



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)
Traffic and Transit SAWG Meeting #6***

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



March 11, 2008

Meeting Title: Stakeholders' Advisory Working Groups (SAWGs)
Traffic and Transit SAWG Meeting #6

Meeting Purpose: Exchange of Information

Location Date: Best Western Nyack on Hudson, 27 Route 59, Nyack, NY
March 11, 2008

Agenda:

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

Attendees:

Name

Borgman, Charles
Connors, Joan
Cuffel, Heather
Dym, Syrette
Fallik, Jay
Trenk, Neil
Getz, Orrin
Levine, Julius
Hon. Lawrence Lynn
Morgan, Maureen
Shimsky, Mary Jane
Winoker, Arthur
Zagoria, Janet

Tangredi, John
Keller, Jane
Pisano, Arlene

And the representatives of the agencies and consultant team.

Agenda Item 1

Introduction

Mr. Robert Laravie welcomed attendees and explained the current status of the scoping process. He introduced Paul Plotczyk who explained the changes in the meeting structure. He asked if there were unanswered questions from the last meeting, and suggested that any questions following this meeting, or comments on the scoping process be called into the project office (914-358-0600) or Rita Campon (212-266-8524). Mr. Plotczyk then introduced Michael Lambert of Earth Tech who presented the evening's topic, Light Rail Transit.

LRT Concepts Presentation

Mr. Lambert began the PowerPoint presentation by explaining the components of LRT systems, highlighting vehicles, stations, variety of rights-of-way and other major components. He then showed where the LRT alternative appeared in the current study. He then turned the floor over to David Wilson of Arup.

LRT Alternative Presentation

Mr. Wilson described the LRT alternatives routing and station locations through the corridor, focusing on areas where specific issues were addressed, particularly central White Plains.

Agenda Item 2

Technical Presentation

Agenda Item 3
Questions and Comments

- Question: Can LRT vehicles be operated safely in mixed rail traffic with CRT vehicles?
- Answer: The vehicles are too light weight, and do not meet Federal Railway Administration standards for operation in mixed rail traffic. In some cases, they operate at different times of the day – NJTransit's River Line, for example.
- Question: Why is there no LRT proposed in Rockland?
- Answer: It was difficult to locate an LRT line in Rockland that would attract significant ridership and not take lanes from Route 59.
- Question: Isn't LRT cheaper to put in tunnels than CRT? Look at the tunnels in Boston and Philadelphia?
- Answer: Those tunnels were built decades ago. Building LRT tunnels today is almost as expensive as CRT tunnels.
- Question: Who would operate LRT? NJTransit operates CRT and LRT?
- Answer: Specific operating entities were not evaluated as part of the study.
- Question: Won't LRT encourage Transit Oriented Development, so people can live in affordable housing convenient to transit?
- Answer: LRT has been shown to encourage TOD elsewhere, including in New Jersey.
- Question: Where would the maintenance facility go?
- Answer: Three options: south of the Tarrytown Station, south of the Port Chester Station or north of the Port Chester Station.
- Question: Which gives better travel times, LRT, CRT or BRT?
- Answer: LRT is 34-40 minutes from Tarrytown to Port Chester, about half that to White Plains. CRT would be faster, BRT a little slower.
- Question: How will you analyze the traffic problems in White Plains caused by the lane takings?
- Answer: Special Paramics traffic simulations will be done for White Plains, to see what the impact of BRT and LRT will be.
- Question: How much time would be saved by keeping the jitneys from White Plains to the Platinum Mile and skipping the stops?

Answer: 2-3 minutes would be saved on the LRT runs, but the Platinum Mile users would suffer a 10 to 15-minute longer trip.

Question: Why aren't you tunneling under White Plains?

Answer: A tunnel under White Plains for the LRT was considered in the Alternatives Analysis (Scenario LRT2), and eliminated due to cost.

Question: Would you reconsider LRT across Rockland in light of ARC and its impact on Manhattan bound ridership?

Answer: Cross Rockland LRT was considered in the Alternatives Analysis without ARC, but it was so significantly less cost-effective than either BRT or CRT that it was eliminated. The differences we are seeing with ARC in ridership to Manhattan would not be significant enough to change that conclusion.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:15 PM.