February 22, 2013

Matthew A. Stanley, AICP
Dormitory Authority State of New York
One Penn Plaza
52nd Floor
New York, New York 10119-0098

Re: DASNY
Stony Brook University Medical Center - East
Campus Parking & Medical Facilities Project
101 Nicholls Rd.
BROOKHAVEN, Suffolk County
11PR04841

Dear Mr. Stanley, AICP:

Thank you for requesting the comments of the Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP). We have reviewed the project in accordance with the New York State Historic Preservation Act of 1980 (Section 14.09 of the New York Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation Law). These comments are those of the Division for Historic Preservation and relate only to Historic/Cultural resources. They do not include potential environmental impacts to New York State Parkland that may be involved in or near your project. Such impacts must be considered as part of the environmental review of the project pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (New York Environmental Conservation Law Article 8) and its implementing regulations (6 NYCRR Part 617).

Based upon this review, it is the OPRHP’s opinion that your project will have No Impact upon cultural resources in or eligible for inclusion in the State and National Register of Historic Places.

If further correspondence is required regarding this project, please be sure to refer to the OPRHP Project Review (PR) number noted above.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Ruth L. Pierpont
Deputy Commissioner for Historic Preservation
January 9, 2013

Tara Stewart
Louis Berger Group
412 Mt. Kemble Ave, Bx 1946
Morristown, NJ 07962 1946

Dear Ms. Stewart:

In response to your recent request, we have reviewed the New York Natural Heritage Program database with respect to an Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Expansion of the Stony Brook University Medical Center – Project CJA 8063, site as indicated on your enclosed map, located in the Town of Brookhaven, Suffolk County.

We have no records of rare or state listed animals or plants, or significant natural communities, on or in the immediate vicinity of your site.

The absence of data does not necessarily mean that rare or state-listed species, or significant natural communities, do not exist on or adjacent to the proposed site. Rather, our files currently do not contain information which indicates their presence. For most sites, comprehensive field surveys have not been conducted. We cannot provide a definitive statement on the presence or absence of all rare or state-listed species or significant natural communities. This information should not be substituted for on-site surveys that may be required for environmental assessment.

Our databases are continually growing as records are added and updated. If this proposed project is still under development one year from now, we recommend that you contact us again so that we may update this response with the most current information.

This response applies only to known occurrences of rare or state-listed animals and plants, significant natural communities and other significant habitats maintained in the Natural Heritage Databases. Your project may require additional review or permits; for information regarding other permits that may be required under state law for regulated areas or activities (e.g., regulated wetlands), please contact the appropriate NYS DEC Regional Office, Division of Environmental Permits, as listed at www.dec.ny.gov/about/39381.html.

Sincerely,

Jean Pietrusiak, Information Services
NYS Department Environmental Conservation

Enc.
cc: Reg, 1, Wildlife Mgr.
From: Shah, Manish (DOT) [Manish.Shah@dot.ny.gov]
Sent: Friday, October 19, 2012 7:57 AM
To: Stanley, Matthew
Cc: Martin, John.R (DOT); Hardej, Chris (DOT); Mann, Howard (DOT)
Subject: RE: Stony Brook Hospital Project

Matt,

It stands for Interagency Consultation Group which consists of NYSDEC,FHWA,FTA,NYSDOT and EPA.

Thank you

Manish

Matt, 

Thank you very much. Please, for my records, tell me what "ICG" stands for. Thanks.

Matt Stanley

Matt,

ICG agreed that this project does not meet the criteria of Regional Significant.

Thank you

Manish
Chris,

When we last spoke (early September), you indicated that you planned to present the DASNY Stony Brook project as being not regionally significant. I am just wondering where NYMTCC is at in its process of making a final determination on this matter. Please advise. Thanks.

Matt Stanley | DASNY Environmental Affairs | 212.273.5097
March 23, 2012

Matthew A. Stanley, AICP
Dormitory Authority State of New York
One Penn Plaza
52nd Floor
New York, New York 10119-0098

Re: DASNY
Stony Brook University Medical Center - East
Campus Parking & Medical Facilities Project
101 Nicholls Rd./BROOKHAVEN, Suffolk
County
11PR04841

Dear Mr. Stanley, AICP:

Thank you for requesting the comments of the Field Services Bureau of the Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP). We have reviewed the project in accordance with the New York State Historic Preservation Act of 1980 (Section 14.09 of the New York Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation Law). These comments are those of the Field Services Bureau and relate only to Historic/Cultural resources. They do not include potential environmental impacts to New York State Parkland that may be involved in or near your project. Such impacts must be considered as part of the environmental review of the project pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (New York Environmental Conservation Law Article 8) and its implementing regulations (6 NYCRR Part 617).

Based upon this review, it is the OPRHP’s opinion that your project will have No Impact upon cultural resources in or eligible for inclusion in the State and National Register of Historic Places.

If further correspondence is required regarding this project, please be sure to refer to the OPRHP Project Review (PR) number noted above.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Ruth L. Pierpont
Deputy Commissioner for Historic Preservation
December 1, 2011

Matthew A. Stanley, AICP
Senior Environmental Manager
Office of Environmental Affairs
Dormitory Authority of the State of New York
One Penn Plaza, 52nd Floor
New York, NY 10119-0098

RE: SEQRA Coordination - Stony Brook University Medical Center (DASNY)

Dear Mr. Stanley:

The SCWA appreciates the opportunity to comment on the above referenced application.

Please be advised that our agency has no objection to DASNY assuming Lead Agency status for the project.

The SCWA would however like to provide the following comments as they apply to the application as submitted.

