DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (DEIS)
PUBLIC HEARING

Rockland County – February 28, 2012
Westchester County – March 1, 2012
Why Replace the Tappan Zee Bridge

Main Span Issues
- Foundations need to be replaced
- Significant number of structural members need to be replaced or retrofitted
- Need to provide redundancy for river crossing at this point on the Hudson - not possible with current bridge

Approach Span Issues
- Extensive work required in foundations, substructure, steel superstructure
- Ongoing deck replacement addresses riding surface but not other significant deterioration concerns
- Future risks would remain
- No break-down shoulders is a public health and safety risk

Members to be retrofitted
Milestones

- **Rescinded Notice of Intent:** October 12, 2011
- **New Notice of Intent:** October 12, 2011
- **Public Scoping Meetings:** October 25 and 27, 2011
- **Published DEIS:** January 19, 2012
- **Began Soil Boring Program:** January 30, 2012
- **Accepted Bids for PIDP:** February 9, 2012
- **Public Hearings:** February 28 and March 1, 2012
Maximize the Public Investment

Provide the Infrastructure for Future Transit on the New Highway Bridges:

- Providing additional width
- Increased design loadings
- Providing certain constant grades
- Spanning the space between spans at later date to provide Infrastructure for future transit modes
Purpose and Need

Identify Alternatives

Identify Impacts
Project Limits

- 4-mile limit includes bridge and its immediate landings

PROJECT CONTEXT
Rockland County Landing
Westchester County Landings
Purpose and Need

Purpose of the Project

To maintain a vital link in the regional and national transportation network by providing an improved Hudson River crossing between Rockland and Westchester counties.
Purpose and Need
Purpose and Need

- **Need for the Project**
  Bridge has documented:
  - Structural deficiencies
  - Operation deficiencies
  - Safety deficiencies
  - Security deficiencies
  - Mobility deficiencies
Project Goals

• Ensure the long-term viability of this Hudson River Crossing

• Improve transportation operations and safety on the crossing

• Maximize the public investment in a new Hudson River crossing
Two Alternatives in DEIS:

- No Build
  - Baseline, Future Forecast
- Replacement Bridge
  - Options for bridge span
Replacement Alternative

- Four Lanes in Each Direction
- Provides Shared-Use Bike and Pedestrian Path
- Provides Wide Shoulders – Avoids Closures due to Break-downs
- Maximize the Public Investment by allowing future transit
Approach Span Options

• These bridge options have been evaluated in the DEIS

• Final Configurations will vary based on the successful bidders proposal

Long Span Option  |  Short Span Option
Main Span Options: Cable-stayed
Main Span Options: Arch
DEIS Impact Analysis

- Transportation
- Parklands & Recreational Resources
- Community Character
- Acquisition, Displacement & Relocation
- Historic & Cultural Resources
- Visual and Aesthetic Resources
- Noise and Air Quality
- Energy & Climate Change
- Environmental Justice
- Topography, Geography & Soils
- Water Quality & Ecology
- Hazardous Materials
- Cumulative Effects
- Construction

Identify Impacts
Visual and Aesthetic Resources
Historic and Cultural Resources
Noise

Rockland County Mitigation

Westchester County Mitigation
Ecology
Construction Impacts

Environmental Performance Commitments:

• Minimize environmental impacts of project’s construction

• Included in project’s
  • Design
  • Construction methods

Mitigation measures proposed where impacts would occur
Environmental Performance Commitments

- Transportation
- Community Character
- Architectural Resources
- Land Acquisition, Displacement and Relocation
Environmental Performance Commitments

• Noise

- Use shrouds or attenuating curtains for pile drivers and other compressors and generators.
- Electric powered equipment should be utilized instead of diesel equipment wherever possible.
- Impact devices (i.e. jack hammers, pavement breakers, and pneumatic) tools must use shrouds.
- Construction staging areas must have appropriate noise attenuation materials installed such as attenuation curtains.
- Contractors and subcontractors are required to properly maintain equipment.
Environmental Performance Commitments

- Air Quality
- Energy and Climate Change
- Topography, Geology and Soils
Environmental Performance Commitments

- Water Quality and Ecology
- Hazardous Materials
Pile Installation Demonstration Project

- The installation of Piles is a critical part of the construction of the new Bridge to assist with load testing and environmental monitoring.
- The Pile Installation Demonstration Project (PIDP) will collect information about the installation of different sized piles (4', 8' and 10' diameters) at different locations. The environmental effects of pile installation will also be monitored.
- This information will be provided to contractors as they develop bids, proceed with design, and seek to mitigate the environmental effects of pile installation during construction.
- There are several types of geological materials that the new bridge piles must be driven through in order to be stabilized.
- The PIDP project will be awarded soon and is expected to be complete by July 2012.
What is Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act?

If a transportation project needs to use land from publicly owned parks, recreational areas, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, or public and private historical sites of national significance, it must be shown that:

- There is no feasible and prudent alternative.
- The action includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the property.

How Section 4(f) applies to this project:

The Replacement Bridge Alternative would “use” these properties:

- **Elizabeth Place Park in South Nyack** - Less than 5% of Elizabeth Place Park (0.03 acres) is temporarily needed to replace the South Broadway Bridge.
- **The existing Tappan Zee Bridge** - the bridge will be removed.
- **Two historic South Nyack houses at 21 Cornelison Avenue and 78 Smith Avenue** – these homes need to be demolished in order to replace the South Broadway Bridge.

Section 4(f) draft findings:

- There are no feasible and prudent alternatives.
- Measures to minimize harm to these properties have been proposed.

What's next?

- Public comments on the draft Section 4(f) statement.
- Coordination with the Village of South Nyack.
- Measures that minimize harm to historic resources are reviewed under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.
- Final Section 4(f) findings published with the FEIS.
Path Forward

- Comments on Draft EIS until March 15, 2012
- Review comments & prepare responses
- Publish FEIS in July 2012
- Record of Decision (ROD) in summer 2012
Please Visit Us at ...

www.tzbsite.com