no seats available. There will be demand to run more trains and related safety issues. [Cheryl Morse, November 17, 2007 Public Hearing Transcript, page 142]

> **Response 3.7-5-PHT:** There may be increased demand for trains; however, the frequency of trains is out of the Applicant's control. The Applicant contacted representatives of Metro North Transportation Authority (MTA) to inquire about any future plans to increase the frequency of trains. Vahak Khajekian of MTA responded that ridership is monitored almost daily and as demand increases, service will be increased. He also noted that the service increase may initially happen by adding cars to existing trains and could eventually lead to adding more trains.[12]

**Comment 3.7-6-PHT:** Where are people going to park when they go out into Town? You can barely find a parking space at the train station now. You really can't find a space at the post office. You can't park at the local store. You can put cars underground on the project site but not anywhere else in town. [Bart Wu, November 17, 2007 Public Hearing Transcript, pg 99]

> **Response 3.7-6-PHT:** Parking in the downtown area is beyond the control of the Applicant. The Silo Ridge project will have a shuttle for residents and visitors that will run between the site, the train station, and the hamlet. This is expected to reduce some of the demand for parking at the train station and in Town caused by the Silo Ridge project. As noted in Response 3.7-3-PHT, Metro North is planning to expand the parking lot at the Wassaic train station, although the timing and details of the expansion have not yet been established.
>
> In addition, in response to this comment, the Applicant conducted a parking study of the downtown hamlet area. The report is included as Appendix K of this FEIS. The downtown area, for the purpose of this study, is defined as centered at the intersection of Routes 22/44/343 and the area studied is along those routes. The study area is further defined as the existing on-street parking, designated by either pavement markings or signing, and off-street

[12] Conversation between Mike Dignacco and Vahak Khajekian of MTA on August 12, 2008.

parking areas adjacent to the on-street parking locations. This report documents the existing parking conditions, existing parking supply, existing Saturday and weekday parking demand. The study also discusses the anticipated impact of the Silo Ridge project generated traffic on the existing parking supply.

The findings of the report indicate that there are a total of 103 on-street parking "spots" as determined during field observations in the study area. Route 44 contains 19, with nine on the north side and 10 on the south side. All parking on Route 44 is limited to one hour duration by signing. Route 343 contains 84 parking "spots", with 36 on the north side and 48 on the south side. All parking is limited by signing to two hour duration, with two exceptions. Seven parking spots of one hour duration are located on the south side of Route 343 immediately after the main intersection of Routes 22/44/343, including in front of the Post Office. Eight possible on-street parking spots in front of the Cumberland Farms store on the north side of Route 343 are not designated as to duration by signing.

Field counts of parked vehicles were undertaken on Saturday August 16, 2008, from 9:00am to 7:00pm, and on Monday August 18, 2008 from 10:00am to 7:00pm. Counts were taken at one-half hour intervals. In addition, periodic counts at two hour intervals were taken at off-street parking areas at the Four Brothers restaurant and the school.

The field recorded counts are documented by number of parked vehicles and % of parking supply used. Tables 1 and 2 in Appendix M document the counts of Saturday, August 16 and Monday, August 18, respectively.

The field counts on both days showed minimal use of the existing on-street parking in the downtown area of Amenia. Periodic review of the school lot on Route 22 north of the intersection did not show any use of the facility above one or two vehicles. Reviews of the Four Brothers parking lot showed some use during non-business hours, and the expected increased use during times of the restaurant being open.

On Saturday, August 16, the time frame of 9:00 to 9:30 am exhibited the highest number of parked vehicles with just 18 vehicles parked, or 17% of supply. In other words 83% of the existing parking supply, or 85 parking spaces were available during the busiest half hour period on Saturday. The average demand on Saturday was 10 vehicles or 10% of supply.

On Monday, August 18, the time frame of 11:30 am to 12:00 pm and 12:00 pm to 12:30 pm exhibited the highest number of parked vehicles, with 22 vehicles parked, or 21% of supply. In other words 79% of the existing parking supply,

or 81 parking spaces were available during the busiest half hour periods on Monday. The average demand on Monday was 16 vehicles or 16% of supply.

*Impact of Silo Ridge on Parking*

The Silo Ridge Resort project proposes to build 338 residential units and 300 hotel units as well as related facilities, including retail and service facilities in a Traditional Neighborhood environment. In regard to retail facilities, it is proposed to include approximately 18,627 square feet (sf) of retail on the site's Village Green, 2,000 sf of sundry/gift shop space in the hotel, 1,500 sf of retail in the proposed spa area, and 4,000 sf for the golf pro shop

Assume that on an average day 75% of the residential/hotel units are occupied. Further assume that each occupied unit makes a trip into Amenia during the course of an 8-hour period. Trips made to get gasoline, or visit the Four Brothers restaurant for example, would not utilize the on-street parking supply. Accordingly, assume that 75% of the trips made utilize the on-street parking supply, a very conservative, or worse case, assumption. Accordingly, of the 480 trips over the 8-hour period, 360 on-street parking spots would be utilized over the 8-hour period, or 45 spots per hour. The average number of parking spots not used currently is over 80 per hour. This is well above the demand associated with the project under this scenario, and the remaining supply of on-street parking is sufficient to handle the scenario of Silo Ridge generated parking demand presented. See Appendix K for the full parking study.

**Comment 3.7-7-PHT:** The hill does get shut down in the winter by local police when it is deemed too dangerous. Putting homes and a winery on this hill could be a nightmare, especially winter. [Elizabeth Whaley, November 17, 2007 Public Hearing Transcript, page 134]

**Response 3.7-7-PHT:** If Route 44 is being closed now in inclement weather, it is assumed that this would continue in the future, as determined necessary for safety. Any residents and businesses in this location would be affected by an emergency road closure in the same manner as residents and businesses elsewhere in the town that periodically experience road closures.

