



TAPPAN ZEE BRIDGE/I-287
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

**New York State Department of Transportation
Metropolitan Transportation Authority Metro-North Railroad
New York State Thruway Authority**

Meeting Minutes

***Stakeholders' Advisory Working Groups (SAWGs)
Bridge SAWG Meeting #4***

***Tappan Zee Bridge/I-287 Corridor
Environmental Review***



November 15, 2007

Meeting Title: Stakeholders’ Advisory Working Groups (SAWGs)
Bridge SAWG Meeting #4

Meeting Purpose: Exchange of Information

Location/Date: Holiday Inn, Airmont, NY
November 15, 2007

Agenda: Item 1. Introduction (Page 2)
Item 2. Technical Presentation (Page 3)
Item 3. Questions and Comments (Page 18)

Attendees: **Name**
Walter Aurell?
William Helmer
Jan Degenshein
Donald Goldberg
Marilan Lund
Paul Richards
Robert Miller
George Sherman
Marie Lorenzini (alternate)
Paul Plotczyk (Facilitator)

Members of the agencies and consultant team.

Agenda Item 3
Questions and Comments

Question: Why does the Replacement Bridge Option 3 include 2 modes of transit (CRT and BRT)?

Answer: This option has the same modes as defined in Alternatives 4A, 4B and 4C. CRT is the only transit mode on the TZB.

Question: Is there a risk in the Replacement Bridge Option 2 that construction of the separate CRT bridge may be postponed as CRT is on a separate structure from the highway?

Answer: The DEIS does not consider construction phasing so the current assumption is that a complete option one would be fully constructed. Construction phasing may be considered in the future and Replacement Bridge Option 2 does offer that possibility.

Question: Has the effect on traffic on nearby bridges due to rehab/replacement of the Tappan Zee Bridge been considered?

Answer: Yes, these issues are being studied as part of the DEIS.

Question: What is the schedule for the project?

Answer: In the current schedule an alternative will be chosen in 2008 and design will be completed in 2009. Construction will commence in 2010. The construction period for a replacement bridge is 5 years, the construction period for a bridge rehabilitation is slightly longer (10 years).

Question: Would other crossing locations such as a bridge at Newburgh better address the regional mobility issues (e.g. access to Stewart Airport)?

Answer: Studying a new crossing at Newburgh is beyond the scope of this project.

Question: Has any further consideration been given to a truck tunnel?

Answer: Adding shoulders to the bridge to bring it up to minimum highway safety standards will widen the bridge by 50' which is 60% of the width of the existing bridge. This is a significant increase in width and will require a lot of new structure, any further lane requirements would be a relatively small increment to the widening for shoulders. It makes more sense to widen the bridge rather than to build a tunnel.

Question: Do you have enough information from the river borings to compare the river conditions to the San Francisco Oakland Bay Bridge East Span foundations?

Answer: The site investigation carried out in the river by the project team has provided detailed geotechnical information that has been used to prepare several conceptual foundation schemes for a new crossing.

Question: How well surveyed are the supports of the main span? Could we tell if they have moved several millimeters?

Answer: The surveys are not that accurate at this stage.

Question: Replacement Bridge Option 3 (dual level with CRT below) seems unbalanced with CRT on one lower deck and the other deck empty. Why not put CRT in the center?

Answer: That is a fair comment. The intent of these options is to illustrate a concept; there are several possible cross sections that have not been shown but would be considered if a replacement TZB is determined to be the way forward.