There are two areas of concern for SCWA with respect to this project. The only water demand information provided for this project was an estimated average daily demand of 480,000 gallons per day. This results in an average instantaneous demand of 333 gpm. There was no estimate provided for peak water usage or the fire flow required to protect the new construction. These numbers will result in a significantly higher instantaneous demand.

Based on the current maximum demands and the capacity of our water supply system, SCWA will not be able to provide for the increased demand. Additional water supply sources will have to be developed in order to provide for the new water supply requirements. The developer will need to contribute to the funding of these requirements.
Secondly, the proposed height of the structure will require higher pressure than the SCWA system can provide. It will be the responsibility of the developer to provide an internal system to boost the pressure to the level that is required for the installation. The land elevation in the project area is a high point in the SCWA pressure zone that serves the area. Therefore, SCWA system pressure is at its lowest value. This situation makes it critical that the internal system be sized correctly and installed in the proper location. This is necessary to ensure there are no pressure problems once the facility is constructed.

Should you wish to discuss this matter further I may be reached at 631-563-2018.

Very truly yours,

Carrie Meek Gallagher, M.S., MBA
Chief Sustainability Officer

CMG:kk

cc: Jeffrey W. Szabo, CEO SCWA
    Herman Miller, Deputy CEO Operations, SCWA
Facsimile Transmittal

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Long Island Field Office
3 Old Barto Road
Brookhaven, NY 11719

Telephone: 631-776-1401
Fax: 631-776-1405

TO: JUSTIN BIVER
FROM: STEVE PAPA
DATE: 9/25/2011

NUMBER OF PAGES: 4 + COVER

COMMENTS: EIS Proposed Expansion Story Brook LLC
The request for info. There are no LEAs under jurisdiction of FWS at the proposed project site.
United States Department of the Interior
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
New York Field Office
3817 Luker Road, Cortland, NY 13045
Phone: (607) 753-9334
Fax: (607) 753-9699
Long Island Field Office
3 Old Barto Rd., Brookhaven, NY 11719
Phone: (631) 776-1401
Fax: (631) 776-1405

Endangered Species Act List Request Response Cover Sheet

This cover sheet is provided in response to a search of our website* for information regarding the potential presence of species under jurisdiction of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) within a proposed project area.

Attached is a copy of the New York State County List of Threatened, Endangered, and Candidate Species for the appropriate county(ies). The database that we use to respond to list requests was developed primarily to assist Federal agencies that are consulting with us under Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) (87 Stat. 884, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.). Our lists include all Federally-listed, proposed, and candidate species known to occur, as well as those likely to occur, in specific counties.

The attached information is designed to assist project sponsors or applicants through the process of determining whether a Federally-listed, proposed, or candidate species and/or "critical habitat" may occur within their proposed project area and when it is appropriate to contact our offices for additional coordination or consultation. You may be aware that our offices have provided much of this information in the past in project-specific letters. However, due to increasing project review workloads and decreasing staff, we are now providing as much information as possible through our website. We encourage anyone requesting species list information to print out all materials used in any analyses of effects on listed, proposed, or candidate species.

The Service routinely updates this database as species are proposed, listed, and delisted, or as we obtain new biological information or specific presence/absence information for listed species. If project proponents coordinate with the Service to address proposed and candidate species in early stages of planning, this should not be a problem if these species are eventually listed. However, we recommend that both project proponents and reviewing agencies retrieve from our online database an updated list every 90 days to append to this document to ensure that listed species presence/absence information for the proposed project is current.

Reminder: Section 9 of the ESA prohibits unauthorized taking** of listed species and applies to Federal and non-Federal activities. For projects not authorized, funded, or carried out by a Federal agency, consultation with the Service pursuant to Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA is not required. However, no person is authorized to "take**" any listed species without appropriate authorizations from the Service. Therefore, we provide technical assistance to individuals and agencies to assist with project planning to avoid the potential for "take**", or when appropriate, to provide assistance with their application for an incidental take permit pursuant to Section 10(a)(1)(B) of the ESA.
Additionally, endangered species and their habitats are protected by Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA, which requires Federal agencies, in consultation with the Service, to ensure that any action it authorizes, funds, or carries out is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of listed species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat. An assessment of the potential direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts is required for all Federal actions that may affect listed species.

For instance, work in certain waters of the United States, including wetlands and streams, may require a permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps). If a permit is required, in reviewing the application pursuant to the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (48 Stat. 401, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.), the Service may concur, with or without recommending additional permit conditions, or recommend denial of the permit depending upon potential adverse impacts on fish and wildlife resources associated with project construction or implementation. The need for a Corps permit may be determined by contacting the appropriate Corps office(s).*

For additional information on fish and wildlife resources or State-listed species, we suggest contacting the appropriate New York State Department of Environmental Conservation regional office(s) and the New York Natural Heritage Program Information Services.*

Since wetlands, ponds, streams, or open or sheltered coastal waters may be present in the project area, it may be helpful to utilize the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) maps as an initial screening tool. However, they may or may not be available for the project area. Please note that while the NWI maps are reasonably accurate, they should not be used in lieu of field surveys for determining the presence of wetlands or delineating wetland boundaries for Federal regulatory purposes. Online information on the NWI program and digital data can be downloaded from Wetlands Mapper, http://wetlands.fws.gov/mapper_tool.htm.

Project construction or implementation should not commence until all requirements of the ESA have been fulfilled. After reviewing our website and following the steps outlined, we encourage both project proponents and reviewing agencies to contact our office to determine whether an accurate determination of species impacts has been made. If there are any questions about our county lists or agency or project proponent responsibilities under the ESA, please contact the New York or Long Island Field Office Endangered Species Program at the numbers listed above.

