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Responses to Comments on the Environmental Assessment

1 INTRODUCTION

This document summarizes and responds to comments on the Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Shared-use Path Facilities and Bicycle/Pedestrian Connections (Proposed Action) associated with the replacement of the Tappan Zee Bridge (Replacement Bridge), issued by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the New York State Thruway Authority (NYSTA), and the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) on February 29, 2016. As noted in the EA, the Replacement Bridge previously underwent environmental review as part of the Tappan Zee Hudson River Crossing Project (TZHRCP) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), for which a Final EIS (FEIS) and a Joint Record of Decision (ROD) and Findings Statement were issued in 2012. As the Proposed Action is a new element of the TZHRCP involving both federal and state approvals, additional environmental review was undertaken.

A public review period for the EA was established through April 1, 2016, during which two public hearings were held: one in Sleepy Hollow, Westchester County, New York on March 15, 2016; and one in South Nyack, Rockland County, New York on March 16, 2016. A transcript of oral comments provided at the public hearings and all written comments received through the close of the public comment period are provided in Attachment A.

Section 2 below contains a summary of the substantive comments received during the public comment period and a response to each. These summaries convey the substance of the comments made, but do not necessarily quote the comments verbatim. Comments are organized by subject matter and generally parallel the chapter structure of the EA. Where more than one commenter expressed similar views, those comments have been grouped and addressed together. Section 3 lists the elected officials, organizations, and individuals that provided comments on the EA.

The EA presented two alternatives for the Proposed Action: Alternatives E and F. The parking accommodations and limited ancillary facilities at the eastern terminus in Tarrytown, Westchester County, were the same under each alternative, but they differed at the western terminus in South Nyack, Rockland County. Based on the public comments received during the public review period, there was substantially greater support for Alternative F than Alternative E. Based on this public input, and after consideration of the impacts and benefits described in the EA, Alternative F has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.
2 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES ON THE EA

2-1 PURPOSE AND NEED

Comment 1: The shared-use path should be well connected to adjacent towns, bike paths, and public transportation.

Response: As described in the FEIS for the TZRCP and continued under the Proposed Action, way-finding signage would be provided to guide users to the shared-use path from public transportation, bicycle routes, the local roadway networks, and other trails that are in proximity to the shared-use path termini, such as the Esposito Trail.

Comment 2: It is unrealistic to have walkers on the bridge unless they live within walking distance. There is no room to park and people will try to park on Salisbury property.

Response: The primary purpose of the Proposed Action is to provide off-street parking and limited ancillary facilities to accommodate users of the shared-use path on the Replacement Bridge. The provision of off-street parking at each termini of the shared-use path under the Proposed Action would avoid having users park on local streets or private parking lots. In addition, there would not be an entrance to the shared-use path near Salisbury Point.

2-2 ALTERNATIVES

2-2-1 ALTERNATIVE E

Comment 3: A number of commenters supported Alternative E, stating reasons including it would be the least disruptive to traffic patterns, parking would be better situated, and it would be the most cost-effective.

Response: After consideration of the impacts and benefits described in the EA and public input received during the public review period, Alternative E is not being advanced and Alternative F has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.

Comment 4: A number of commenters opposed Alternative E stating a variety of reasons, including potential visual impacts and other negative impacts on village character; it would increase traffic and parking on local streets; the switchback ramps and stairs would impede cyclists; there would be
limited access for cyclists (except from the Esposito Trail); the paved bike/pedestrian path would be built next to the Esposito Trail; parking would extend the path too far; pedestrians would have to cross a high-traffic area; there would not be room to expand the parking area; it would eliminate a visual barrier between a residential area and Interstate 87/287; there would be no pedestrian crossing near Shadyside Avenue; and the tunnel under Broadway would have safety concerns.

Response: After consideration of the impacts and benefits described in the EA and public input received during the public review period, Alternative E is not being advanced and Alternative F has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.

Comment 5: The switchback ramp should be designed to allow bicycling up and down with sufficient turning radius at the ends of the ramp.

Response: The switchback ramp included under Alternative E would have been designed in accordance with all applicable design standards and bicyclists would be required to dismount. However, after consideration of the impacts and benefits described in the EA and public input received during the public review period, Alternative E is not being advanced and Alternative F has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.

Comment 6: The stairway next to the Village Hall connecting South Broadway to the Esposito Trail should be removed. Leaving that stairway intact will encourage tourists to park on South Broadway to gain entrance to the shared-use path.

Response: The existing stairway next to South Nyack Village Hall is within the jurisdiction of the Village and whether it remains is a local decision. It would also be at the discretion of the Village to implement parking restrictions to prevent users of the shared-use path from parking on local streets.

2-2-2 ALTERNATIVE F

Comment 7: A number of commenters supported Alternative F, stating a variety of reasons, including its beneficial effects on quality of life; it would help ameliorate damage from the original bridge on the neighborhood; it would redirect motorists from South Broadway to the Interstate 87/287 southbound/eastbound access ramp off Hillside Avenue; it would best accommodate visitors in terms of parking and minimizing traffic off local streets while using State-owned land within Interchange 10; it would provide room for the parking lot to expand; it would add a needed
pedestrian crossing at the south end of the village; it would be more cyclist-friendly; and it would avoid construction of switchback ramps and a pedestrian overpass.

Response: Based on consideration of the impacts and benefits described in the EA and public input received during the public review period, Alternative F is being advanced as the Preferred Alternative.

Comment 8: A number of commenters opposed Alternative F, stating a variety of reasons, including cost; it would not change the volume of cars going across the bridge; it would close the local access ramp off South Broadway; it would intermingle the shared-use path and the Esposito Trail; it would make parking difficult to access from the highway; and it would create ambiguity at the end of the shared-use path at Clinton Avenue and Franklin Street.

Response: Based on consideration of the impacts and benefits described in the EA and public input received during the public review period, Alternative F is being advanced as the Preferred Alternative.

Comment 9: The Federal Highway Administration should approve Alternative F and issue the Shared-Use Path Parking Facilities and Bicycle/Pedestrian Connections project a Finding of No Significant Impacts (FONSI). By so doing, this aspect of the project work can move forward immediately, saving both time and money for the overall project.

Response: Based on consideration of the impacts and benefits described in the EA and public input received during the public review period, Alternative F is being advanced as the Preferred Alternative.

Comment 10: Alternative F would be less expensive if (1) the paved section on the Esposito Trail was removed, (2) the ramp connecting the shared-use path to the Esposito Trail was removed, (3) there is no connection at all from the shared-use path to the Esposito Trail, or (4) an inexpensive staircase like they have for the Highline in New York City is installed.

Response: The paved side path included under Alternative F would be separate and adjacent to the Esposito Trail. The Esposito Trail will remain in its gravel/cinder form. The Esposito Trail surface is not conducive to all cyclists, such as those with thin-tire bicycles, which would be accommodated by the paved side path. Removing a connection to the Esposito Trail would be inconsistent with the Proposed Action’s objective to “provide access from existing bicycle and pedestrian routes to the
shared-use path” and would be inconsistent with local and regional plans that promote connectivity of pedestrian and bicycle facilities. The paved side path would provide a continuous paved surface for users of the shared-use path to connect to the local street network and other trailways, if they could not use the Esposito Trail. Furthermore, installing a staircase in place of the pedestrian and bicycle ramps would limit accessibility and would not meet the principles of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

Comment 11: There should be no connection to the Esposito Trail from the shared-use path. The Esposito Trail is currently used by joggers, dog walkers, parents with babies in strollers and young children and families playing. The addition of cyclists will make this path unsafe.