**Comment 3.7-8-PHT:** The cumulative impact of all the surrounding incoming resorts on watershed and traffic should be very carefully considered. There's a 550 resort community coming into Pawling. There are 1400 homes coming into Dover for Dover Knolls. There are a thousand units, 943 for the Carvel. The cumulative impact of all of those on the traffic and the watershed is not being considered in these individual EISs, and I would urge you to consider that. [Tonia Shoumatoff, March 5, 2008 Public Hearing Transcript, page 23]

**Response 3.7-8-PHT:** As noted in the TIS (Appendix 9.4 of the DEIS), the 2% background growth rate addresses general background growth in the area of the site. NYSDOT and DCDPW were recently contacted and confirmed the use of the 2% rate as appropriate (see Appendix E, "Correspondence"). Accordingly, it is not necessary to include the trip generation of any of the aforementioned projects in the traffic analysis. Also refer to Response 3.7-25-31U.

**Comment 3.7-9-PHT/41BBB:** The winery is going to have 80 seats, which means you're going to have parking for 40 cars. Where are those cars going to park? How are you going to manage this? [Bart Wu, November 17, 2007 Public Hearing Transcript, page 97; Letter, March 25, 2008, Comment BBB, page 11]

**Response 3.7-9-PHT/41BBB:** The parking for the winery is indicated on the site plan. There are 30 self park spaces indicated on the site plan and another 15 spaces available in an overflow grass area. During busy periods, valet parking would increase the capacity for this facility even further. The Code requires 27 spaces (or 1 parking space per 3 seats) for a restaurant use.

**Comment 3.7-10-5I:** Serious traffic congestion develops as a result of many more vehicles in the Resort than projected in the DEIS. While it is possible to take a train from NYC to Wassaic, it is not practical to get around Dutchess County without a car. One should assume that many units in the resort will have at least two cars. [G.A. Mudge, Letter, March 19, 2008, Comment I, page 3]

**Response 3.7-10-5I:** The traffic projected in the DEIS is based on the proposed land uses in the MDP and is considered conservative because the residential traffic was based on the worst-case scenario of all homes being occupied on a full-time, permanent basis. This is considered unlikely. Trip generation, or the number of trips that a type of land use is expected to generate, is based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Handbook, a nationally accepted source for trip generation data for over 150 different land uses. The ITE data is based on studies conducted nationwide.

Land Use Codes 210 and 230 for residential land uses were used to generate the residential trip rates. ITE does not provide rates based on area of a residential home. According to ITE, "the number of dwelling units is generally used as the independent variable of choice because it is usually readily available, easy to project, and has a high correlation with average weekday vehicle trips. Using the weekday PM peak period as an example, Land Use 210 has 0.71 vehicles entering per dwelling unit and 0.42 vehicles leaving per dwelling unit. Therefore, for that period, there are 1.13 trips per dwelling unit.

**Comment 3.7-11-15B:** Families in the spread out homes will require transportation over town, county and state roads into the village for services and normal shopping needs. Some of this requirement could be met with scheduled public transportation from the Silo Ridge site to town and or the train station. This service would not be feasible in a spread out format. [Rudolph Eschbach, Letter, January 24, 2008, Comment B, page 1]

**Response 3.7-11-15B:** Comment noted.

**Comment 3.7-12-16B:** Assuming that each unit has an average of three bedrooms, with an average of three people per unit who have a total average of two cars, that would amount to an additional 1,200 people and 800 cars to the hamlet. That excludes people who would stay at the proposed 120-room hotel (which could potentially expand to 300 rooms, according to Silo Ridge developers). This has the potential to greatly impact the population of all Amenia, including Smithfield, Wassaic and South Amenia. There are other large tracts of land that could be used for a large development if Amenia wants to expand that way. [Arlouine Wu, *The Millerton News* editorial, October 11, 2007, Comment B]

**Response 3.7-12-16B:** Comment noted.

**Comment 3.7-13-19A:** This office has reviewed the material for the proposed Silo Ridge Resort Community transmitted by The Chazen Companies via cover letter dated October 11, 2007. This office has a concern about the findings of the Traffic Impact Study conducted for the project. In the analysis of the Route 22/Lake Amenia Road/Dunn Road intersection, it appears that the proposed action will result in a decrease in Level of Service (LOS) for Dunn Road westbound traffic under all peak times studied. It is apparent that the westbound traffic on Dunn Road at this intersection is originating from northbound County Route 81 (Old Route 22) a few hundred feet to the east. Vehicles must negotiate a left turn from CR 81 onto Dunn Road at a severely skewed intersection with poor geometric alignment. As this intersection will be subject to additional traffic as a result of the proposed action, the CR 81/Dunn Road intersection should be evaluated for safety and capacity. Safety enhancements of the CR 81/Dunn Road intersection should be proposed and implemented as necessary by the applicant to prevent a decrease in the safety or LOS of this intersection. This office will review proposed safety improvements as necessary. [Robert Balkind, Dutchess County Public Works, Letter, October 29, 2007]

**Response 3.7-13-19A:** As noted in the DEIS, there will be a decrease in LOS for the Route 22/Lake Amenia Road/ Dunn Road intersection as a result of the proposed project. However, the decrease is due to increased traffic on Route 22, not on Dunn Road. It is projected that the maximum increase in Dunn Road traffic will be three cars. Although this increase would have no

significant impact on Dunn Road or its intersection with CR 81 (Old Route 22), the Applicant will work with Dutchess County at the appropriate time during the project site work to address the County's concern.

