



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 Group  
Bridge SAWG 14***

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

---



**October 27, 2009**

**1. Introduction**

Kristine Edwards, the NYSDOT bridge manager for the study, opened the meeting. Ms Edwards explained that there will be a series of Cooperating Agency meetings and public working meetings over the next few weeks. The public working meetings will be an open invitation for anyone to attend and will be at various locations across the two counties as follows:

- November 10, 2009 – Ramapo – Spring Valley high school
- November 18, 2009 – Clarkstown
- December 1, 2009 – Greenburg Library
- December 12, 2009 – Port Chester – White Plains Town of Harrison / Rye

Attendance at Bridge Stakeholders' Advisory Working Group Meeting October 27, 2009 Tarrytown Village Hall, Tarrytown, New York
Francis Goudie
Gilbert Hawkins
John Messina
Jon Marshall
Marie Lorenzini
Marilyn Lund
Marion Franklin
Neil Trenk
Paul Richards
Robert Hintersteiner
Ron Weinstein
Maureen Morgan

The Cooperating Agency Meetings will extend through December and will be focused around Hudson River suspended solids. Details from this meeting will be presented at a future Bridge SAWG meeting.

This meeting continued the ongoing discussions about the configuration of the possible replacement TZB. Having established options for the single and dual level options in previous meetings, this meeting continued the examination of the landing issues, particularly the CRT connection to the Hudson Line. Once the details and implications of the Hudson Line Connection are understood, and particularly the transportation, environmental and cost implications, the remaining TZB configuration options will be reassessed to determine which would be progressed into the DEIS for full assessment.

The meeting was informal and interactive with members sitting around a large table upon which the latest engineering drawings were placed. SAWG members and other attendees participated, asked questions, and offered opinions throughout the meeting.

**2. Technical Discussions**

The primary purposes of this meeting was to get further input from the working group on the commuter rail transit (CRT), bus rapid transit (BRT), and highway alignment issues and how they may impact the Tarrytown side of the possible replacement TZB.

Both single level and dual level bridge configurations were shown at the meeting, which focused in part on how highway lanes, BRT/high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes, and a commuter rail system could be arranged on the bridge structure while considering project goals, design criteria, right-of-way (ROW) concerns, safety and security, operations, BRT connectivity, CRT connectivity, constructability, possible main span bridge type, and transit accommodations that could be made to the highway and bridge while the transit environmental analysis is under way.

Mr. Roche (Arup, engineering consultant) began the technical part of the meeting with a general introduction and recap of the SAWG meeting 13 held on August 13, 2009. Particular items reviewed included the particular bridge option configurations that are likely recommended for elimination. A main focus of the evening was the CRT alignment at the Westchester landing including the tunnel and trestle options. Issues surrounding the Kraft and Lyndhurst properties were discussed. The following outlines the general discussion and questions:

**CRT Tunnel Option**

- Mr. Roche explained what the various line styles on the engineering drawings meant

- The group discussed the details of the alignment around the Kraft property. The implications for Building D and the required offset were noted. The possibility that vibrations could impact testing in building D was highlighted and possible modifications to trackwork details were discussed.
- CRT Tarrytown Station. The current service plans do not have a CRT station in Tarrytown, but instead bypass Tarrytown and make a first stop Irvington (Non-express service).
- The tunnel length as currently expressed in these preliminary drawings would be about 1 mile. There will be the need for ventilation. Potential access points were identified.
- 1-2 ventilation buildings would be required producing an additional foot print of approximately 100' x 75' including the building and parking area
- The minimum speed for trains in the tunnel and the different horizontal curves resulting were discussed. The alignment for the 45mph was discussed in detail, in particular the high grades and the proximity of the Lyndhurst property.
- Flood protection measures along the Hudson Line were discussed as well as the implications of global warming. Flood protection, in the form of a flood ramp were discussed including their location and extent.
- The Metro-North property boundaries were identified and the need to use a five rather than a six track alignment was discussed to minimize impact in the Hudson River.
- Discussions on construction highlighted the need for substantial work along the Hudson Line which would need to be staged to maintain the existing Metro-North service operational.

### **CRT Trestle Option**

- Discussion focused on the extent of the construction and the visual implications
- Construction of the trestle option focused on the staging requirements to maintain the existing Metro-North operational. The possible need to widen into the Hudson River was discussed and was identified as possible differentiator from the tunnel option.
- The elevation of the trestle was compared to the elevation of the land at Van Wart, Lyndhurst and Sunnyside properties. As the trestle elevation was above the adjacent land elevations for much of the alignment the group highlighted the visual implications to residents along the Hudson Line.
- Outline cost comparison of the trestle and tunnel options were discussed with the later being significantly more expensive.

Other issues discussed over the drawings included the alignment of the BRT at the Tarrytown landing. The potential connections between BRT in a busway or in bus lanes along the I-287 and Route 119 were explored. The need to make sure that the possible BRT station at Broadway would be integrated within the system was a focus with a number of potential configurations for the station suggested.

The Tarrytown Connector for bus to the Metro-North Tarrytown Station was the subject of much discussion with the two options discussed in detail – a north option and a south crossover option. The elevations of the tennis courts at the Quays and the BRT were explained with a number of suggestions made as to how the elevation of the BRT could be lowered.

### **3. Other questions and comments included:**

Question 1: Will the transit be funded at the same time?

Answer: Prior to the DEIS being done, a funding plan needs to be in place.

- Question 2: What makes a grade of 1.9% ok in a tunnel?  
Answer: The absence of leaves inside the tunnel makes a major difference. Outside tunnels the leaves reduce the friction between the track and the train wheels reducing traction and the ability to get up hills. Inside tunnels, this condition does not exist.
- Question 3: Regarding the CRT, would there ever be a need to go north?  
Answer: That is not being considered at this time, but may be for future development.
- Question 4: It was indicated that a larger market exists for an east/west movement not a north/south movement. Why is the north/south movement considered for the CRT only?  
Answer: The north/south movement is primarily to Grand Central during the peak hours. This can be accommodated on a commuter train with reasonable travel times. For the east/west market, the BRT system is proposed as this mode can suit the many-to-many sources and destinations in both counties.
- Question 5: Would it be beneficial to have a train hub in the center of Tarrytown?  
Answer: A train hub at Tarrytown was investigated early in the Scoping process but eliminated from further consideration because of the extent of property impacts, environmental impacts in the station area, the ability to have a one-seat ride to Manhattan and cost.
- Question 6: Are improvements being contemplated at the Irvington Station?  
Answer: Not at this stage as there are no proposed modifications in the Irvington Station area.