Attachment (county list of species)

*Additional information referred to above may be found on our website at: http://www.fws.gov/northeast/nyfo/es/section7.htm

** Under the Act and regulations, it is illegal for any person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States to take (includes harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect; or to attempt any of these), import or export, ship in interstate or foreign commerce in the course of commercial activity, or sell or offer for sale in interstate or foreign commerce any endangered fish or wildlife species and most threatened fish and wildlife species. It is also illegal to possess, sell, deliver, carry, transport, or ship any such wildlife that has been taken illegally. "Harm" includes any act which actually kills or injures fish or wildlife, and case law has clarified that such acts may include significant habitat modification or degradation that significantly impairs essential behavioral patterns of fish or wildlife.
Suffolk County

Federally Listed Endangered and Threatened Species and Candidate Species

This list represents the best available information regarding known or likely County occurrences of Federally-listed and candidate species and is subject to change as new information becomes available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kemp's [=Atlantic] ridley turtle(^1)</td>
<td><em>Lepidochelys kempi</em></td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green turtle(^1)</td>
<td><em>Chelonia mydas</em></td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawksbill turtle(^1)</td>
<td><em>Eretmochelys imbricata</em></td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leatherback turtle(^1)</td>
<td><em>Dermochelys coriacea</em></td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loggerhead turtle(^1)</td>
<td><em>Caretta caretta</em></td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piping plover(^2)</td>
<td><em>Charadrius melodus</em></td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseate tern</td>
<td><em>Sterna dougallii dougallii</em></td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandplain gerardia</td>
<td><em>Agalinis acuta</em></td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seabeach amaranth</td>
<td><em>Amaranthus pumilus</em></td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortnose sturgeon(^3)</td>
<td><em>Acipenser brevisrostrum</em></td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small whorled pogonia (<em>Historic</em>)</td>
<td><em>Isotria medeoloides</em></td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Status Codes: E=Endangered, T=Threatened, P=Proposed, C=Candidate, D=Delisted.

Suffolk County

1 Except for sea turtle nesting habitat, principal responsibility for these species is vested with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration/Fisheries.

2 Habitat is only found at the shoreline, on barrier islands, sandy beaches and dredged material disposal islands. Please see the fact sheet for more information.

3 Primarily occurs in Hudson River. Principal responsibility for this species is vested with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration/Fisheries. Please visit the following website for more information http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/species/esa.htm.

Information current as of: 9/28/2011
May 20, 2011

Ms. Stacey Barron, AICP
Principal Planner
The Louis Berger Group
199 Water Street, 23rd Floor
New York, NY 10038

Re: Stony Brook University Medical Center Master Plan Project

Dear Ms. Barron:

The Regional Director, Subi Chakraborti, has asked that I respond to your May 9, 2011 letter in which you describe the above referenced project and request information regarding New York State Department of Transportation projects (NYSDOT) programmed in the vicinity of SBUMC.

NYSDOT currently has the following NY 347 projects scheduled to be completed by 2021:

PIN 0054.12- NY 347 over CR 97 Interchange Construction
PIN 0054.09- NY 347 Reconstruction, Hallock Road to CR 97
PIN 0054.10- NY 347 Reconstruction, CR 97 to Old Town Road

Due to financial constraints and schedule uncertainty for these projects, we recommend that you analyze both the build and no-build conditions for these sections of NY 347 and the proposed interchange. Information regarding these projects can be found at NYSDOT.gov.

As part of your DEIS, you will need to analyze traffic impacts on NY 25A and NY 347 and, if appropriate, propose mitigation.

Lastly, the NYSDOT requests that they be an involved agency during the SEQR review.

Please feel free to contact me at (631) 952-6108 if you have any questions regarding the above.

Very truly yours,

T. Colikara
Glenn Murrell, P.E.
Acting Regional Planning and Program Manager
March 25, 2011

Justin Baker  
Louis Berger Group, Inc  
412 Mount Kemble Ave, Bx 1946  
Morristown, NJ 07962-1946

Dear Mr. Baker:

In response to your recent request, we have reviewed the New York Natural Heritage Program database with respect to an Environmental Assessment for the proposed Expansion at the Stony Brook University Medical Center, Project CJR 3079, site as indicated on the map you provided, located in the Town of Brookhaven, Suffolk County.

We have no records of rare or state-listed animals or plants, significant natural communities or other significant habitats, on or in the immediate vicinity of your site.

The absence of data does not necessarily mean that rare or state-listed species, natural communities or other significant habitats do not exist on or adjacent to the proposed site. Rather, our files currently do not contain information which indicates their presence. For most sites, comprehensive field surveys have not been conducted. We cannot provide a definitive statement on the presence or absence of all rare or state-listed species or significant natural communities. This information should not be substituted for on-site surveys that may be required for environmental assessment.

Our databases are continually growing as records are added and updated. If this proposed project is still under development one year from now, we recommend that you contact us again so that we may update this response with the most current information.

This response applies only to known occurrences of rare or state-listed animals and plants, significant natural communities and other significant habitats maintained in the Natural Heritage Data bases. Your project may require additional review or permits; for information regarding other permits that may be required under state law for regulated areas or activities (e.g., regulated wetlands), please contact the appropriate NYS DEC Regional Office, Division of Environmental Permits, as listed at www.dec.ny.gov/about/39381.html.