**Comment 3.7-14-20A:** In the Description of the Proposed Action, Page 2-19, the Applicant states that 483,000 cubic yards of cut and 596,000 cubic yards off fill will be required to construct the project. There will also be a need for 156,000 cubic yards of cut and 43,000 cubic yards of fill to construct the golf course. Although the applicant states that all materials will be utilized on the site, the project calls for massive amounts of earth to be moved around the site. The capacity of commonly used dump trucks is generally 14 cubic yards. So, for example, to move 483,000 cubic yards of excavated material around the site 34,500 truck trips will be needed. The emissions from the earth-moving machinery may have a significant impact on the air quality in the Route 22 valley. There is no discussion of air quality impacts during construction and/or operational phases from excavation or truck traffic activities. What will be impacts from such motor vehicle operations on levels of carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, volatile organic compounds, ozone, particulates and sulphur oxides? In what air quality control region is the project located, and is this area currently attaining air quality standards? [Elaine LaBella, Housatonic Valley Association, Letter, March, 25, 2008, Comment A, pages 1-2]

**Response 3.7-14-20A:** The project site is located in NYSDEC Region 3, the Hudson Valley Air Quality Control Region. The Poughkeepsie area (Putnam, Orange, and Dutchess Counties) was designated by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in 2004 as a moderate non-attainment area for Ozone.

In May 2004, as part of its Clean Diesel program, EPA finalized a comprehensive rule to reduce emissions from non-road diesel engines by integrating engine and fuel controls as a system to gain emissions reductions. The new engine standards will reduce particulate matter (PM) and nitric oxides (NOx) emissions by 90%. New Fuel requirements mandated by the EPA will also decrease sulphur in fuel by more that 99%. These new engine and fuel control systems have already been implemented in newer engine designs, which will comprise the majority of the equipment used during this project.

As the site plans are advanced in support of the site plan approval, detailed site grading will be refined in an attempt to achieve a more favorable (i.e., balanced) cut and fill. Some benefits to a more favorable cut and fill scenario include reduced earthwork, minimized off-site construction traffic, maximization of natural areas, preservation of existing natural hydrology, and minimized soil erosion. Dust control measures to be used during construction have been identified in the DEIS and will be implemented to

minimize potential dust impacts from earth-moving activities, including when soil is being transported within the site.

According to the construction contractor for the project (The Pike Company), it is estimated that up to 50 pieces of heavy equipment could be utilized during the construction of the project. However, the number of pieces of equipment operating at any given time will be much less and will be dependent on the specific activities that are occurring at the time. Some types of equipment, such as bulldozers, loaders, and tractors, will be used throughout the duration of construction, while others such as pavers and stone crushers will be used for a period of 6-8 months as needed.

During site work and construction operations there will be a wide variety and size of vehicles used to deliver the equipment and materials required to complete the project. The quantity of delivery vehicles arriving on site will vary from day to day and will be regulated on the particular construction activities. For example, 40 to 150 cubic yards of concrete may placed on any given day; this activity will generate between 4 and 15 concrete truck deliveries. Four hundred cubic yards of pavement stone base may be placed in one day; this activity may generate 20 to 25 dump truck deliveries. Throughout construction, deliveries will be made for all aspects of the project and the number of delivery trucks may vary from five one day to 25 the next day. For the duration of the project, it is reasonable to assume an average of 5 to 15 delivery vehicles arriving on the site each day.

The types of delivery vehicles that are anticipated include: concrete trucks, dump trucks, flat bed tractor trailers, box type tractor trailers, box type trucks and vans and pickup trucks. An estimated average of 100 construction worker and administrative vehicles will arrive daily during the initial 2 years of work. After that it is expected to be reduced.

In summary, by being in compliance with the latest changes in fuel emissions standards, implementing efficient grading plans, and minimizing the number of vehicles required at any given time, minimal impacts to the area's air quality can be achieved. The scale of emissions from this construction project relative to the baseload emissions for a non-attainment area will therefore be negligible.

**Comment 3.7-15-27F:** The Comprehensive Plan Update cites the potential economic and recreational benefits of an appropriately designed resort community based on traditional neighborhood development guidelines. The Plan also acknowledges the importance of the Metro-North Railroad extension to the stations at Wassaic and Ten Mile River and the potential for transit-oriented development at both locations. The Route 22 location of the proposed Silo Ridge Resort

Community will encourage traffic-reducing energy-saving connections among the railroad stations, the resort, and a revitalized Hamlet. [Noela Hooper, Dutchess County Department of Planning, Letter, March 25, 2008, Comment F, page 4]

**Response 3.7-15-27F:** Comment noted.

**Comment 3.7-16-31A:** Demonstrate that large moving vans, fire apparatus and emergency vehicles are able to maneuver through the various rectangular courtyards and "cul-de-sacs" shown on the site plan. [Michael Soyka, Rohde, Soyka & Andrews, Letter, March 27, 2008, Comment A, page 1]

**Response 3.7-16-31A:** An auto-run analysis will be conducted during the Site Plan review process in order to demonstrate that the various rectangular courtyards and cul-de-sacs proposed will be of sufficient geometry to accommodate large vehicles.

**Comment 3.7-17-31B:** Garages or adequate detached parking facilities are not shown for all residences. One small example is the two single-family residences in area "L" (they are the first one upon entering and the last one upon entering). There are no parking facilities shown for either one of these units on Master Development Plan Sheet No. SP6a. [Michael Soyka, Rohde, Soyka & Andrews, Letter, March 27, 2008, Comment B, page 1]

**Response 3.7-17-31B:** All single-family homes will have two-car garages at a minimum, and two spaces will be available in the driveway. This is shown on Sheets SP-4 and P-1 of the April 2008 MDP (please see Appendix M).