Response: Removing a connection to the Esposito Trail would be inconsistent with the Proposed Action’s objective to “provide access from existing bicycle and pedestrian routes to the shared-use path” and would be inconsistent with local and regional plans that promote connectivity of pedestrian and bicycle facilities. The Proposed Action will include a paved side path separate and adjacent to the Esposito Trail to provide a continuous paved surface for users of the shared-use path and minimize conflicts with Esposito Trail users.

Comment 12: Under Alternative F, would it be possible for a cyclist approaching the access point from the Rockland side to reach the comfort station directly from the Esposito Trail without having to enter the bridge ramp, go to the junction of the two paths and turn back to go to the parking area and comfort station?

Response: It would be unsafe to provide direct access to the comfort station from the Esposito Trail as it would require crossing three lanes of the heavily traveled highway ramp system.

2-2-3 ALTERNATIVES – OTHER

Comment 13: Concept B should be implemented on the Westchester County side.

Response: The Preferred Alternative (Alternative F) incorporates the same design features for the Westchester County side as were previously presented under Concept B. Concept B was eliminated due to design considerations on the Rockland County side.
2-3 TRANSPORTATION

Comment 14: The amount of parking for the shared-use path has been underestimated. The number of parking spaces in South Nyack in Interchange 10 should be expanded. The catchment area that was used to analyze the need for parking at the path should be enlarged. It was only 15 miles, whereas it should extend farther.

Response: The catchment area was developed based on evaluation and surveys of similar facilities in the region and in other parts of the country. Based on the data collected, a 15-mile catchment area was deemed appropriate, and therefore the 15-mile catchment area was used for parking estimation. It should be noted that the parking area allows for expansion, should there be additional demand in the future.

Comment 15: Closing the entrance ramp to the bridge in South Nyack is a bad idea as it is used to commute to Westchester County. The EA wrongly concludes that “while closing the local access ramp from South Broadway may inconvenience some motorists...the diversion of vehicles [to Route 9W] would not result in significant adverse impacts to traffic conditions.” Alternative F will dramatically worsen the morning rush hour. The hundreds of vehicles from the three main sources of traffic approaching this Interchange in the morning—South Broadway/ Cornelison Avenue, Route 9W southbound, and Route 9W northbound—will be diverted onto Route 9W, will join southbound traffic, and will cause vehicles to come to a standstill at a new traffic light at S. Franklin Street extension. Once these vehicles get through the new traffic light, they will merge with Route 9W northbound traffic, and begin a slow-motion circular odyssey, crossing from the west side of the Thruway to the east side of the Thruway, then crossing back to the west side, before making a heavy merge onto the highway itself.

Response: Alternative F will preserve the ability to make all key movements associated with current commuter demands, diverting some traffic to the improved Route 9W corridor to reduce traffic on congested local streets such as South Broadway and Clinton Avenue. While diversions will increase daily traffic along the Route 9W corridor between the South Franklin Street Extension and Shadyside Avenue, this is a state highway and principal arterial intended to serve commuter flows. By contrast, South Broadway in the area south of Clinton Avenue is a locally maintained collector roadway.
As presented in the EA, traffic operations associated with Alternative F were examined for Years 2018 (Estimated Time of Completion) and 2028 (10 Year design horizon) in accordance with NYSTA, NYSDOT and industry protocols for data collection and analysis. The analysis revealed that the Route 9W corridor currently has sufficient capacity to handle these increased flows between intersections, and the geometric and operational modifications included under Alternative F will maintain peak period operations along the new diverted routes at Level of Service C or better through Year 2028. Design components include widened approaches and progressive signalization that encompass state of the art technologies for traffic detection and signal phasing. In combination, Alternative F processes the diverted volumes at similar or slightly better levels of service than existing routings along Clinton Avenue, South Broadway and the South Franklin Street Extension.

Comment 16: Those of us whose daily commute begins on the east side of the Thruway will actually be required to cross the Thruway an astonishing 3 times before entering. This is more than an “inconvenience”. Travelling back and forth over the highway in a wide circle, while stuck in congested traffic, will be an incredible collective waste of time and fossil fuel and will result in an immense increase in vehicle emissions in the area. It will be harmful to the environment and destructive of the quality of life of the entire community.

Response: While new traffic patterns may result in an inconvenience to some motorists, the traffic analysis found that with the closure of the local access ramp off South Broadway, traffic circulation at Interchange 10 and surrounding roadways will operate at acceptable levels of service. Conversely, some motorists originating west of Interstate 87/287 will experience a more direct routing into Interchange 10, avoiding the local street congestion that has been noted during the weekday morning peak period along Clinton Avenue and South Broadway. The air quality analysis presented in the EA determined that Alternative F would not result in any significant adverse impacts. In addition, reduced traffic on South Broadway and Clinton Avenue would provide a quality of life benefit to residents on these local streets.

Comment 17: Under Alternative F, consider maintaining access to Interchange 10 from the south end of South Broadway to avoid the extensive detour and multiple traffic signals that motorists who currently use the South Broadway entrance would need to otherwise endure.

Response: Closing the existing local access ramp from South Broadway would be necessary to accommodate the shared-use path. While closing the
existing local access ramp from South Broadway may result in a longer or circuitous route for some motorists, the traffic analysis presented in the EA found that closure of that ramp would not result in significant adverse traffic impacts. Thus, maintaining local access to Interchange 10 from South Broadway is not warranted.

Comment 18: Traffic in South Nyack is already poor. Consider traffic patterns and signal timing with any new traffic signals to ensure efficient traffic flow.

Response: An extensive program of traffic data collection, analysis and alternative design development was included in the EA. Alternative F will include some roadway modifications and new traffic signals, which will be coordinated with other proximate signals pursuant to NYSDOT requirements. The traffic analysis presented in the EA concluded that changes in traffic patterns would not result in significant adverse impacts and that traffic circulation would operate at acceptable levels of service. Also note that peak usage of the shared-use path and proposed parking accommodations would not coincide with peak periods of commuter traffic.

Comment 19: Consider traffic impacts on Route 59 and at Interchange 11 from closing the local access ramp off South Broadway.

Response: For motorists destined for Interstate 87/287 southbound/eastbound, Interchange 10 provides the easternmost highway access point before crossing the Hudson River. As such, it is not expected that motorists who currently use Interchange 10 would travel further west to Interchange 11 to then head southbound/eastbound. Northbound/westbound access to Interstate 87/287 from Interchange 10 would remain unchanged under the Proposed Action, and motorists would not likely divert to Interchange 11.

Comment 20: The parking lot associated with Alternative F cannot be easily accessed from the highway. This favors only local users, but does not accommodate users from the larger community or outside the immediate area.

Response: The parking area would be accessible from Route 9W. Under Alternative F, the parking area would not be directly accessible from Interchange 10, which currently only provides an exit from Interstate 87/287 northbound/westbound immediately after crossing the Hudson River; however, a parking area will be provided in Westchester County, east of
the Hudson River. Users from points west of the Hudson River using Interstate 87/287 could access the parking area via Interchange 11 to Route 9W.

Comment 21: Consider potential impacts from increasing truck traffic using Old Mountain Road as a result of the new bridge, which is not designed to accommodate large trucks.

Response: Truck traffic was considered as part of the analysis presented in the EA. Existing restrictions on truck size and weight along the Route 9W corridor south of Interchange 10, and vehicle and turning restrictions along Old Mountain Road will be maintained. Providing more direct access into Interchange 10 from southbound Route 9W (rather than by way of the South Franklin Street Extension, Clinton Avenue and South Broadway) would provide a safer alternative for demands from areas west of Interchange 10 to gain access to the bridge, and reduce travel on South Nyack local streets.

Comment 22: Bus routes (e.g., Tappan Zee Express and NYC buses) need to be rerouted to South Franklin Street, or moved to Route 9W under Alternative F. The stops should no longer be on South Broadway and Clinton Avenue. There is no need for buses to turn on Clinton Avenue with this alternative.