Sincerely,

Tara Salerno  
Information Services  
New York Natural Heritage Program

Enc.  
cc: Region 1  
# 271
Dormitory Authority of the State of New York (DASNY)

SMART GROWTH ASSESSMENT FORM

Date: April 20, 2012
Project Name: Stony Brook University Medical Center Medical Facilities and Parking Project
Project Number: N/A
Completed by: Matthew A. Stanley, AICP
Senior Environmental Manager, Office of Environmental Affairs

This Smart Growth Assessment Form (“SGAF”) is a tool to assist you and the Dormitory Authority of the State of New York (“DASNY”) Smart Growth Advisory Committee in deliberations to determine whether a project is consistent with the New York State Smart Growth Public Infrastructure Policy Act (“SGA”) (Article 6 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law). Not all questions/answers may be relevant to all projects.

Have any other entities issued a Smart Growth Impact Statement with regard to this project? (If so, attach same). ☐ Yes ☒ No

1. Does the project advance or otherwise involve the use of, maintain, or improve existing infrastructure? Check one and describe:

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not Relevant

The Proposed Project would result in development that would utilize existing transportation, water, sewer, and energy infrastructure, including SBU’s cogeneration facility. Additionally, the Proposed Project would improve existing infrastructure such as an existing parking lot and existing roadways. Finally, the Proposed Project would result in the development of a new parking garage. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be generally supportive of this criterion.

2. Is the project located wholly or partially in a municipal center, characterized by any of the following: Check all that apply and explain briefly:

☐ A city or a village
☒ Within the interior of the boundaries of a generally recognized college, university, hospital, or nursing home campus
☐ Area of concentrated and mixed land use that serves as a center for various activities including, but not limited to:
☐ Central business districts (such as the commercial and often geographic heart of a city, “downtown”, “city center”)
Main streets (such as the primary retail street of a village, town, or small city. It is usually a focal point for shops and retailers in the central business district, and is most often used in reference to retailing and socializing)

Downtown areas (such as a city's core (or center) or central business district, usually in a geographical, commercial, and community sense).

Brownfield Opportunity Areas (http://nyswaterfronts.com/BOA_projects.asp)

Downtown areas of Local Waterfront Revitalization Plan areas (http://nyswaterfronts.com/maps_regions.asp)

Locations of transit-oriented development (such as projects serving areas that have access to mass or public transit for residents)

Environmental Justice areas (http://www.dec.ny.gov/public/899.html)

Hardship areas

As the SBUMC campus is an existing, developed institutional campus (see Project Location and Site Details in Chapter 1, “Project Description”), the Proposed Project would be supportive of this criterion.

3. Is the project located adjacent to municipal centers (please see characteristics in question 2, above) with clearly defined borders, in an area designated for concentrated development in the future by a municipal or regional comprehensive plan that exhibits strong land use, transportation, infrastructure and economic connections to an existing municipal center? Check one and describe:

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☒ Not Relevant

4. Is the project located in an area designated by a municipal or comprehensive plan, and appropriately zoned, as a future municipal center? Check one and describe:

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☒ Not Relevant

5. Is the project located wholly or partially in a developed area or an area designated for concentrated infill development in accordance with a municipally-approved comprehensive land use plan, a local waterfront revitalization plan, brownfield opportunity area plan or other development plan? Check one and describe:

☒ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Not Relevant

As the SBUMC campus is an existing, developed area (see Project Location and Site Details in Chapter 1, “Project Description”), the Proposed Project would be supportive of this criterion.
6. Does the project preserve and enhance the State’s resources, including agricultural lands, forests, surface and groundwater, air quality, recreation and open space, scenic areas, and/or significant historic and archeological resources? Check one and describe:

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Not Relevant

The potential effects of the Proposed Project on natural resources, air quality, open space and historic and archeological resources are analyzed in Chapter 9, “Natural Resources;” Chapter 14, “Air Quality;” Chapter 5, “Open Space and Recreational Facilities;” Chapter 7, “Design and Visual Resources;” and Chapter 6, Historic and Archaeological Resources, respectively. These assessments find that the Proposed Project would not have any significant adverse impacts on these technical areas. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be supportive of this criterion.

7. Does the project foster mixed land uses and compact development, downtown revitalization, brownfield redevelopment, the enhancement of beauty in public spaces, the diversity and affordability of housing in proximity to places of employment, recreation and commercial development and/or the integration of all income and age groups? Check one and describe:

☒ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Not Relevant

The Proposed Project would foster compact development by constructing facilities on underutilized land within an existing hospital campus. The Proposed Project would enhance the beauty of public spaces on the SBUMC campus through improvements to pedestrian amenities and open space (see Chapter 5, “Open Space and Recreational Facilities”). Therefore, the Proposed Project would be partially supportive of this criterion.

8. Does the project provide mobility through transportation choices, including improved public transportation and reduced automobile dependency? Check one and describe:

☒ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Not Relevant

The Proposed Project would include recommendations for the development of a Travel Demand Management (“TDM”) program in order to reduce the amount of single-occupancy vehicles (“SOVs”) traveling to the SBUMC campus each day. The program would provide encouragement, incentives and support for commuters to use alternative modes of transportation (such as ridesharing, public transit, cycling, and telecommuting), alternative work schedules, and other efficient transportation options (see Chapter 13, “Traffic and Transportation”). Therefore, the Proposed Project would be supportive of this criterion.
9. Does the project demonstrate coordination among state, regional, and local planning and governmental officials? (Demonstration may include SEQR coordination with involved and interested agencies, district formation, agreements between involved parties, letters of support, State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (“SPDES”) permit issuance/revision notices, etc.). Check one and describe:

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not Relevant

The planning for, and approval of, the Proposed Project would require coordination among State, regional and local agencies. DASNY, as SEQR lead agency, has included as involved or interested agencies in the SEQR review numerous State, regional and local agencies, including the State University Construction Fund, New York State Department of Health, New York State Department of Transportation (Region 10), New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (Region 1), New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation, Town of Brookhaven, Suffolk County Executive, Suffolk County Department of Public Works, Suffolk County Department of Planning, Suffolk County Water Authority, and Long Island Regional Planning Council. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be supportive of this criterion.