**Comment 3.7-18-31N:** Page 3.7-3, 2007 Existing Traffic Volumes: Identify the traffic count information that was obtained from the New York State Department of Transportation, the Dutchess County Department of Public Works and the Town of Amenia, as referenced in the first paragraph. [Michael Soyka, Rohde, Soyka & Andrews, Letter, March 27, 2008, Comment N, page 2]

**Response 3.7-18-31N:** Background traffic volumes, AADT, were obtained from NYSDOT (NYSDOT Traffic Volume Report 2003) and DCDPW (Poughkeepsie-Dutchess County Transportation Council, 2004 Traffic Count Report, May 2005) for NYSDOT and Dutchess County roadways. These AADTs were included in Section 3.1 of the TIS under the discussion of existing conditions.

**Comment 3.7-19-31O:** Page 3.7-3: Explain how the existing and proposed land uses specific to the project site influenced the times that were selected to perform traffic counts. [Michael Soyka, Rohde, Soyka & Andrews, Letter, March 27, 2008, Comment O, page 2]

**Response 3.7-19-31O:** Traffic counts were taken corresponding to peak periods on the adjacent roadways and specified uses of the site. Weekday AM and PM counts were taken to correspond to the normal peak periods of the adjacent roadways. Counts were taken during the Friday PM peak period to capture conditions during the anticipated arrival of residents/guests for a weekend. Saturday mid-day counts were taken to capture trips generated by the golf course/clubhouse, i.e., golfers leaving from a morning round of golf or arriving for an afternoon round, as well as arrivals for special events, and to capture the normal Saturday peak activity on the adjacent roadways. Sunday PM peak counts were taken to capture conditions during the anticipated departure of residents/guests after a weekend stay.

**Comment 3.7-20-31P:** Page 3.7-15: Table 3.7-3 does not contain trip generation data for the weekday PM peak hour. [Michael Soyka, Rohde, Soyka & Andrews, Letter, March 27, 2008, Comment P, page 2]

**Response 3.7-20-31P:** Weekday PM peak hour trip generation data is included in Table 3.7.3 as the 2nd peak hour column from the left.

**Comment 3.7-21-31Q**: Page 3.7-15: Table 3.7-3 does not include traffic generated by the golf clubhouse. [Michael Soyka, Rohde, Soyka & Andrews, Letter, March 27, 2008, Comment Q, page 2]

**Response 3.7-21-31Q:** The golf course/clubhouse is an existing trip generator. All manual counts used in the analysis of "worst-case" conditions were taken during May 2007 (golfing season) with the exception of the AM peak, which was taken in January 2006. Since the AM counts were taken in the golf off-season, ITE data was used to estimate activity, which was then included in the current activity foundation information. Consequently, the existing traffic volumes in the report include traffic generated from the golf course/clubhouse for all peak periods analyzed. Accordingly, the existing volumes include traffic generated by the golf course, including weekends. It is noted that overall, the AM peak generations for the various land uses are the lowest for any of the peak periods.

**Comment 3.7-22-31R:** Refer to the various Traffic Volume Figures: A Figure for the site generated traffic volumes should be created for the Friday PM peak hour for the 2007 Existing Traffic Volume and the 2012 Build Traffic Volume. [Michael Soyka, Rohde, Soyka & Andrews, Letter, March 27, 2008, Comment R, page 2]

**Response 3.7-22-31R:** As defined earlier in the DEIS (Page 3.7-3), the Friday PM peak is defined as the weekday PM peak. This was done to assess the "worst-case" conditions. Figure 3.7-2 in the DEIS shows the 2007 existing

weekday PM peak hour traffic volumes and Figure 3.7-16 shows the 2012 "build" condition weekday PM peak hour traffic volumes.

**Comment 3.7-23-31S:** The phasing schedule shown in the Master Development Plan shows full build out occurring 5-1/2 years after the project start. The soonest start date would appear to be 2009, therefore the "Build" traffic analysis should be 2015. The traffic study should be revised to reflect this. [Michael Soyka, Rohde, Soyka & Andrews, Letter, March 27, 2008, Comment S, page 2]

**Response 3.7-23-31S:** In the SEQRA process, a project completion forecast year is somewhat fluid and is selected based on the best available information to initiate discussion on the project and anticipated impacts. The year 2012 was used as the year of completion for the analysis in the TIS and as presented in the DEIS. Utilization of 2015 would increase the no-build traffic by 6% (3 years at 2% per year). It should be noted that the 2% rate is the upper limit of that associated with normal background growth in the area as per NYSDOT (see Appendix E). During verbal discussions with Mr. Soyka, it was decided to add the 6% additional traffic and reanalyze two intersections (Route 22 @ Route 44, and Route 22 @ Lake Amenia Road/Dunn Road) under a 2015 build year, as a means of quantifying the impact of this later build-out year.

However, it should be noted that the project has been updated and the current plan reflects the April 2008 MDP submittal, which includes changes to some of the land use sizes. The impact on the estimated project trip generation by the current MDP compared to the analysis in Section 5.2 of the DEIS is a drop in overall project generated trips of approximately 10% during the weekday AM peak period to approximately 13.2% during the Sunday PM peak period, with an average drop in generated trips of 12.2% for the four peak periods analyzed. This drop in trip generation is greater than the increase in trip generation resulting from a build year of 2015 as noted in the previous paragraph. Please see Response 3.7-27-31W for a detailed revised trip generation table.

The revised trip generation estimates were used in conjunction with the growth projections out to 2015 to reevaluate the intersections of Route 22 @ Route 44, and Route 22 @ Lake Amenia Road/Dunn Road, as requested. Table 3.7-1 summarizes the results.