Response: As discussed in the EA, the bus stop on South Broadway near South Nyack Village Hall may need to be relocated due to the closure of the local access ramp to Interchange 10 from South Broadway. Also as discussed in the EA, NYSDOT and NYSTA are currently investigating transit improvements along the Interstate 87/287 corridor under a separate independent action, and any modifications would be planned to be compatible with Alternative F and coordinated with the appropriate transit operators.

Comment 23: The ability to have bicycle access on the bridge will encourage recreation, reduce vehicle usage, and promote tourism. Bike access will link major cycling routes on both sides of the river, greatly enhancing the local cycling experience and the local communities.

Response: Comment noted.

Comment 24: On the Westchester side, there is no indication of incorporating the nearby North/South County Trailway. The Trailway is a major north-south route for cyclists, and the most direct route between the break in
the trail at Elmsford and the NNY Bridge is NY 119, a busy, high-speed 4-lane roadway with mostly no shoulders. Are there any plans to create access from the Trailway to the bridge?

Response: Connections from the shared-use path to the North/South County Trailway are outside the scope of this action. However, as part of construction of the Replacement Bridge and shared-use path, way-finding signage will be provided from the shared-use path to public transportation, bicycle routes, the local roadway networks, and other trails that are in proximity to the shared-use path termini.

Comment 25: The shared-use path needs to be safely and easily accessible to cyclists and pedestrians, and particularly those with disabilities.

Response: The Preferred Alternative will be designed pursuant to the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) standards, as well as the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

Comment 26: The shared-use path will overcrowd the parks in Rockland County, which are all overflowing with crowds and bicycles and joggers. This project will bring havoc with traffic flow and residents.

Response: The shared-use path is being included as part of the replacement of the Tappan Zee Bridge to support regional initiatives to enhance pedestrian and bicycle mobility. The Proposed Action will enhance access to the shared-use path by providing parking for users. As shown in the traffic analysis presented in the EA, the Proposed Action will not result in any significant adverse traffic impacts.

Comment 27: A signalized crosswalk with a median refuge area is necessary at the intersection of Route 9 and the Shared-Use Path due to high traffic volumes at this juncture. The nearest existing crosswalks are not convenient.

Response: Based on projected vehicular and pedestrian movements, the shared-use path entrance onto Route 9 does not meet the warrants for signal control pursuant to the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). Existing crosswalks at Prospect Avenue and Route 119 north and south of the shared-use path terminus, respectively, will be available for pedestrians and can be accessed by existing sidewalks. However, NYSTA and NYS DOT will work with the Village of Tarrytown and other key stakeholders to identify any additional appropriate crossings, which could, for example, include a new crosswalk at the existing signal for the
shopping center just south of the shared-use path terminus. Furthermore, a 10-foot-wide paved pedestrian and bicycle side path is being contemplated as part of a separate independent project along the west side of Route 9 from the shared-use path terminus to the DoubleTree hotel, located south of Interstate 87/287 and Route 119, which will facilitate enhanced access to any new and existing crosswalks in this area. Appropriate signage and striping associated with pedestrian and bicyclist use of the nearby crosswalks will be added in final design.

Comment 28: There needs to be excellent wayfaring signs on the shared-use path for people who are crossing, especially on the Westchester side.
Response: As described in the FEIS and continued in the EA, NYSTA will collaborate with key stakeholders to implement appropriate way-finding signage to direct users of the shared-use path to any new or existing street crossings, public transportation, bicycle routes, the local roadway networks, and other trails that are in proximity to the shared-use path termini.

Comment 29: There should be multiple access points to the shared-use path, such as River Road/Piermont Avenue (State Bicycle Route 9). This would be a shorter entrance for people entering the bike path.
Response: Access to the shared-use path is being restricted to the parking area and an access point from Clinton Avenue where the Esposito Trail currently intersects Clinton Avenue to limit visitors from parking on local streets within residential neighborhoods, in response to community feedback.

Comment 30: If Alternative E or F is chosen, there is value to having the initially proposed bicycle/pedestrian ramp at South Broadway/Cornelison Avenue as an additional access point for people walking and biking to/from the south on Route 9W and those living in neighborhoods south and southwest of the bridge.
Response: The entrance point at South Broadway and Cornelison Avenue was eliminated in response to community feedback, as a number of residents and local officials were opposed to potentially increased pedestrian and bicycle traffic in this neighborhood. However, existing staircase access from South Broadway to the Esposito Trail (which will also provide access to the paved side path under the Preferred Alternative) may remain, at the discretion of the Village of South Nyack.
2-4 COMMUNITY CHARACTER

Comment 31: The character of surrounding neighborhoods must be protected from the car, bike, and foot traffic and parking from the project.

Response: The proposed parking areas would be located in areas that would be accessible from main roadways (such as Route 9W in Rockland County or Route 9 in Westchester County) and that would be removed from residential neighborhoods. As discussed in the EA for the Proposed Action, the local street network would be able to adequately accommodate vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle traffic associated with the Proposed Action, and the siting of the parking area and pedestrian/bicycle connections would not adversely affect neighborhood character.

Comment 32: Some of the parking locations are remote and potentially dangerously unattended, instead of being in well-trafficked, public use areas. The proposed facilities should be manned 24/7 by a NYS Trooper at no cost to South Nyack and should be maintained, especially the bathrooms, on a daily basis by NYSTA and NYSDOT at no cost to South Nyack.

Response: The locations of the parking area were selected because they would be within NYSTA-owned property and within an existing transportation facility (Interchange 10). A plan for operating the shared-use path will be developed by NYSTA in coordination with appropriate stakeholders, including the Village of South Nyack, to determine appropriate operations and security measures at the parking areas and ancillary facilities.

2-5 VISUAL AND AESTHETIC RESOURCES

Comment 33: Alternative E Visualization—the ramp behind the Police Station: the sound wall would need to be raised to increase the sound abatement as well as hide walkers on the walkway.

Response: The sound wall was designed in accordance with state and federal policy. Please note that Alternative E will not be advancing, as Alternative F has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.

Comment 34: Alternative E Visualization—the ramp behind the Police Station: trees need to be replaced around the police station, not shrubs and vines.
Response: Please note that Alternative E will not be advancing, as Alternative F has been selected as the Preferred Alternative. NYSTA will work with the Village of South Nyack to finalize appropriate landscaping around Village Hall and the police station under the Preferred Alternative.

Comment 35: Tarrytown has wonderful stone architecture that should be used as a model to tie the facility in to the community.
Response: Contextual materials and aesthetic considerations will be incorporated into the design of the parking area and limited facilities at the Westchester County terminus of the shared-use path to the extent practicable.

2-6 NATURAL RESOURCES

Comment 36: It must be ensured that the shared-use path is ecologically sensitive.
Response: The EA concluded that the Proposed Action would not result in any significant adverse impacts to ecological resources.

Comment 37: Use porous pavement wherever possible.
Response: Porous pavement will be considered for the extension of the shared-use path adjacent to the Esposito Trail and will also be considered for use in the parking area.

2-7 GENERAL

Comment 38: Clarify if fencing and/or fence separation on the Esposito Trail would be necessary.
Response: The paved side path that would be constructed adjacent to the Esposito Trail would be separated from the Esposito Trail by a fencing system, designed with input from the Village of South Nyack. The two paths would have different surfaces (pavement on the side path versus cinder/gravel on the Esposito Trail) to accommodate the need of different users, and the rail will keep these users separated.

Comment 39: The gray box pictured in the rendering for the shared-use path facilities near Tarrytown is very drab and not inviting. There is an opportunity to make it beautiful.
Response: The NYSTA Maintenance facility referenced in this comment is being reconstructed as part of the Replacement Bridge project and is outside the scope of the Proposed Action. No changes are being considered to
this facility, although more plantings are being added to the landscape plan to address this concern and NYSTA will continue to work with the Village of Tarrytown regarding community concerns related to construction of the Replacement Bridge.