10. Does the project involve community-based planning and collaboration? Check one and describe:

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not Relevant

The Proposed Project would avoid the unique geological features and steep slopes of the SBU campus identified in the 1996 Town of Brookhaven Comprehensive Land Use Plan and would, therefore, be generally compatible with the plan. The DEIS for the Proposed Project is subject to public review in accordance with SEQR, including a public scoping meeting; circulation of the DEIS to involved agencies and interested parties, including the public; and a public hearing and comment period for obtaining public comments on the DEIS. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be generally supportive of this criterion.

11. Is the project consistent with local building and land use codes? Check one and describe:

☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Not Relevant

12. Does the project promote sustainability by strengthening existing and creating new communities which reduce greenhouse gas emissions and do not compromise the needs of future generations?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not Relevant
The Proposed Project would incorporate numerous environmental sustainability measures that would promote this criterion. It is expected that the proposed new facilities would be designed consistent with LEED® “Silver” requirements, and that the Proposed Project would incorporate “green” technologies for the proposed renovations when applicable. As described under *Greenhouse Gas Emissions* in Chapter 14, “Air Quality,” in 2009 SBUH signed a Memorandum of Understanding (“MOU”) with the USEPA, pledging to become an environmental steward by implementing numerous green measures to reduce the Hospital’s carbon footprint and improve the environment. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be supportive of this criterion.

13. During the development of the project, was there broad based public involvement? (Documentation may include SEQR coordination with involved and interested agencies, SPDES permit issuance/revision notice, approval of Bond Resolution, formation of district, evidence of public hearings, Environmental Notice Bulletin (“ENB”) or other published notices, letters of support, etc.). Check one and describe:

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not Relevant

DASNY, as *SEQR* lead agency, has included as involved or interested agencies in the *SEQR* review numerous State, regional and local agencies, including the State University Construction Fund, New York State Department of Health, New York State Department of Transportation (Region 10), New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (Region 1), New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation, Town of Brookhaven, Suffolk County Executive, Suffolk County Department of Public Works, Suffolk County Department of Planning, Suffolk County Water Authority, and Long Island Regional Planning Council.

In addition, the *DEIS* for the Proposed Project is subject to public review in accordance with *SEQR*, including a public scoping meeting; circulation of the *DEIS* to involved agencies and interested parties, including the public; and a public hearing and comment period for obtaining public comments on the *DEIS*. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be generally supportive of this criterion.

14. Does the Recipient have an ongoing governance structure to sustain the implementation of community planning? Check one and describe:

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not Relevant

As described under *Greenhouse Gas Emissions* in Chapter 14, “Air Quality,” in 2009 SBUH signed a Memorandum of Understanding (“MOU”) with the USEPA concerning the reduction of the Hospital’s carbon footprint. SBUMC is committed to the implementation of the MOU, including the implementation of various measures to improve the environment. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be supportive of this criterion.
DASNY has reviewed the available information regarding this project and finds:

☑ The project was developed in general consistency with the relevant Smart Growth Criteria.

☐ The project was not developed in general consistency with the relevant Smart Growth Criteria.

☐ It was impracticable to develop this project in a manner consistent with the relevant Smart Growth Criteria for the following reasons:

ATTESTATION

I, President of DASNY/designee of the President of DASNY, hereby attest that the Proposed Project, to the extent practicable, meets the relevant criteria set forth above and that to the extent that it is not practical to meet any relevant criterion, for the reasons given above.

______________________________
Signature

Jack D. Homkow, Director, Office of Environmental Affairs
Print Name and Title

April 20, 2012
Date
APPENDIX C

WRITTEN COMMENTS ON THE DEIS AND TRANSCRIPT OF MAY 4, 2012, DEIS PUBLIC HEARING
WRITTEN COMMENTS ON THE DEIS
May 18, 2012

Matthew Stanley, Senior Environmental Manager
Office of Environmental Affairs
Dormitory Authority of the State of New York
One Penn Plaza, 52nd Floor
New York, NY 10119-0098

Re: Responses to Draft Environmental Impact Statement Document Review
Stony Brook Medical Center - Medical Facilities & Parking
Stony Brook, Suffolk County, NY 11794

Dear Mr. Stanley:

Please find below our comments to the Stony Brook Medical Center Draft Environmental Impact Statement Document (DEIS).

**Noise**

The proposed traffic mitigation measures identified for the Nicolls Road and NY25A and Nicolls Road and NY347 intersections, as discussed in the DEIS, should be evaluated for potential noise impacts based on the NYSDOT Noise Analysis Policy and Procedures specifically as they may relate to the Type I project description and auxiliary Lanes. A link to the current document is provided below.


**Air Quality & Energy**

In the letter to Sheref dated 2/7/12, DASNY, responded to one of our previous comments with the following statement:

“NYSDOT requests that DASNY contact the Nassau/Suffolk Transportation Coordinating Committee to determine if the Proposed Project qualifies as regionally significant and should be included in regional emissions analysis. DASNY intends to reach out to NSTCC as requested.”
No reference was found in the documentation in the DEIS indicating that DASNY had reached out to NSTCC. Was the contact made as requested, and did DASNY/NSTCC interaction result in a determination that the project is not regionally significant under the Transportation Conformity regulation 40 CFR Part 93?