## Table 3.7-1, "Capacity Summary - Level-of-Service/Estimated Delay"

**(Seconds per vehicle)**

***Revised 07/10/08 – 2015 Build and Revised MDP Plan***

| INTERSECTION | PEAK | APPROACH | NO BUILD VOLUMES 2012 | NO BUILD VOLUMES 2015 | BUILD VOLUMES 2012 | BUILD VOLUMES 2015 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Route 44 at Route 22**<br><br>**Signalized** | **AM** | **OVERALL** | **B/11.9** | **B/12.7** | **B/15.0** | **B/15.7** |
| | | EB | B/13.7 | B/14.8 | B/17.7 | B/18.1 |
| | | WB | B/12.3 | B/13.0 | B/16.5 | B/16.6 |
| | | NB | A/9.8 | B/10.6 | B/13.9 | B/14.1 |
| | | SB | B/12.0 | B/12.9 | B/13.5 | B/15.1 |
| | **PM** | **OVERALL** | **C/21.4** | **C/24.6** | **C/32.8** | **D/39.8** |
| | | EB | C/27.4 | C/33.4 | C/34.0 | D/37.6 |
| | | WB | B/19.9 | C/22.4 | C/32.5 | C/33.5 |
| | | NB | B/16.3 | B/17.3 | C/22.7 | C/24.8 |
| | | SB | C/24.0 | C/28.2 | D/43.1 | E/61.6 |
| | **Saturday Mid-Day** | **OVERALL** | **C/23.8** | **C/22.5** | **D/38.9** | **D/45.2** |
| | | EB | C/31.2 | D/39.0 | D/44.5 | D/54.3 |
| | | WB | B/19.1 | C/21.2 | C/31.5 | C/33.2 |
| | | NB | C/21.0 | C/22.3 | D/41.1 | D/44.4 |
| | | SB | C/24.4 | C/28.6 | D/38.3 | D/48.8 |
| | **Sunday PM** | **OVERALL** | **B/16.4** | **B/18.0** | **C/24.2** | **C/25.7** |
| | | EB | B/17.4 | B/18.3 | C/20.1 | C/20.7 |
| | | WB | B/19.9 | C/21.9 | C/30.3 | C/31.4 |
| | | NB | B/11.0 | B/11.7 | B/17.9 | B/18.2 |
| | | SB | B/17.7 | B/19.8 | C/27.4 | C/30.2 |
| **Route 22 at Lake Amenia Rd. and Dunn Rd. (CR 81)**<br><br>**Unsignalized** | **AM** | EB | B/11.4 | B/11.6 | B/13.1 | B/13.3 |
| | | WB | B/12.3 | B/12.5 | C/16.3 | C/16.1 |
| | | NB | A/0.6 | A/0.5 | A/0.8 | A/0.8 |
| | | SB | A/0.3 | A/0.2 | A/0.2 | A/0.2 |
| | **PM** | EB | C/23.0 | C/20.5 | E/36.3 | E/36.0 |
| | | WB | D/32.2 | D/29.3 | F/89.5 | F/91.5 |
| | | NB | A/1.1 | A/1.1 | A/2.2 | A/2.2 |
| | | SB | A/0.4 | A/0.5 | A/0.5 | A/0.5 |
| | **Saturday Mid-Day** | EB | B/12.6 | B/12.9 | C/17.3 | C/18.3 |
| | | WB | C/18.2 | C/19.4 | E/41.0 | E/44.1 |
| | | NB | A/1.1 | A/1.1 | A/1.8 | A/1.8 |
| | | SB | A/0.3 | A/0.3 | A/0.2 | A/0.2 |
| | **Sunday PM** | EB | C/17.3 | C/18.2 | D/29.3 | D/29.6 |
| | | WB | C/22.0 | C/23.8 | F/60 | F/60.6 |
| | | NB | A/0.3 | A/0.3 | A/0.5 | A/0.5 |
| | | SB | A/0.0 | A/0.0 | A/0.0 | A/0.0 |

Based on the above, any degradation in level of service due to additional traffic from a 2015 build year is negated by the improvement in level of service resulting from a decrease in project trips generated by the land uses

and land use sizes of the current MDP. Accordingly, the recommendations as presented in the DEIS and the October 2, 2007 TIS for the intersections studied are appropriate.

**Comment 3.7-24-31T:** New turning movement traffic counts should be taken to show current conditions. [Michael Soyka, Rohde, Soyka & Andrews, Letter, March 27, 2008, Comment T, page 2]

**Response 3.7-24-31T:** The Town of Amenia Zoning Law, adopted July 19, 2007, stipulates that the TIS shall be based on traffic volume data not more than three years old. All analysis was done using traffic counts from May 2007, with the exception of the AM peak counts which were taken in January 2006. All counts are less than 3 years old and are appropriate for the purpose of analysis and determining project impact.

**Comment 3.7-25-31U:** The Amenia Hills and Depot Hill projects should be included in the traffic analysis as requested by NYSDOT. [Michael Soyka, Rohde, Soyka & Andrews, Letter, March 27, 2008, Comment U, page 2]

**Response 3.7-25-31U:** The Planning Board has determined that cumulative impact analysis is not required to be performed by the Silo Ridge Resort Community under SEQRA. Depot Hill is still in the initial stages of SEQRA and as such is neither approved nor under construction. The Amenia Hills project is stalled at this time, but consists of only 19 units and is covered under 2% background growth rate. As noted in the TIS, the 2% background growth rate addresses general background growth in the area of the site and is inclusive of other potential development in the immediate area. NYSDOT and DCDPW were recently contacted and confirmed the use of the 2% rate as appropriate (see Appendix E). Please see Response 3.7-26-31V below.