Comment 40: Consider naming one of the rest areas on the shared-use path after Pete Seeger.
Response: Comment noted.

Comment 41: The path needs to be open 24/7.
Response: The hours of operation for the shared-use path will be determined as part of a plan for operations of the shared-use path that NYSTA will be developing in coordination with appropriate stakeholders.

Comment 42: The path should not be open 24/7.
Response: This is outside the scope of the Proposed Action. The hours of operation for the shared-use path will be determined as part of a Shared-Use Path Operations Plan that NYSTA will be developing in coordination with appropriate stakeholders.

Comment 43: Bicyclists in Westchester would not use the parking lot for the shared-use path; the land for the parking lot should be otherwise used, e.g., for benches or seating.
Response: While it is expected that many cyclists would travel to the shared-use path on their bicycles, pedestrians and some cyclists would potentially drive to the facility. The parking area and associated small visitor center would incorporate landscaped seating and gathering areas.

Comment 44: South Nyack residents should be able to park in shared-use path parking during the week during business hours. It would be a great perk for residents and could keep some cars off the bridge. There could also be an opportunity to coordinate a TZ Express bus stop here.
Response: As described in the EA, the number of parking spaces was determined based on the projected number of recreational users of the shared-use path. It has not been designed as a commuter lot, that would be outside of the scope of the EA.
Responses to Comments on the Environmental Assessment

Comment 45: Consider the length of the bridge, and the climate in this part of the country. Concerns for the shared-use path include shelter from sudden storms, medical emergencies, and crime.

Response: The shared-use path was proposed as part of the environmental impact statement (EIS) for the Tappan Zee Hudson River Crossing Project (TZHRCP), prepared for the Replacement Bridge, which included a robust public outreach program. There was substantial public support for the shared-use path and it was included as part of the Replacement Bridge. Emergency access will be maintained to the shared-use path.

Comment 46: Consider shuttles from the train to the bridge for out-of-town visitors.

Response: Comment noted. NYSTA will be working with stakeholders to develop a plan for operating the shared-use path to address this and many other issues.

Comment 47: Native plants should be used for all landscaping.

Response: The landscape plan for the Proposed Action would include native species indigenous to this region of New York to the greatest extent practicable in accordance with a landscape plan that would be in compliance with Executive Order (EO) 13112, “Invasive Species”, which states that federal agencies must prevent, to the extent practicable and permitted by law, the introduction of invasive species and provide for their control and to minimize the economic, ecological, and human health impacts that invasive species cause.

Comment 48: We support any noise abatement measures under Alternative F.

Response: Under Alternative F, the existing noise wall along South Broadway between Smith Avenue and the existing local access ramp to Interchange 10 will be replaced and designed in accordance with federal and state policy.

Comment 49: Consider locating the emergency access point at River Road rather than Smith Avenue.

Response: Existing grades preclude the ability to provide emergency access from River Road to the shared-use path. Please note that the Preferred Alternative (Alternative F) does not include an emergency access point from Smith Avenue, as this alternative does not include a switchback ramp and emergency access can be gained from the parking area.
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A-1 Transcripts of Public Hearings

March 15, 2016: Sleepy Hollow High School, Sleepy Hollow, Westchester County, New York
March 16, 2016: Nyack Middle School, South Nyack, Rockland County, New York
THE NEW NY BRIDGE

SHARED-USE PATH

Held at Sleepy Hollow High School
210 North Broadway
Sleepy Hollow, New York
March 15, 2016
Public Session

ROCKLAND & ORANGE REPORTING
2 Congers Road
New City, New York 10956
(845) 634-4200

Rockland & Orange Reporting
rowork@courtreportingny.com - (845) 634-4200
MR. SAEED: Good evening and welcome. My name is Khurram Saeed, and I'll be serving as the moderator and hearing officer for this evening's public hearing.

Before we get started, I'd like to make a brief statement on behalf of the New York State Thruway Authority and Tappan Zee Constructors regarding this weekend's tragic accident.

Everyone on the New New York Bridge team is enormously saddened by the tragedy that occurred over the weekend. We share a kinship with all of those who brave the dangers of working on the river. And although Paul Amun, Timothy Conklin and Henry Hernandez were not part of the New New York Bridge Project, our thoughts and deepest sympathies go out to their families and friends.

I have some official information here that I'd like to share before this public hearing can begin. It's a little long, so thank you in advance for your
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patience.

First of all, I'd like to thank the Tarrytown School District for allowing us to use their building.

In case of an emergency, please remain calm and exit this room using the exits located at the side rear, which will lead you to the hallway, where you can exit to the outside.

The restrooms are located at the end of the hallway, to our left.

Parking and limited ancillary facilities are being proposed for the users of the shared-use path on the New NY Bridge in South Nyack and Tarrytown.

This public hearing is one of two public hearings sponsored by the Federal Highway Administration, the New York State Thruway Authority, and the New York State Department of Transportation to receive comments on the Environmental Assessment that has been prepared for the Shared-Use Path Facilities and Bicycle/Pedestrian

Rockland & Orange Reporting
rowork@courtreportingny.com - (845) 634-4200
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Connections.

This meeting also fulfills the requirements of Article 2 of the New York State Eminent Domain Procedural Law for Right-of-Way acquisition required for construction.

The New NY Bridge was previously the subject of an Environmental Impact Statement prepared for the Tappan Zee Hudson River Crossing Project in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act and the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act. However, as the parking and other facilities would be new elements of the Tappan Zee Hudson River Crossing Project involving both federal and state approvals, it requires additional environmental review.

The EA has been prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA; 42 USC Section 4321 and others) and also satisfies environmental review.
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requirements of the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA; 6 NYCRR Part 617 and 17 NYCRR Part 15), and a number of other federal and state regulations and requirements, including Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act.

These public hearings are one of many opportunities to make formal statements on the Environmental Assessment before any project decision-making occurs. Written comments can also be submitted by e-mail, mail, fax or through the use of comment cards, which can be left at the registration table. Written comments on the Environmental Assessment will be accepted through Friday, April 1st, 2016.

Based on the findings of the Environmental Assessment, the oral comments received tonight, and written comments received during the public comment period, the lead agencies will make a determination of the significance
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of the impacts pursuant to the National
Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the
New York State Environmental Quality
Review Act. If it is determined that the
proposed action will not result in any
significant impacts that were not
previously identified in the Environmental
Impact Statement prepared for the Tappan
Zee Hudson River Crossing Project, a
Finding of No Significant Impact and
Negative Declaration will be prepared to
conclude the environmental review process.

To assist interested parties in
formulating their comments, the
Environmental Assessment document is
available at the project website, at
www.NewNYBridge.com/SUP, and for public
inspection during normal business hours at
established repositories throughout the
region, including local libraries and the
New NY Bridge Outreach Centers. The
addresses for the repository locations are
available on-line, or on one of the
display boards in the open house, and at
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the registration desk. We also have two
copies here.

The proceedings of this meeting are
being recorded by a stenographer, and a
verbatim, written transcript will be
prepared and reviewed by the lead agency
and project sponsors.

We ask that all persons sign in at
the registration table, so that we can
have a record of all those who came to
this meeting. For those of you who wish
to make oral comments today in front of
all the attendees, please fill out a
"Speaker's Card" which are available at
the registration table, and give it to one
of the staff at the registration table.

At the appropriate time, I will call
you up to the microphone. We will need to
confine oral comments to a length of about
two minutes, so that everyone who has
signed up will have a chance to speak. I
will let you know when we're coming close
to the end of those two minutes, so that
you can try to wrap up your comments. In
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accordance with our policy, elected and
appointed officials will be given the
first opportunity to speak. Others will
then be called to make their statement in
the order in which they're received. So
that everyone who desires to speak has the
opportunity and their statements made part
of the official record, we will not be
responding to your questions from the
floor at this meeting.

