

**Bridgehampton Citizens Advisory Committee
Post Office Box 1650**

Bridgehampton, New York 11932

cac@aboutbridgehampton.com

Fred Cammann, Chair - Tony Lambert Vice Chair - Richard Bruce, Secretary

May 12, 2010

**A REPORT ON THE BRIDGEHAMPTON CAC MEETING HELD ON
APRIL 26, 2010 AT THE BRIDGEHAMPTON BANK**

A. The meeting was called to order at 7:00 PM

Those present were Richard Bruce, Fred Cammann, Jenice Delano, Tony Lambert, Helene Mahoney, Ian MacPherson, Phyllis MacPherson, Jeffrey Mansfield, Weezie Quimby, Cathie Gandel, Christine Smith, Alejandro Saralegui, Steven Steinberg, Jeffrey Vogel, Peter Wilson

B. The following resolution was passed and was sent to the Town Board

The Bridgehampton Citizens' Advisory Committee met on April 26, 2010 to review the Town Board proposed boundaries for the unincorporated hamlet of Bridgehampton. By unanimous vote the CAC agreed that the map submitted by the town presents the best compromise and delineation of the borders that encompass the hamlet of Bridgehampton.

Consequently we endorse this action by the Town Board in affirming the official hamlet borders and express our thanks to Councilwoman Nancy Graboski for her efforts and guidance in this matter

Jeffrey Vogel on behalf of the Bridgehampton CAC

Background:

The Town, with the guidance of Nancy Graboski, has spent quite a period of time trying to establish informal boundaries for the numerous unincorporated hamlets that make up the balance of Sotuhampton's land that is not within the boundaries of incorporated villages. This project has been a particular wish for the Bridgehampton community dating back to our investigation into possible incorporation in the wake of the "Dunehampton Village" threat to our shoreline identification about six years ago. The resulting incorporation of Sagaponack Village as protection against the Dunehampton invasive effort led members of our incorporation committee to ask the town to establish their boundary definitions for Bridgehampton. The results you will see are mainly the delineation of the Bridgehampton School District. Fred Cammann and Jeffrey Vogel have maps if anyone wishes to see the boundaries.

C. . The following resolution was passed and subsequently sent to the Town Board

We, The Bridgehampton Citizens' Advisory Committee do not consider a bus/rail system will serve the East End's interests since vehicular traffic is fundamental to our area and we therefore request that other options be considered directed towards reducing congestion including consideration of hamlet bypasses.

Ian MacPherson on behalf of the Bridgehampton CAC

Background:

Although this resolution is brief and broad, it in general reflects the consensus arrived after a lengthy review of the proposed Peconic Transportation . Here are some CAC comments based upon the bill proposed by Assemblyman Thiele. There are a number of ways to "skin this cat". We think the problem has not been adequately researched

- while I whole heartedly agree that a rail/bus system doesn't offer much to Bridgehampton and from our perspective is a massive waste of tax dollars in a time of the need for austerity and restraint in spending. I don't think that a "bypass" is ever likely to come about either and think that it will only result in a lot of litigation and legal fees. I do think that putting some of the freight on the rails might help and be cost effective. Other than that I think that only much higher transport costs are the only "solution" to the congestion. IMP "more road = more cars"

Whereas the CAC in reviewing Bill A06743A and the underlying SEEDS and Volpe reports notes:

- that a bus rail system is proposed for the South Fork as a means of reducing congestion because the ability to expand existing highways is limited and the construction of new highways is not feasible
- that according to the SEEDS and Volpe reports the amount of traffic which will be diverted from the roads to the bus rail system is insufficient to solve congestion on the East End now, and will be even less so in the future as development continues.
- that the ability or inability to improve roads or construct a new highway is entirely a matter of Community choice and investment feasibility
- that vehicular traffic is fundamental to our region
- that a seamless bus system would be the most beneficial means of achieving a greater measure of mass transit

The CAC therefore at its meeting on April 26th 2010 unanimously resolved that:

:

- * We do not consider a bus/rail system will serve the East End's interests
- In order to achieve material reduction in road congestion on the East End other options must be considered including a bypass for the hamlets on rte 27

The part time home owners and the weekenders are not going to take buses or rail to get to their weekend and summer homes and they are not going to take public transportation during the summer to go from Bridgehampton east or west for dinner, or lunch, or the beach, etc. etc.. And they are a cornerstone of our economy.

And when the housing market picks up in the Hamptons the contractors trucks are not going to go onto a freight carrier from Speonk to Montauk.