**Comment 3.7-26-31V:** Confirm that the 2 percent background growth rate is acceptable to Dutchess County Department of Public Works and New York State Department of Transportation. [Michael Soyka, Rohde, Soyka & Andrews, Letter, March 27, 2008, Comment V, page 2]

**Response 3.7-26-31V:** The rate was obtained from NYSDOT Region 8 Planning Group. On 04/02/08, NYSDOT confirmed the use of the 2% rate. NYSDOT Planning indicated that 1.5% to 2% would be utilized, with 2% appropriate as including small specific projects. Dutchess County PDW was also queried and responded on 04/04/08 that they also find this rate acceptable. A copy of the correspondence is included in Appendix E.

**Comment 3.7-27-31W:** Show the rates used to arrive at the values in the Trip Generation Tables. [Michael Soyka, Rohde, Soyka & Andrews, Letter, March 27, 2008, Comment W, page 2]

**Response 3.7-27-31W:** The trips generated for the project land uses were obtained from Trip Generation software, based on the ITE document, created by MicroTrans[13], Inc. Consistent with the intent to create a worst-case set of traffic conditions from which to estimate impact, each proposed land-use was reviewed using both equations and the weighted average rate.[14] In each case, the methodology used was that which produced the most trips per independent variable (number of units, number of seats, number of square feet, etc.). Table 5-10 of the DEIS has been revised to indicate the trip generation rates used and is presented below.

It is noted that Table 5-10 of the DEIS also has been revised and presents the comparison between the trips generated by the April 2008 MDP and the trips analyzed in the DEIS/TIS under the initial Traditional Neighborhood Alternative. The results are shown in Table 3.7-2 below. The effect of the change in trip generation was discussed above in Response 3.7-23-31S.

[13] Trip Generation, Version 5, 2004.
[14] Three methods are provided by ITE for calculating forecasted trips at proposed developments. The two most used methodologies are the regression equation (based on the third method…plot versus size of the independent variable), and the weighted trip generation rate.

**Table 3.7-2, "Traditional Neighborhood Alternative Trip Generation Estimates (Revised to include rates) Comparison with New Generator Sizes"**

| Generator | Weekday AM Peak Hour Volumes (7:00 - 9:00 AM) | | Weekday PM Peak Hour Volumes (4:00 – 6:00 PM) | | Saturday Mid-Day Peak Hour Volumes (11:00 AM – 1:00 PM) | | Sunday PM Peak Hour Volumes (4:00-6:00 PM) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Enter** | **Exit** | **Enter** | **Exit** | **Enter** | **Exit** | **Enter** | **Exit** |
| Land Use #210 Detached Single-family (60 Units) | 13 (0.21) | 39 (0.64) | 43 (0.71) | 25 (0.42) | 35 (0.58) | 30 (0.49) | 31 (0.52) | 28 (0.47) |
| Land Use #230 Townhouse/Condo (299 Units)/(278 units) | 21/20 (0.07) | 103/95 (0.34) | 99/92 (0.33) | 49/45 (0.16) | 70/64 (0.23) | 59/56 (0.20) | 58/53 (0.19) | 61/56 (0.20) |
| Land Use #310 Hotel including Banquet/conference facilities, retail, and restaurant uses (393 keys/367 Keys) | 136/128 (0.35) | 87/81 (0.22) | 123/114 (0.31) | 109/103 (0.28) | 158/147 (0.40) | 125/117 (0.32) | 113/106 (0.29) | 132/125 (0.34) |
| Land Use #492[2] Spa/Health/Fitness (81,940 sf)/(46,000 sf) | 21/12 (0.51) | 29/16 (0.70) | 85/48 (2.07) | 81/45 (1.98) | 85/48[1] | 81/45[1] | 85/48[1] | 81/45[1] |
| Land Use #814[2] Specialty Retail Center (18,700 sf)/(26,127 sf) | 0 | 0 | 15/20 (1.56) | 19/26 (1.99) | 15/20[1] | 19/26[1] | 15/20[1] | 19/26[1] |
| Land Use #931 Quality Restaurant (Winery) (80 seats) | 0 | 0 | 14 (0.17) | 7 (0.09) | 16 (0.16) | 11 (0.14) | 12 (0.15) | 7 (0.09) |
| **Total Site Activity** | **191/ 173** | **258/ 231** | **379/ 331** | **290/ 251** | **379/ 330** | **325/ 285** | **314/ 270** | **328/ 287** |
| | **449/404** | | **669/582** | | **704/ 615** | | **642/557** | |

[1] In the absence of published ITE data for Saturday and Sunday peak hour trip generation, the estimated weekday PM volumes have been used.
[2] Inclusive of a 50% reduction in generated trips to account for anticipated on-site patronage. The 50% reduction was chosen in recognition of the fact that the onsite services would be particularly attractive to users who are already onsite to play golf, who are staying at the hotel, or who live in the residential units.

**Comment 3.7-28-31X:** Coordinate shuttle service with the Metro North Railroad. [Michael Soyka, Rohde, Soyka & Andrews, Letter, March 27, 2008, Comment X, page 3]

**Response 3.7-28-31X:** Please see Response 3.7-3-PHT. The Applicant intends to coordinate the shuttle schedule with the Metro North train schedule.

**Comment 3.7-29-31Y:** Provide a mitigation plan for construction traffic including details on truck routes, truck types, numbers, etc [Michael Soyka, Rohde, Soyka & Andrews, Letter, March 27, 2008, Comment Y, page 3]

> **Response 3.7-29-31Y:** Construction traffic will arrive either via Routes 22, 44 or 343 and initially will access the site via the main entry when construction activity first starts. The secondary entrance (on Route 22 south of the main entrance) will then be utilized after the main entry is completed and being used. The staging area is expected to be on or south of the employee parking lot location. Also see Response 3.7-14-20A.