You can provide any additional
comments in writing. Written statements
may be submitted in any of these three
different ways: You can drop off these
comments with us tonight. There is a box
at the registration table; or, you may
send them to us by e-mail at
info@newnybridge.com no later than
April 1st; or, you can mail them to any of
the addresses listed on the comment cards.
They must be postmarked no later than
Friday, April 1st, 2016.

Written statements will be given the
same weight and consideration as oral
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statements made at this meeting. So if you have a written statement and you also want to speak tonight, you do not have to read everything in it, as long as you submit that written statement. You can hand in that statement and it will become part of the record and considered. If you have already provided written comments before today, you do not have to resubmit them; they are already part of the record and will be responded to.

Staff will remain at the boards and available to answers any questions that you may have on any of the issues presented, but those conversations will not be part of the formal record. So please keep these things in mind when you submit your verbal or written comments.

Before I call on some speakers, I'd like to introduce the people on the dais. We have Jamey Barbas, from the New York State Thruway Authority; and, Daniel D'Angelo, from the New York State Department of Transportation. Also in
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attendance tonight is John Burns, from the
Federal Highway Administration.

Okay. Let's begin our public
hearing. When I call your name, please
identify yourself for the record.

Let's start with John Squires.

MR. SQUIRE: Hi. I'm John Squires.
I'm from Millwood, New York. And I want
to compliment the New York State Thruway
Association on the plan for mixed use,
bridge cycling, walking.

I'm a cyclist. I live next to North
County Parkway Trailway, and I just want
to comment on the economic and great
recreation resource that it's been to
Central and North Westchester.

My hope is that the bridge pathway
will provide the same for both sides of
the river. Obviously, it will reduce
traffic congestion through commuting by
bicycle, and encourage Rockland County
residents and Nyack residents to ride on
the bridge at no cost, or, if they wish,
to White Plains. I hope that happens. I
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often see that on the North County
Trailway, when I ride in the morning on
the Trailway.

I can't really speak to the
questions of how many walkers will use the
parking lot facilities on the Rockland
County side, but I can actually speak to
how many cyclists will. I think it will
be very unlikely that the cyclists will
actually use those lots. Cyclists, after
a long ride, want to have a cafe, or a
beer, or they want to eat. They're
hungry. They're looking for services.
And, as can be attested by what you see in
the communities that attract cyclists from
New York and from Rockland County, right
below Nyack. And I really believe that
the cyclists who use the bridge will pass
through, probably into town, and look for
these services, or come through the other
way, into Tarrytown, to do the same. So I
think whatever the New York State Thruway
Association is thinking of in terms of
cycling impact on those lots, will be
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very, very minimal. I just wanted to speak to that. And I hope you conclude a great plan. We're really looking forward to the pathway being in, so congratulations.

Thank you.

MR. SAEED: Thank you very much.

The next speaker will be Daniel Convissor.


I would like to thank you for the opportunity to make a presentation tonight about the Shared-Use Path Environmental Assessment.

Not addressed in the assessment is the necessary requirement that 24-hour access be provided. I'd like to just state that here, and encourage the Thruway Authority to provide 24 access for bicycles and pedestrians. It's a transportation resource being built here, and similar to the road, the Thruway
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Authority doesn't close the road overnight, so, similarly, it should be open for bicyclists and pedestrians as well. The Thruway is open at all times of the night.

We need a signal at the Westchester end of the path, and a cross walk. Right now that's not in the plan. There's an apartment complex across the street, with 380 residents, there's a shopping center, a bank. This would draw large numbers of people across the roadway at that point, and we need to provide safe crossing for those people using the road. And finding a safe crossing at that point would be very hard. It's a 50-wide roadway, with five lanes of traffic, and, you know, lots of people driving in and out of the shopping center, so it would be very hard to find a gap in traffic to get across.

I think Alternative F is fantastic. If one of the alternatives is chosen, it should be that one. Alternative E is problematic, with the switch back ramps
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and stairways.

In addition to that, on the Rockland side, we need to add access to bicycling Route 9, which is River Road, at the bottom of the hill in Grandview-on-Hudson, because that's 1.3 miles shorter and eight feet less of climbing. So this is a significant transportation route and recreational route for cyclists coming from New York City, ending up on bike Route 9. It's very heavily used, and would be very advantageous to have an access point here to get onto the bridge and into Tarrytown, and take the train back to the City, for example. And concerns I imagine people have about parking at that access point would be ameliorated, because there is the official parking spots are going to be added up at the Interchange 10, and we just have parking regulations and signage to the effective parking lot, so you would not need parking spaces there at the access point.
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Similarly, the initially proposed access point at Cornelius Avenue, or whatever it's called, pardon me, and South Broadway, I think it would be good to keep in the plan, to take it from the initial plan and keep it in the new plans, to provide access for people living south of the bridge and west of the bridge, south of the Thruway, to keep them from having to travel further into the whole interchange complex, and come back around, you know, to the bridge, versus the other parts of the roadway network, and save them travel time.

Thank you very much.

MR. SAEED: Thank you for your comment.

Okay. Next up we have David Hodoson.

MR. HODOSON: My name is David Hodoson. I'm a resident of Sleepy Hollow. Thank you very much the wonderful signage or displays that you've put together, and the wonderful job you've been doing so
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far on the bridge. I really appreciate
the public ability to comment.

I am a biker, and I do use the
bridge quite often, and I've always been
upset that there's one day a year we get
to use the old bridge, so this is
fantastic. I'm very excited that you're
giving us the ability to comment on the
intersections and things that are
happening around the bridge.

My number one concern is the
crossing on Route 9, in Tarrytown, that I
just saw the new designs here. I haven't
fully been able to understand them, but
it's very, very complicated there now.
It's very hard to cross those roads. And
I had initially thought that an island or
some bridge would be more tunneled, would
be something that you guys could look at.
Since I've seen the new designs, I think
we're on the right track there. But I
have a 11-year old who likes to ride with
me, and, you know, it's just a very
chaotic situation. As Dan just mentioned,
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there's the bank and the deli and
everything over there.

My number one concern with the
parking is I don't think the bicyclers, as
this gentleman just said, are going to use
the lot that much. I live in Sleepy
Hollow. There's no way I would drive over
there, and then park my car, and then just
go over the bridge and back. I would bike
from my house, or, you know, park
somewhere else. I would much rather see
that usage of the parking, and I can't
speak for the walkers, but for the bikers,
I would prefer some conveniences, some
lookouts, some benches, some other use of
that land. So, you know, your calculation
1.8 lots per person, whatever you're going
to come up with, you know, I don't know
where you're getting that. Maybe the
Mid-Hudson Bridge can give you some
experience, or something, but I can't see
a lot of people using that.

The Alternative F, as Dan mentioned,
looks to me also the best, but, you know,
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that just looks like a great idea.

And the time of day, to me I don't think I'm going to be biking back at 2:00 in the morning, but I can't see why you would close the bridge for any particular reason. And I do have a boat, as well, and I have ended up at Nyack, with no way to get home, and if the bridge was open, maybe I could walk home, or have a fold-up bike on the boat, or something. So I would see that there should be really no reason to keep the bridge closed at any particular time, that I could see, and it would be advantageous to keep it open, especially until 10:00, 11:00, 12:00 at night for me, and very early in the morning, 5:00 in the morning would be a great time to start. We have the North County Trailway. We have some other projects to open up a bike lane all the way north. If people are going to be commuting to the City, train stations, however they commute, you know, why close it.
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Thank you very, very much.

MR. SAEED: Thank you.