**Planning**

Pages (13-20) Cross access between developed properties should be strongly encouraged. Local access to developed property for pedestrians and bicyclists should also be considered.

Pages (13-40) NYSDOT is supportive of the Travel Demand Management (TDM) concepts being proposed within the DGEIS.

Pages (13-40) NYSDOT no longer employs the services of Long Island Transportation Management. 511NY Rideshare, which is sponsored by New York State Department of Transportation, provides an enhanced level of services, tools, and information on cost-effective and reliable alternatives to driving alone. These alternatives which may be available to employers, commuters and the general public include carpooling, vanpooling, public transit, bicycling, walking and teleworking. 511 NY Rideshare’s goal is to provide commuters with a mobility plan that is flexible enough to adjust to the changing conditions on our roadways. To enhance this goal, planning is in place for a launch of [www.511nyrideshare.org](http://www.511nyrideshare.org) at a later point in 2012. This new website will provide a suite of program services including the above mentioned ridematching for carpooling and vanpooling, employer commuter benefits services, and resources and information for transit, bicycling, walking, telework and other options.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 631-952-6059.

Sincerely,

*(original signed)*

Sheref Fathi, P.E.
Regional Environmental Manager

cc: M. Bocamazo, Regional Design Engineer, Region 10
    S. Fathi/P. Elgut/J. Martin, Landscape Architecture and Environment, Region 10
    Circ. Copy – Design R-10 – LA/ENV
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PROCEDINGS

THE MODERATOR: It's now seven minutes after six. So I think it's time for us to get our public hearing started.

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen.

On behalf of the Dormitory Authority of the State of New York, I would like to welcome you to this evening's State Environmental Quality Review public hearing for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Stony Brook University Medical Center's Medical Facility and Parking Project.

My name is Matthew Stanley and I'm a Senior Environmental Manager with the Office of Environmental Affairs for the Dormitory Authority. I will be the moderator for this evening's public hearing.

The Proposed Project is being reviewed pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act, Article 8 of the Environmental Conservation Law, and its implementing regulations, which are collectively referred to as "SEQR," or the "SEQR process."

The purpose of tonight's SEQR public hearing is to allow all involved agencies and interested parties an opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.
Tonight's agenda will include my introductory remarks about the Dormitory Authority, a description of the Proposed Project and the SEQR process. Next, a discussion of the purpose and need for the Proposed Project will be given by a representative of Stony Brook School of Medicine.

A summary of the Draft EIS will then be given by the consulting firm that prepared the document. Finally, we will open the floor for public comments.

For those of you not familiar with our agency, the Dormitory Authority is a public-benefit corporation of the State of New York established in 1944 to finance and construct dormitories at New York State teachers' colleges. Those teachers' colleges were the forerunner of the State University of New York system.

Over the years, DASNY'S scope has grown to include government agencies and certain nonprofit, public-purpose organizations as well. DASNY'S commitment to these institutions has helped fund the creation and improvement and hospitals, research centers, nursing homes, universities, courthouses, athletic facilities, and libraries all across the state.

Next I'll speak about the availability of the Draft EIS. The Draft EIS, the Notice
of Completion, and the Notice of Public Hearing for the
process may be reviewed in the Government Documents
section of the Frank Melville Jr. Memorial Library on the
Stony Brook University campus. In addition, these
materials may be viewed or downloaded from DASNY's website
at the following address www.dasny.org/envaffs.

Comments on the Draft EIS will be
accepted until May 21, 2012. There are several ways for
you to submit comments. You may make your comments orally
tonight. If you would like to speak tonight, please sign
up on the Speaker List/Mailing List at the table in the
back and be sure to check the box in the column under, "Do
you wish to speak tonight?" Next, write your name on an
index card and hand it to the staff member. Your name
will be called when it is your turn to speak.

Written comments are also accepted.

Letters may be sent to me at the following address:
Matthew Stanley, Office of
Environmental Affairs, Dormitory Authority of the State of
New York, One Penn Plaza, 52nd Floor, New York, New York
10019. Written comments may also been sent via e-mail at
mstanley@dasny.org.

In addition, there is a comment
sheet available tonight for your use in submitting written
comments. You may complete it here tonight and submit it
before you leave. Or you may take it home, fill it out, send it in by the May 21st deadline. My address is at the bottom, and be sure to write your name on the sheet.

If you would like to receive future documents related to the Environmental Review of the subject as they are issued, you may also sign up on the speaker list/mailing list tonight.

Next I'll discuss the Proposed Action and Proposed Project. DASNY has received a funding request from Stony Brook University Medical Center for funding portions of its proposed Medical Facilities and Parking Project.

For the purposes of SEQR, the Proposed Action would consist of DASNY's authorization of the expenditure of tax-exempt bond proceeds. The bond proceeds would be used to finance portions of Medical Facilities and Parking Project.

Additional funding would come from the State University Construction Fund, a SUNY 2020 Challenge Grant, Stony Brook operating funds and private donations. Construction is expected to begin in 2012 and end in 2018.

The Proposed Project would include the following:

An eight-story, approximately
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250,000-square foot Medical and Research Translation Building also known as MART. This building would contain patient care uses, teaching and research space, research laboratories and radiology.

An eight-story, approximately 200,000-square foot Bed Tower would include 45 new hospital beds and 68 beds relocated from existing hospital facilities, plus food services, laboratory services. An additional 45 new beds will be located within existing hospital facility.