**Comment 3.7-30-31Z:** The residents as well as visitors to the site will use the on-site amenities. Demonstrate that the visitor traffic is included in the trip generation numbers. [Michael Soyka, Rohde, Soyka & Andrews, Letter, March 27, 2008, Comment Z, page 3]

> **Response 3.7-30-31Z:** Trip generation numbers were based on the land uses as proposed and provide anticipated total trips to and from the site. While the TIS notes that several of the land uses will be used by on-site residents, no credit for these "internal-trips" was taken in the assessment of impacts on the adjacent roadways. For other land uses, a 50% reduction in trips was applied to account for anticipated on-site patronage in recognition of the fact that the onsite services would be particularly attractive to users who are already onsite to play golf and/or who are staying at the hotel. Accordingly, visitor traffic is considered in all trip generation numbers.

**Comment 3.7-31-31AA:** Consult with DCDPW and NYSDOT to identify traffic mitigation measures including, but not limited to additional turn lanes on Route 22. [Michael Soyka, Rohde, Soyka & Andrews, Letter, March 27, 2008, Comment AA, page 3]

> **Response 3.7-31-31AA:** Traffic mitigation is identified for the Route 22/Main Entrance (signalization and turn lanes) and the Route 44/Vineyard Townhouses (left turn lane) and will be pursued with NYSDOT under their Highway Work Permit process. It is also recommended that several other locations be monitored and re-assessed upon project completion in conjunction with oversight and input from NYSDOT. NYSDOT, via written correspondence dated May 1, 2008 (see Letter 42 in Appendix C and also Comment 3.7-47-42), indicated that the project was conceptually acceptable. When the Highway Work Permit application is submitted, the NYSDOT will conduct further review of the project documentation. Proposed mitigation measures will be reviewed and acceptance will be demonstrated by NYSDOT's final acceptance of the construction plans/specifications for the mitigation work in New York State right-of-way. This process was

subsequently discussed with Town Engineer, Mr. Soyka of RSA, on May 6, 2008 and he concurred with the process as described.

There are no project access locations onto Dutchess County roadways, nor are Dutchess County roads affected to any degree by the estimated project generated trip. Therefore, mitigation is not proposed for any Dutchess County roads. However, correspondence from DCDPW indicates that the County has concerns about the intersection of CR 81 and Dunn Road and its current configuration. The Applicant has agreed to work with Dutchess County during the site plan approval process to address the County's concern.

**Comment 3.7-32-31BB:** Further detail is required for both the proposed project and the Traditional Neighborhood Development alternative where parking is concerned. Provide a table with proposed parking ratios by land use. Show the location of these parking spaces on a site plan. This is an upscale community. It is unlikely that residents will want parking in open lots, rather than protected spaces. [Michael Soyka, Rohde, Soyka & Andrews, Letter, March 27, 2008, Comment BB, page 3]

**Response 3.7-32-31BB:** Parking detail has been provided in the MDP submission dated April 3, 2008, which is included as Appendix M of this FEIS. Specifically reference sheets P-1 through P-8.

**Comment 3.7-33-31CC**: How many parking spaces will be provided for a three bedroom home? A four bedroom home? A five bedroom home? Will these be in a garage? Where is the garage located? [Michael Soyka, Rohde, Soyka & Andrews, Letter, March 27, 2008, Comment CC, page 3]

**Response 3.7-33-31CC:** All single-family estate homes will have two-car garages at a minimum and two spaces will be available in the driveway. The golf villa single-family homes will have two garage spaces and one driveway space. Parking detail has been provided in detail in the MDP submission dated April 3, 2008 (see Appendix M). Specifically refer to Sheets P-1 through P-8.

**Comment 3.7-34-31DD:** The parking arrangements for the hotel are unclear. How many spaces will be provided for keys, employees, spa, and other uses? A plan of the underground parking, by level, should be provided. [Michael Soyka, Rohde, Soyka & Andrews, Letter, March 27, 2008, Comment DD, page 3]

**Response 3.7-34-31DD:** Parking detail has been provided in detail in the MDP submission dated April 3, 2008 (see Appendix M). Specifically reference Sheets P-1 through P-8.

**Comment 3.7-35-31EE:** Will the underground parking be built in phases, or not? If in phases, how many? [Michael Soyka, Rohde, Soyka & Andrews, Letter, March 27, 2008, Comment EE, page 3]

> **Response 3.7-35-31EE:** The underground parking for the hotel and clubhouse will be built in Phase 1 of the development. The underground parking for the residential buildings, contained within the footprint of each building, will be constructed in conjunction with each building, in Phase 1 and Phase 2.

**Comment 3.7-36-31FF:** The intent is to make this a "walking community" to the greatest extent possible. The sidewalks should be clearly shown on a plan. [Michael Soyka, Rohde, Soyka & Andrews, Letter, March 27, 2008, Comment FF, page 3]

> **Response 3.7-36-31FF:** The location of sidewalks has been provided in the MDP submission dated April 3, 2008 (see Appendix M).

**Comment 3.7-37-31GG:** Identify the number of on-street parking spaces and the justification for the number selected. [Michael Soyka, Rohde, Soyka & Andrews, Letter, March 27, 2008, Comment GG, page 3]

> **Response 3.7-37-31GG:** Detailed parking plans are included in the April 3, 2008 MDP in Appendix M. There are 31 pull-in street parking spaces at the Village Green, Main Street. These spaces are for convenience parking for the small retail shops on the Village Green. There are also 113 parallel parking spaces, for residents and residents' guests, located on Upper Drive and South Lawn Drive. The Applicant, Parking Consultant, Resort Operator, and Landscape Architect reviewed all the parking counts and determined it was an adequate balance of parking for the needs of the resort residents and guests.