WE NEED ROADS, REAL WIDE ROADS, to handle the traffic we have invited to the east end. And if we can't build roads, then we will have to live with the congestion as the effect that the economic pluses that the traffic brings.

Maybe we can't have it both ways. Maybe we need to compromise our lofty goals. I think this regional authority is a waste of taxpayer money, at a time when the state can't pay school aid (See NYT today) and is cutting hospital subsidies. Lets get our priorities straight in these tough times instead of continuing with our high flying ideas as if these were the good old days.

I happened to be at the bus stop this morning from 7:45AM to 8AM and observed traffic going east, which was slow and heavy. A preponderant majority of the vehicles were either workmen in trucks or laborers in cars. Some were clearly commuters in moderate cars, people going to work. My conclusion is: these people aren't taking light rail or the like, nor are they bus riders. I think we are wasting public money and time on anything other than dealing with our needs for roads, roads, roads. Add what I saw this morning to the summer time when substantial revenue is earned by local businesses, and I can't see any other answer.

I really like your addition of the bus system because I think it's important to try to encourage mass transit.

You are largely right about the trade parade, but actually, many workers could easily use any public transit system.

If bus service were fully expanded EW, you probably could reduce radically NS service.

Bus increase requires no infra-structure increase and allows for future hard structure alternatives, but it would have to be part of a bypass for auto travel to be meaningful, and it would have to have time-efficient uploads with LIRR someplace west of here.

Jitney and LIRR with transfers to a regular light/mono rail would capture some day-trippers, but those services are focused on Manhattan. There's a lot of island in between. I have customers and suppliers from the in between who can only use cars as it now stands.

while I believe you are right in your assessment of the truck and car traffic I would urge you to look at the bus in the afternoon which is packed...

It might take a while but could/would attitudes about driving your own vehicle change if there were other options.

It might be crazy but if there were a monorail out to Montauk why would we need the LIRR if the two met somewhere west of here?

I personally only care about the congestion (and the road condition), so I personally would like to see a bypass. Short term I see no value in an LIRR light rail coordination with a shrinking bus service.

Long term (after many of us are gone), I think the viability of our kind of mixed seasonal and year-round community will develop and get more dense and crowded. Petroleum based personal transport will become obsolete (too expensive - China's entry as the biggest user almost guarantees that). I want a bypass to move the folks who live and play east of us, so they don't bother me. Having had a gallery on the North Fork, I have seen it works.

I agree that a light rail based on LIRR service will not do much in the short run, or, I would add, in the long run. Sooo, if we push for a monorail (which I believe would have a longer viable value than an expanded LIRR light rail), we probably can't get it. But the package includes a by pass (good for most of our short term needs). So the antiquated NYC commuter LIRR service doesn't change until the absurdity of it collapses it, but the bypass does get used to alleviate traffic for a decade or so.

Why did the MTA not wish to continue the service which addressed the potentially high volume demand commuter periods, and why has the MTA never sought to establish a frequent local service?

Why choose a rail system, where much of the capital cost will be spent outside NY State, and not assist local employment.?

Volpe estimates that the system fare recovery will be between 6 and 13% of operational cost. Is it the expectation that subsidies would derive from MTA taxes collected on the East End on the rationale that any mass transit system would be eligible? If so could they not also be applied to a bus only system?

Since the bill states that the issue of congestion must be addressed promptly and adequately to safeguard the economy, why is the bill focusing on the Shuttle when Sean

Pierce of Volpe told Ian MacPherson of the CAC that the Shuttle was not designed to reduce congestion, but that if it did do so, it would be welcome?

In view of these questions the CAC respectfully request that the bill provide for consideration of other solutions, including an all road solution to an environmentally satisfactory design, with a seamless bus system, as preferred by the North Fork?

One such possibility is the joint use of the LIRR corridor, from CR39 which was recommended for investigation by the Land Committee of the Southampton Town Transportation Task Force in 2002, which, even if it only ran to Stephen Hands, could reasonably be expected to reduce rte 27 traffic by 50% and eliminate use of residential streets as by-passes

Consideration of such options, if carried out with the thoroughness of the Volpe Report, would be, according to Volpe, not only a requirement with Federal Regulations for Federal Financing but would also ensure that the community is able to choose the most beneficial solution.

E. Following discussion of some other matters the meeting was adjourned at 9:15 PM
The next meeting will be held on Monday May 24, 2010 at 7:00 PM

Fred Cammann , Chair, hacres@optonline.net
Bridgehampton CAC