The next speaker will be David Bedell.

MR. BEDELL: Good evening. My name is David Bedell. I live in Sleepy Hollow. And I'm also very excited about the shared-use path. It has the potential to create a really wonderful network connecting both sides of the river, which would make it a real, real nice place to live and a really nice place to visit.

And, you know, as a Westchester resident, I'll direct my comments towards that side of the path tonight.

I think, as people have pointed out, the intersection of 9 and 119 is extremely busy and complicated, and it was disappointing that that intersection was segmented from the rest of the project.

And my comment is really to the DOT, that if a project to evaluate that intersection, given the new uses and given the development happening in Sleepy Hollow
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and Tarrytown, is not already underway, that a project should be started.

And it is entirely, you know, Route 9. Route 9 is a state route. 119 is a state route. It's basically the state's in a good position to do something, do something there.

And just to mention, you know, as people come to and from the shared-use path from Tarrytown, it essentially ends, and several places aren't -- can't be directly linked to the shared-use path, and so if the state has -- can reconfigure the roadway. For instance, southbound traffic can be expanded to two lanes, it could be expanded slightly later, and make Broadway narrower, for a cross walk, or something like that. So I would urge the state to open a project for that.

There also needs to be excellent wayfaring signs for people who are crossing, especially on the Westchester side. They're gonna end up at Broadway, a bit of a ways from downtown Tarrytown, and
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it won't be obvious where to get on from Croton-on-Hudson, for instance. I suggest just very good wayfaring signs.

I'd also like to see -- I'd also like to see native plants used for all landscaping. The county, on Riverwalk, has a policy to use native plants. The Village of Sleepy Hollow does. And I'm not sure what the DOT's policy is. I see a lot of native plants used on the Thruway and different kinds of plantings. I'd like to ask that that be -- those be used in this project.

And, lastly, I would also like to urge the path be open at very extended hours, so people can use it as much as possible.

Thank you.

MR. SAEED: Thank you.

Before we get to our next speaker, I'd just like to recognize Tarrytown Mayor, Drew Fixell, who is joining us here tonight, as well as Tarrytown Village Administrator Mike Blau, and Kathlyn
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Conolly, representing Congresswoman Nita Lowey's office is also here.

Welcome, and thank you for coming out.

Okay. Robert Olsson, for our next speaker.

MR. OLSSON: Hi. I'm Robert Olsson. I represent the Croton-on-Hudson bicycle pedestrian community. And I want to recognize the fact that your including the bicycle pedestrian lane at this crossing is really a significant step for the next 50 years. I'm going to look at it in the bigger picture, in that there's a lot of ground swell that I'm seeing locally and in New York City towards non-motorized vehicles, and that this project and the inclusion of bicycle pedestrian lane is -- is de facto recognition of that cultural trend. And the Tappan Zee Bridge also serves, as you probably know, as a crossing for bicycle, pedestrians, it will provide that. The nearest one to the south is the George
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Washington Bridge, and the nearest one to the north is the Bear Mountain Bridge. So this location is really, really an essential point where people can cross. And it serves not only for economic development on either side of the river, as was pointed out by other speakers, about how people will ride and find destinations to have a cup of coffee or a sandwich someplace, but also there are support industries of people who cannot afford cars to access the Tarrytown Train Station or going to their job in Nyack or Tarrytown for their jobs. They would be now likely to have that option, rather than taking a bus or -- or getting a ride with some other people.

And the important thing is that our continued option to a non-motorized access between places is also a very green consideration in cutting down overall carbon emissions for the region, which is a big benefit for everybody.

And I thank you for allowing me to
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MR. SAEED: Thank you very much.

Leanne Bloom. Leanne Bloom is our next speaker. Here she comes.

MS. BLOOM: Thank you. My name is Leanne Bloom. And I'm a resident of Tarrytown. I have my one year old in the back, so thanks for being patient.

I love Tarrytown. I think it's a great town, and I, unfortunately, think that maintenance building is a blight on our beautiful town, and it makes me sad every time I see that rendering. Forbes rated Tarrytown one of America's prettiest towns. Can we think about that just for a minute? Of all of America, Tarrytown is rated as one of America's prettiest towns. That gray box does not belong in America's prettiest town. It certainly doesn't belong at the gateway of our beautiful town or the entrance of our beautiful town.

And I appreciate -- I love the idea of the shared-use path. I love the idea
Proceedings

of biking. I love the idea that other
people have said about it being a real
community place. That rendering doesn't
look like that to me. It looks like a lot
of cement. It looks like 135 parking
spaces. In the dead of winter -- three
months of the year it might be green,
but, instead, what it's going to look like
nine months of the year is a lot of gray
and drab, really not a very inviting place
to be.

If you walk along Main Street, you
can see what makes Tarrytown so beautiful,
and why so many of us choose to make this
our home. We love our town. And this --
that whole area, that whole corridor, this
could have been an opportunity to recreate
another main street. We -- you know, too
many places have torn down too many
historic places, and just -- it's just
really, really sad that this is not an
opportunity to make something more
beautiful.

And it certainly doesn't honor our
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heritage, because this is a place where Kykuit, Lyndhurst, Washington Irving, the Rockefellers, Van Cortlandts, the Phillipsburg Manor, all of these really powerful names in New York history have called home, or have, you know, have said that this is a beautiful place. And our heritage, you know, it shows when you visit this town. And that gray box doesn't honor that historical heritage. And I'd like to see -- I'd love to see a -- at least a nod made to saying, you know, we want to belong here, and we want to beautify your area, and not just be a place for, you know, whatever your -- the snowplow to get -- to be able to like save five minutes.

MR. SAEED: Thank you very much.

Okay.

Next up is Edward Pugliese. Sorry if I mispronounced it.

MR. PUGLIESE: It's quite all right.

My name is Ed Pugliese. I'm from
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Somers, New York. Thanks for letting me have the opportunity to talk. I'm with the Westchester Cycle Club. We are looking forward to this opportunity to have a new route available to us. We frequently go over the Bear Mountain Bridge, the Mid-Hudson Bridge, the Walkway Over the Hudson, and the Newburgh-Beacon Bridge, and this will open up a lot more routes for us.

In addition to the Westchester Cycle Club, I know that the New York Cycle Club goes over the Washington -- George Washington Bridge, and to be able to make a loop around, would make their rides more interesting, so having this resource is just a great opportunity.

Unfortunately, with just a limited amount of time to make comments, I don't think I could do justice. I would offer our cycle club's expertise to add any further plans, if you'd like to contact us.

As far as parking, very few of our
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rides would require parking spots near the bridge. We frequently will start mid-county and then make our way around, but we do frequently stop at facilities that are near the bridge, for meals, or if somebody needs an emergency repair. So, parking, I can't comment on that piece.

And that's probably the best that I could do in that short time.

Thank you.

MR. SAEED: Okay. Thank you very much.

MR. PUGLIESE: Oh, I'm sorry, the open times. Yes. In the summer we do like to leave early in the morning, to avoid the -- the heat of the summer. So having as early as possible an opening time, not being closed, would be helpful to us.

And thank you.

MR. SAEED: Thanks again.

We have no more comments at this time.

Do we have another card?
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MR. GARRAGAN: Hello. My name is Mark Garragan. I'm also from the Westchester Cycle Club and the Board of Directors. This is really just a personal comment.

First, with regard to access. I do agree with the earlier speakers, that we're interested in 24-hour access for commuters and people to go over any time, but even just from an enjoyment aspect, I actually like to go out for moonlight rides, and would love to go over that bridge under a full moon. So I certainly would urge 24-hour access.

