



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 #7***

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



December 4, 2008

Meeting Title: Stakeholders' Advisory Working Groups (SAWGs)
Traffic and Transit SAWG Meeting #7

Meeting Purpose: Exchange of Information

Location Date: Holiday Inn, 3 Executive Boulevard, Suffern, NY
December 4, 2008

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

Attendees: **Name**

- Charles Borgman
- Philip Bosco
- Joan Connors
- Bob Dillon
- Jay Fallik
- Patrick Gerdin
- Richard Harrington
- Jane Keller
- Barton Lee
- Hon. Lawrence Lynn
- John P. McLaughlin
- Maureen Morgan
- Charlie Murphy
- Mary Jane Shimsky
- Janet Zagoria

And the representatives of the agencies and consultant team.

Agenda Item 1

Introduction

Mr. Russell Robbins welcomed attendees and explained the current status of the scoping process. He indicated that the comment period for the October 2008 Public Information Meetings ended December 1, 2008. The Scoping Summary Report, which will present the results of the scoping process, is expected by the end of January, and will be posted to the web site. 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 James Coyle of Earth Tech who presented the evening's topic, Transit Mode Selection Report results.

Mr. Coyle then presented the evening's technical presentation, explaining the data that were used in the Transit Mode Selection Report that led to the recommendations that Bus Rapid Transit across the corridor from Suffern to Port Chester and Commuter Rail Transit connecting the Port Jervis Line in Suffern with the Hudson Line in Tarrytown be the selected modes. The options still under study include:

- BRT in HOT lanes in Rockland County
- BRT on a busway in Rockland County
- BRT on exclusive lanes in Westchester County
- BRT on a busway in Westchester County
- CRT in the median of I-287 in Rockland County
- CRT south of the roadway in Rockland County
- CRT along Wayne Avenue in Suffern
- CRT along the Piermont rights-of-way in Suffern

Agenda Item 2

Technical Presentation

The technical presentation is attached.

Agenda Item 3
Questions and Comments

- Question: Will we get to select the options in the DEIS?
- Answer: Options will be developed in greater detail [particularly alignment] and will be selected and recommended in the DEIS. Stakeholder input is requested.
- Question: Is there a market for the Hudson Line northbound from Rockland County, especially given development at Stewart Airport?
- Answer: That market was looked at in the Alternatives Analysis, and does exist, but is very small. It will be served with a transfer in some options.
- Question: Currently only 7% of the people crossing the Tappan Zee Bridge are headed to Manhattan. Why is that such an important movement?
- Answer: Currently most Rockland and Orange County residents headed for Manhattan use other river crossings. They represent a large market for Rockland and Orange Counties, one particularly attractive for transit. The Tappan Zee Bridge can serve those commuters. It is also important to point out that 28% of Rockland and Orange County residents are headed to New York City (Bronx, Manhattan and rest of NYC) across the Tappan Zee Bridge currently and this will grow in the future.
- Question: Is financing cost included in the cost estimates?
- Answer: The cost estimates shown do not include the cost of financing, which will depend on the amount borrowed, the institutional arrangements, and the market interest rates. These matters are discussed in the financing study, available on the web site.
- Question: What grades are assumed at the Hackensack River crossing? Has consideration been given to the raising of the CSX elevation to prevent flooding?
- Answer: Some consideration has been given to the Hackensack River crossing – remaining high to cross the CSX tracks, using a 2% grade for rail and 3% grade for busway/HOT lanes. More detail will be developed in the DEIS, and consideration of flooding problems on the Hackensack River will be included.
- Question: What are the differences between Tier 1 and Tier 2 transit analysis?
- Answer: Tier 1 transit is only alignment (horizontal and vertical), with potential station locations. Tier 2 transit includes detailed station locations and analysis of station configuration and traffic impacts.
- Question: What can we do to keep this project on schedule?
- Answer: Keep us all informed of your concerns and remain involved.

Question: I am concerned about the built-in assumptions to the modeling process, of a continuation of growth patterns and travel patterns 30 years into the future. What adjustments are you making?

Answer: The regional model we are using, BPM, is the adopted model of the region's Metropolitan Planning Organization, NYMTC. We are aware of the limitations to the process that result from the model, and are exploring the sensitivities to changes in relative costs, attractiveness and service levels.

Question: What kinds of "what ifs" are you testing? What if CRT never happens?

Answer: We are looking at sensitivity to relative costs of highway and transit modes – fuel costs and fares, congestion pricing and such. All of the agencies involved are behind the proposal for CRT.

Question: Is there flexibility to expand the bridge?

Answer: No, there is excess capacity in the rail facility, but no way to expand highway capacity, since there is no place for the traffic to go at the shoreline.

There was some discussion of topics for future SAWG meetings, including detailing of the options, pedestrian and bicycle improvements, prevention of suicides, alternative futures and service planning.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:45 PM.