**Comment 3.7-38-31HH:** Identify visitor parking locations, number and justification for the number chosen. [Michael Soyka, Rohde, Soyka & Andrews, Letter, March 27, 2008, Comment HH, page 3]

> **Response 3.7-38-31HH:** Visitor parking is located throughout the resort and is part of the overall Parking Management Plan. More specifically, there is visitor parking in the hotel parking structure, in the clubhouse parking structure, on the Village Green, on the street, in driveways or in parking courts. All of these locations are part of the overall Parking Management Plan. Please refer to Sheets SP-4 and P-1 through P-8 for parking details.

**Comment 3.7-39-31II:** Identify the parking area for the publicly accessible trails. [Michael Soyka, Rohde, Soyka & Andrews, Letter, March 27, 2008, Comment II, page 3]

**Response 3.7-39-31II:** The Applicant is not seeking approval for publicly accessible trails.

**Comment 3.7-40-31JJ:** If there is shuttle bus service to the Wassaic train station, then Metro North should be included as an Interested Agency. [Michael Soyka, Rohde, Soyka & Andrews, Letter, March 27, 2008, Comment JJ, page 3]

**Response 3.7-40-31JJ:** Please see Response 3.7-3-PHT.

**Comment 3.7-41-31KK:** Would the shuttle service be owned and operated by the hotel or by the Master HOA? [Michael Soyka, Rohde, Soyka & Andrews, Letter, March 27, 2008, Comment KK, page 3]

**Response 3.7-41-31KK:** It is currently envisioned that the shuttle service would be owned and managed by the resort operator as an amenity to resort residents and guests.

**Comment 3.7-42-38I:** In terms of Traffic, there will necessarily be 4 or 5 traffic signals (instead of the current 2) in a three mile stretch of Rt. 22 (train station to Cascade Rd.) as a result of this project (Main entrance/possibly Lake Amenia Rd.) and the certain need for one as a result of the Fire Company's relocation to the Cascade Road area, And, now that there is the inclusion of Commercial Uses on the North side of Rt. 44, including a Drinking establishment, are not the impacts on that Route in terms of Safety (already a concern) increased significantly? [Patrick J. Nelligan, Letter, March 24, 2008, Comment I, page 5]

**Response 3.7-42-38I:** Mitigation for Route 22 is proposed in the DEIS and will be implemented under the NYSDOT Highway Permit process. The Applicant intends to discuss with the NYSDOT installation of a traffic signal at the site's main entrance on Route 22. However, no other signals are warranted or proposed. The Applicant has no involvement in the relocation of the Fire Company.

In regards to the concerns regarding the winery intersection, access points will be properly designed in accordance with NYSDOT requirements as part of the NYSDOT Highway Work Permit process. NYSDOT will review and approve all work to be performed within the State right of way, including project access locations on State highways, prior to granting approval for the work to be done under the permit process. See also Response 3.7-31-31AA.

**Comment 3.7-43-41OO:** How many additional traffic lights does the Town need, and where, to accommodate at least 1,385 additional cars traveling through the Town and hamlet? How much does it cost to purchase, install and maintain the additional traffic lights? [Bart Wu, Letter, March 25, 2008, Comment OO, page 10]

**Response 3.7-43-41OO:** As described in Section 3.7.3 of the DEIS, the Applicant will pursue the signalization of the intersection of Route 22 and the main site access via the NYSDOT highway work permit process. The signal improvements, if approved by the NYSDOT, would include turning lanes on both the northbound and southbound sides of the road for entry into the project site. The expense for these improvements would be borne by the Applicant. The long-term maintenance costs, which are expected to be minimal, would be the responsibility of NYSDOT.

**Comment 3.7-44-41QQ:** How much additional parking is necessary in the Town to accommodate the additional vehicular traffic at municipal services (Town Hall, library, parks, rail trail, on-street or off-street around the post office)? How much does it cost to expand existing or to build new parking facilities? [Bart Wu, Letter, March 25, 2008, Comment QQ, page 10]

**Response 3.7-44-41QQ:** Please see Response 3.7-6-PHT.

**Comment 3.7-45-41TT:** Given the increased usage of the roads, how many additional highway service vehicles are necessary and at what cost? [Bart Wu, Letter, March 25, 2008, Comment TT, page 10]

**Response 3.7-45-41TT:** The project does not involve the creation of any new publicly maintained roadways. It is not anticipated that additional highway service vehicles will be needed as a result of the proposed development.

**Comment 3.7-46-41FFFb:** Secondarily, how will the Sponsor ensure the safety of all vehicle operators and passengers who confront the increased traffic congestion of vehicles entering into the uphill traffic land or across the uphill traffic lane into the downhill traffic land during every season, and especially during the winter? [Bart Wu, Letter, March 25, 2008, Comment FFF, page 12]

**Response 3.7-46-41FFFb:** See Response 3.7-2-PHT.

**Comment 3.7-47-42:** The NYSDOT provided a letter in response to the Silo Ridge DEIS which indicated that the project was conceptually acceptable. The letter also noted that the project will require formal review from the NYSDOT. Specifically, it was noted that a Highway Work Permit Application for Non-Utility Work would be required and that a Permit Agreement for Highway Work Permits Design Review would be required. The latter requires a $2,000 minimum initial fee to commence the review work. [Terence J. Donoghue, PE, NYSDOT, Letter, May 1, 2008]

**Response 3.7-47-42:** The Applicant is aware of the permits and applications required to coordinate review with the NYSDOT and will initiate the review work at a later stage of the design process. Please see Response 3.7-31-31AA.

This page intentionally left blank