Then I disagree a little bit with the other folks that downplayed the need for parking, because I do quite a bit of destination cycling. I do drive to somewhere and then start off on something longer. If you live in Tarrytown or Sleepy Hollow, you probably just ride right to the bridge, but if you live further away in the county or Connecticut or down in Yonkers, you're probably going
to drive there and then start a ride there, and maybe go over into Nyack, up to Rockland Lake, or something like that. So that could be -- I could see it being a starting point, very much like the Walkway Over the Hudson, which I drive to and go across, and lay down 25, 30 miles going over and back.

And then for those of us that are not more serious cyclists, just crossing the bridge and coming back. For some people that six-mile adventure, whatever it is, that is the ride. So I think there will be some need for parking on both sides for the destination cyclists.

That's it. Thank you.

MR. SAEED: Thank you. I apologize, but I did have your card here.

I think that's the last speaker at this point.

Is there anybody else, or do we have anymore cards?

(No response given).

MR. SAEED: Okay. Well, the public
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hearing is going to continue until
8:00 p.m., so I'll be here until then.

(Whereupon, there was a recess
taken.)

MR. SAEED: Thank you for attending
tonight. You can provide any additional
comments in writing. Written statement
may be submitted in any of three different
ways: You can drop off these comments with
us tonight. There is a box at the
registration table. You may send them to
us by e-mail at info@newnybridge.com no
later than April 1st; or, you can mail
them to any of the addresses listed on the
comment cards. They must be postmarked no
later than Friday, April 1st, 2016.

Based on the findings of the
Environmental Assessment, the oral
comments received tonight and written
comments received during the public
comment period, the lead agencies will
determine if the proposed action will
result in any significant impacts that
were not identified in the Environmental
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Impact Statement (EIS) prepared for the Tappan Zee Hudson River Crossing Project (TZHRCP). If it is determined that there will be no significant impacts, a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) and negative declaration will be prepared to conclude the environmental review process. The lead agencies will then decide which alternative will be progressed.

Thank you and good night.
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MR. SAEED: Good evening and welcome. My name is Khurram Saeed, and I'll be serving as the moderator and hearing officer for this evening's public hearing.

Before we get started, I'd like to make a brief statement on behalf of the New York State Thruway Authority and Tappan Zee Constructors regarding this weekend's tragic accident.

Everyone on the New New York Bridge team is enormously saddened by the tragedy that occurred over the weekend. We share a kinship with all of those who brave the dangers of working on the river. And although Paul Amun, Timothy Conklin and Henry Hernandez were not part of the New York Bridge Project, our thoughts and deepest sympathies go out to their families and friends.

I have some official information here that I need to read before the public hearing can begin. It will take a few minutes, so I thank you in advance for
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your patience.

First of all, I'd like to thank the Nyack School District for allowing us the use of their building.

In case of an emergency, please remain calm and exit this room probably right from there, it will take you outside. And the restrooms are located in the rear of this cafeteria.

We are here tonight because parking and limited ancillary facilities are being proposed for users of the shared-use path on the New NY Bridge in South Nyack and Tarrytown.

This public hearing is one of two public hearings sponsored by the Federal Highway Administration, the New York State Thruway Authority, and the New York State Department of Transportation to receive comments on the Environmental Assessment that has been prepared for the Shared-Use Path Facilities and Bicycle/Pedestrian Connections.

This meeting also fulfills the
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requirements of Article 2 of the New York State Eminent Domain Procedural Law for Right-of-Way acquisitions required for construction.

The New NY Bridge was previously the subject of an Environmental Impact Statement prepared for the Tappan Zee Hudson River Crossing Project in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act and the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act. However, as the parking and other facilities would be new elements of the Tappan Zee Hudson River Crossing Project involving both federal and state approvals, it requires additional environmental reviews.

The Environmental Assessment has been prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA; 42 USC Section 4321 and others) and also satisfies environmental review requirements of the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA;
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6 NYCRR Part 617 and 17 NYCRR Part 15),
and a number of other federal and state
regulations and requirements, including
Section 106 of the National Historic
Preservation Act and Section 4(f) of the
U.S. Department of Transportation Act.

These public hearings are one of
many opportunities to make formal
statements on the Environmental Assessment
before any project decision-making occurs.
Written comments can also be submitted by
e-mail, mail, fax or through the use of
comment cards, which can be left at the
registration table. Written comments on
the Environmental Assessment will be
accepted through Friday, April 1st, 2016.

Based on the findings of the
Environmental Assessment, the oral
comments received tonight, and written
comments received during the public
comment period, the lead agencies will
make a determination of the significance
of the impacts pursuant to the National
Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the
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New York State Environmental Quality Review Act. If it is determined that the proposed action will not result in any significant impacts that were not previously identified in the Environmental Impact Statement prepared for the Tappan Zee Hudson River Crossing Project, a Finding of No Significant Impact and Negative Declaration will be prepared to conclude the environmental review process.

To assist interested parties in formulating their comments, the Environmental Assessment document is available at the project website, at www.NewNYBridge.com/SUP, and for public inspection during normal business hours at established repositories throughout the region, including local libraries and the New NY Bridge Outreach Centers. The addresses for the repository locations are available on-line, or on one of the display boards in the open house, and at the registration desk. We also have two copies here.
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The proceedings of this meeting are being recorded by a stenographer, and a verbatim, written transcript will be prepared and reviewed by the lead agency and project sponsors.

We ask that all persons sign in at the registration desk, registration table, so that we can have a record of all those who came to this meeting. For those of you who wish to make oral comments today in front of the attendees, please fill out a "Speaker's Card" which are available at the registration table, and give it to one of the staff.

At the appropriate time, I will call you up to the microphone. We will need to confine oral comments to a length of about two minutes, so that everyone who has signed up will have a chance to speak. I will let you know when you have about 15 seconds left, so that you can try to wrap up your comments. In accordance with our policy, elected and appointed officials will be given the first opportunity to
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speak. Others will then be called to make their statement in the order in which they're registered. So that everyone who desires to speak has the opportunity and their statements made part of the official record, we will not be responding to your questions from the floor at this meeting.

You can provide any additional comments in writing. Written statements may be submitted in any of three different ways: You can drop off these comments with us tonight. There is a box at the registration table. You may send them to us by e-mail, at info@newnybridge.com no later than April 1st. Or you can mail them to any of the addresses listed on the comment cards. They must be postmarked no later than Friday, April 1st, 2016.

Written statements will be given the same weight and consideration as oral statements made at this meeting. So if you have a written statement and you also want to speak tonight, you do not have to read everything in it, as long as you
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submit that written statement. You can
also hand in that statement and it will
become part of the record and considered.
If you have already provided written
comments before today, you do not have to
resubmit them; they are already part of
the record and will be responded to.

Staff will remain at the boards and
available to answers any questions that
you may have on any of the issues
presented, but those conversations will
not be part of the formal record. So
please keep these things in mind when you
submit your verbal or written comments.

Before I call on some speakers, I'd
like to introduce the people on the dais.
To my left is David Capobianco, from the
New York State Thruway Authority; and,
Daniel D'Angelo, from the New York State
Department of Transportation. Also in
attendance tonight is Mr. John Burns, from
the Federal Highway Administration.

Okay. Before we begin our public
hearing, I'd like to recognize government
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officials who are joining us tonight.

Representing US Senator Kirsten
Gillibrand is Susan Spear. We have
Patrick Sheehan, from Senator Carlucci's
office, Senator David Carlucci. Also on
hand is a representative for Assemblywoman
Ellen Jaffee. Rockland County Legislator
Harriet Cornell is with us. Orangetown
Town Supervisor, Andy Stewart, is here.
We have Mayor -- South Nyack Mayor, Bonnie
Christian, and members of the South Nyack
Tappan Zee Bridge Task Force. South Nyack
Trustee Alain Leinbach is also here.
Larry Lynn, Mayor of Grandview, I believe
is in the room. And Nyack Trustee Marie
Lorenzini. Catherine McCue, from the
South Nyack Board of Trustees is also
here.