An approximately 75,000-square foot Medical Office Building would house medical examination and procedure space for various clinical services, plus support space.

Various renovations to existing medical center facilities would be necessary to accommodate proposed connections to the new facilities and to enable back filling of vacated spaces once certain services and functions are relocated to the MART.

A new parking garage would consist of an approximately 1,900-space facility adjacent to the existing hospital parking garage.

The existing surface lot would be expanded to provide an additional 49 spaces.

A new valet lot of 118 spaces would
be constructed east of the existing garage.

A new employee lot of 551 spaces on the north side of Edmond D. Pellegrino Road. Construction of this parking lot would include the placement of column foundations for a potential future parking garage at this site. The potential future parking garage is not part of the Proposed Project.

And finally, the Proposed Project would include roadway improvements as well as construction of new roadways that would connect project elements on the campus.

Now I'd like to introduce Dr. Kenneth Kaushansky, the Senior Vice President of Health Sciences and Dean of the School of Medicine at Stony Brook, who will discuss the Proposed Project in greater detail.

DR. KAUSHANSKY: Thank you very much. It really is a pleasure to go over the rationale for the design and construction of two major expansions to the Stony Brook University School of Medicine and University Hospital.

I'll discuss this as two separate projects, but in reality they are one project. They are one project because we plan to design and build them simultaneously. They will be physically connected. They
will be physically connected to the School of Medicine and to the existing Stony Brook University Hospital.

First, what we're calling the Bed Tower or the expansion of Stony Brook University Hospital. There are a number of very good reasons, in our opinion, for expanding the university hospital.

First of all, our existing hospital, which consists of about 597 licensed beds, is virtually always full. When I come to work in the morning, I get a list of how many patients are waiting for admission to our hospital. It averages 28 every morning.

The university hospital and the medical service, the surgical service are running at 90 to 95 percent capacity all the time. And actually those data are an underestimate of how busy we are because those kind of data are collected at midnight and we're busier in the daytime.

The effort right now is to build a children's hospital in the new Bed Tower. What is the rationale for that? It turns out that there are hundreds of thousands of children in Suffolk County. The size of the pediatric population in Suffolk County exceeds that of 87 percent of population areas that have children's hospitals.

To say it again another way, we are
one of the largest population centers in the United States that does not have a children's hospital. The children of Suffolk County deserve a devoted children's hospital and we are going to fill that need with this expansion.

There are a number of up-to-date services that we should be prepared to fill with the expansion of the Bed Tower. Our operating rooms are filled to capacity. Our intensive care units are filled to capacity. We have a very busy neurosurgical service, but we do not have a neurosurgical intensive care unit.

All of these facilities are needed to better take care of the patients of Suffolk County and beyond. So there's a wealth of rationale for developing an expanded hospital capacity here at Stony Brook University Hospital.

The other part of the project is to create this MART Building or Medicine and Research Translation Building. That, too, is a complex facility composed of both clinical space and education research space.

Right now our cancer center, which is on the south end of the Health Sciences Campus, is pretty full to capacity as well. We constantly have waiting lines to take care of patients with cancer because we do not have sufficient room to care for all of those
cancer patients here at our cancer center.

The MART Building will house a significant increase in space for cancer physicians to take care of their patients. There will be an enlarged infusion center for patients who require infusions of chemotherapy, transfusions, and other forms of infusion therapies.

In addition, there will be new educational space in the Medicine and Research Translation Building. In addition, there will be a 300-person auditorium that will house conferences, it will house classroom work.

Currently we do not have a classroom big enough to accommodate our first-year medical and dental school classes if we are to expand the medical school here at Stony Brook University.

My goal is to expand the medical school class because virtually everyone who has analyzed it, suggests we need more physicians in the United States. And there have been new medical schools and expansion of existing medical schools. We should be contributing to that need. So new educational space in the MART Building.

The hallmark of a research university is to make a major impact on the research of cancer, of neurosciences, of major plights of human
beings. We propose to house 25 or 30 new laboratories that are devoted to cancer, science, and other related disciplines.

    We propose to increase our ability to study patient's tumors and other diseases by an enhanced imaging center present within the MART Building. So the MART Building is going to be a multi-purpose building.

    The 250,000-square feet of space will house scientists, it will house clinicians, it will house medical educators. And it will provide a new venue for enhanced research and education.

    So together, these two projects will really transform the way Stony Brook Medicine looks. It will enhance our clinical capacity, it will enhance our ability to train the next generation of health care providers and it will expand our clinical capacity to care for patients with cancer, with childhood diseases and a number of other problems that we frequently see here in Suffolk County.

    So we are very excited about this project. We believe we have the faculty to house this. It will have a major impact on the economics of this region. That's is why the SUNY 2020 Grant, the $35 million dollar grant, was given to Stony Brook University.
So it's going to fulfill a lot of functions at Stony Brook University. So with that, I am happy to answer any questions.

(No response.)

DR. KAUSHANSKY: Hearing none, I'll yield the floor.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Dr. Kaushansky. Here is a summary of the activities that have taken place thus far as part of the SEQRA process.

On October 24, 2011, Stony Brook submitted an Environmental Assessment Form, Part I, to DASNY, which formally commenced the SEQRA process. Next, DASNY issued a lead agency request letter to the involved agencies and interested parties on October 26, 2011.

This letter indicated that DASNY had made a preliminary determination that the Proposed Project was a Type I action pursuant to the SEQR implementing regulations and proposed to designate itself as lead agency and conduct a coordinated review among the involved agencies. There being no objections, DASNY assumed the lead agency role on November 28, 2011.

On that date, DASNY, as lead agency, issued a series of documents.

First was a Positive Declaration.

Second, a Notice of Public Scoping.
Meeting. And third, a Draft Scoping Document. Notice of the Positive Declaration was published in the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation's Environmental Notice Bulletin on November 30 and December 7, 2011. The Notice of Public Scoping Meeting was published in the December 2, 2011 edition of Newsday. The Positive Declaration indicated that the Dormitory Authority had determined that the Proposed Project may generate significant adverse environmental impacts and, as a result, a Draft Environmental Impact Statement would be prepared. A public scoping meeting was held on December 15, 2011 and the Final Scoping Document was issued on February 29, 2012. Subsequent to the issuance of the Final Scoping Document, DASNY and its consultants began preparing the Draft EIS. During the preparation of the Draft EIS, the Dormitory Authority, Stony Brook University, and their consultants engaged in discussions and correspondence with representative of various local, state, and federal agencies in an effort to ensure that the Draft EIS adequately disclosed and evaluated the potentially significant adverse environmental effects of
Included along these agencies were the New York State Department of Transportation, the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation; the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation; the Suffolk County Department of Planning; the Suffolk County Water Authority; and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

On April 20, 2012, DASNY issued a Combined Notice of Completion of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Notice of Public Hearing. These notices were published in the April 20, 2012 edition of Newsday and the April 25, 2012 edition of the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation's Environmental Notice Bulletin. The combined notices and copies of the Draft EIS were sent to the involved agencies and interested parties on DASNY's mailing list for the Proposed Project.

I'd like to introduce now George Rupp of the consulting firm The Louis Berger Group, to discuss the Draft for the proposed project.

MR. RUPP: Thank you, Matt. Again, I'm George Rupp. I'm Director of Environmental Planning for The Louis Berger Group. We were retained by the Dormitory Authority to assist the Dormitory Authority and
Stony Brook University Medical Center in preparing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement or DEIS.

The DEIS offered a comprehensive evaluation of the full range of environmental and technical topics including traffic, air quality, noise, hazardous materials, sewers, storm water, natural resources, cultural resources, et cetera.

At the end of the day, when all the analysis were done, there were no significant mitigatable impacts that were found. We did evaluate four intersections for traffic off of the campus. Those intersections from north to south are:

- Route 25A at Nicolls Road, North Drive at Nicolls Road, South Drive at Nicolls Road, and Route 347 at Nicolls Road.

Three of those intersections, Route 25A, South Drive, and Route 347, had significant impacts, but we're able to mitigate them back to the same level that they would been at if the project was never built by using standard mitigation measures such as lane re-striping, lane reconfiguration, signal timing, signal re-phases, and implementing a travel to main entry program on the South Campus to lessen the number of single-occupancy vehicles accessing the campus.

We're here this evening to listen to __________________________
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your comments and concerns on the Environmental Impact Statement. And with that in mind, I'll turn the proceedings to Matt Stanley and take any questions you may have.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, George.

After the close of the public comment period on the Draft EIS, DASNY will incorporate relevant comments into a Final Environmental Impact Statement that will be distributed to all persons and agencies on the mailing list. It is anticipated that the Final EIS will be completed in June of 2012.

Subsequent to the completion of the Final EIS, DASNY will issue a SEQR Findings Statement. This Findings Statement will describe the basis of DASNY'S decision on whether or not to approve the Proposed Project.

The Findings Statement will be distributed to all persons and agencies on the mailing list. It is anticipated that the Findings Statement will be issued several weeks after the Final EIS. The issuance of the Findings Statement would signal the completion of the Environmental review process for the Proposed Project.

At this time I would like to commence the public comment session of this hearing. The procedure will be as follows:
Elected officials, in deference to their busy schedules, will speak first, to be followed by members of the public in the order in which they signed up.

Speakers will be given three minutes to speak. Before you begin your comments, please identify yourself, clearly spell your name, and indicate your affiliation or title for the court reporter.

Stacey, has anyone signed up to speak?

MS. BARRON: No, they have not.

THE MODERATOR: At this time it appears there are no speakers. It's 6:27, so we will take a recess of 20 minutes and see if anyone shows up. Thank you.

(At this time a recess was taken from 6:27 p.m. to 6:46 p.m.)

THE MODERATOR: It is now 6:46. It has been about 20 minutes. There is still no one signed up to speak. And actually, besides the project team, there is no one in attendance.

Let's take another recess of half an hour to a quarter after seven just to make sure in case anyone does show up. So we're going to break for about a half an hour now. Thank you.
(At this time a recess was taken from 6:47 to 7:18.)

THE MODERATOR: It is now 7:18 p.m.

As there have been no attendees and no speakers and there is currently no one signed up to speak, I think it is appropriate that we close this public hearing.

If anyone wishes to comment, the comment period deadline is May 21st, 2012. Comments may be sent to the Dormitory Authority as previously mentioned and that closes this public hearing for the Stony Brook Medical Facilities and Parking Project.

(At 7:19 p.m., the proceedings were concluded.)
CERTIFICATION

I, REBECCA WOOD, a Notary Public in and for the State of New York, do hereby certify:

THAT the witness whose testimony is hereinbefore set forth, was duly sworn by me; and

THAT the within transcript is a true record of the testimony given by said witness.

I further certify that I am not related, either by blood or marriage, to any of the parties in this action; and

THAT I am in no way interested in the outcome of this matter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this day of ___________ day of ________________, 2012.

________________________
REBECCA WOOD