And I hopefully did not miss
anybody.

MS. HOGAN: Nancy Low-Hogan.

MR. SAEED: And Nancy Low-Hogan is
also joining us.

Thank you very much.
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A VOICE: Charles Boone, Trustee of South Nyack.

MR. SAEED: And Charles Boone, member of South Nyack Board.

Okay. Let's begin the public hearing. We will start with elected officials.

Mayor Christian, the floor is yours.

MS. CHRISTIAN: Okay. Everybody knows how strongly I feel about Concept F. I know the residents of South Nyack do. And I think the Task Force and our Board of Trustees has made it quite clear that F is the only concept that we will accept in South Nyack. It keeps the parking --

(Applause).

MS. CHRISTIAN: -- it keeps the parking off of our streets. It keeps the traffic off of our streets. It's a safety hazard the way it is now. We cannot have anything less than putting it in. If you take Concept E, you're putting it in and somebody else's backyard. We're not here to do that. We're here to keep South
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Nyack's characteristics and integrity intact while we know the SUP is coming and New York Thruway is building their bridge, so we must have Concept F.

MR. SAEED: All right. Next up we have Sara Levine, representing Representative Nita Lowey.

MS. LEVINE: Good evening. I'm reading a letter that Congresswoman Lowey sent on January 26th to Ms. Maria Lehman, the Interim Executive Director.

Dear Ms. Lehman: I am writing to support the Village of South Nyack Board of Trustees' resolution on January 12th, 2016 endorsing the South Nyack Tappan Zee Task Force recommendation for Concept F for the proposed shared-use path. Concept F provides adequate parking for SUP users while substantially reducing the traffic load on local Village streets and keeping options open for future economic development.

Before making its recommendation, the Task Force reviewed more than a dozen
concepts for the SUP and evaluated the advantages and disadvantages of each concept. The Task Force and the Village Board of Trustees favor Concept F because it has room to expand parking capacity, has the parking lot adjacent to SUP's first point of access, and adds a pedestrian crossing from Shadyside Avenue to the SUP parking area. Concept F also removes the majority of morning commuter traffic from the Village, while adding more distance between Route 9W and the homes on the corner of Shadyside Avenue. Although Concept F does not provide a direct connection from the SUP parking lot to the Esposito Trail, requiring a "spur", and may increase traffic on Route 9W between Franklin Street and Shadyside Avenue, the Task Force concluded that its advantages far outweigh any downside.

Concept F was also selected because it does not close the northbound entrance to Thruway, which several other concepts will require. Nor does it require the
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construction of overhead switchback ramps above South Broadway at Cornelison or the construction of an overpass at Franklin Street.

For all these reasons, I support the Village Board's resolution endorsing the Task Force recommendation for Concept F for the proposed SUP. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact my District Representative Sara Levine in my Rockland District Office at 845-639-3485.

MR. SAEED: Thank you.

Legislator Harriet Cornell is up. MS. CORNELL: Do you mind if I use that? (Indicating.) Because those are a little high for me.

First of all, Khurram, I want you to know how much I miss you at the Journal News.

I'm Rockland County Legislator Harriet Cornell. And I chair the Legislature's Special Committee on Transit. From 2005 to 2013, I served as
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Chairwoman of the Legislature. And during that period of time, I devoted a majority of my time to the issue of the new bridge, to the study of various kinds of mass transit that could be utilized, and to insuring that the residents of Rockland County were kept informed about the planning process and were consulted about their concerns and for their ideas.

I held regular public meetings attended by the Thruway, DOT and Metro-North when they were working as a triumvirate on the bridge, and later planned those public meetings with DOT when it was the lead agency. DOT adopted my idea to utilize the best minds and talents of Rockland residents, and they created working groups which met regularly.

During those years, I served on the Westchester-Rockland Task Force for Bridge and Transit Planning which was created by two County Executives, and much was accomplished. After Andrew Cuomo became
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Governor, there was a hiatus in bridge and transit planning with the counties, but at the end of 2012 he created the Governor's Task Force on Mass Transit, and appointed me as one of the members.

When the issue of a Shared-Use Path was initially raised by DOT during the planning sessions with the original Westchester-Rockland Task Force, I immediately raised the concern about the need to recognize that there would inevitably be hugely elevated traffic and parking problems, and used as an example the popularity of the Walkway over the Hudson. I pointed out that South Nyack's residential streets could no way be -- could in no way be subjected to that, and careful consideration and planning needed to take place. It's no stretch to imagine hundreds of cars with four people inside and bicycles atop them coming to South Nyack on a beautiful day, parking on narrow residential streets, looking for bathrooms and food, and destroying the
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quality of life for residents. I raised
my concerns over and over again with state
planners and consultants during the many
meetings of the two Task Forces.

Over the years, Mayor Christian and
before her, Mayor Dubow, and other South
Nyack elected officials with their
planners and their citizens, have
developed detailed plans for Exit 10 that
might in some small way repair what was
destroyed and lost in South Nyack years
ago when the bridge was erected. Whether
those plans will ever come to pass, I
don't know.

But what I do know is that Mayor
Christian and her team have worked
tirelessly on the issue of the terminus of
the shared-use path. They have looked at
every possible solution, studied every
possible alternative, and stood fast in
the determination to preserve the
character of their Village.

I support what they support, which
is Concept F, because it will greatly
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reduce traffic and wear and tear on
Village roads by moving the South Broadway
entrance to the interchange to Route 9W.
It will discourage visitor parking on
residential streets. Visitor parking,
bathroom facilities and walkways will be
kept away from homes and within the
interchange on Thruway property. It
provides for a new pedestrian crossing at
the south end of the Village, connecting
the west side of the Village to the east
side of Route 9W.
I support concept F because state
governments like -- because state
government, like local government, needs
to listen to the voice of the people. The
people have lived for 60 years, people of
South Nyack have lived for 60 years, with
the ramifications of losing their
commercial center because of the bridge; a
cost that far surpasses any cost
differential between the two concepts on
the table. So please show that you hear
the voice of these people by adopting the
Proceedings

best choice for South Nyack, Plan F.

Thank you.

MR. SAEED: County Legislator Nancy Low-Hogan is here. My apologies not acknowledging you earlier.

MS. LOW-HOGAN: It's okay.

Which microphone should I use?

Sorry, I shouldn't turn my back to you.

A VOICE: We're a little more important.

MS. LOW-HOGAN: Okay. I'm just going to be very brief.

I want to thank Bonnie Christian, Mayor Christian. I'd like to thank the Trustees of our Village of South Nyack, the Thruway Authority, the Task Force, and perhaps, most importantly, all of the residents of South Nyack, who have been so vigilant for years about this issue.

I often reflect on how the community involvement, having to do with the location of the shared-use path and its original location at the corner of
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Cornelison and South Broadway, how it was because of, frankly, the community that that location was moved, and what a powerful statement that makes about community involvement, and, frankly, the power of the people. And I truly believe it's one of the best examples of that.

I agree with what my colleague in the Legislature, Harriet Cornell, just said, I support what the Mayor and the Board of Trustees and the Task Force have studied and worked on so long, Concept F. And the main reason is because it looks to me like it has the least negative impact on South Nyack. And that's what it's always been about, ever since we started on this journey. So I support Concept F. And I urge the -- our partners to please do the same.

Thank you very much.

MR. SAEED: Supervisor Andy Stewart will be our next speaker.

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Khurram, and welcome. Just very briefly.
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I just wanted to say, number one, echoing Bonnie Christian and the other elected officials here, the community has spoken; our duly elected officials of South Nyack have spoken; the Task Force has spoken, it's clear that Concept F is preferred by our community.

Having said that, I also want to say, number one, how excited I am, because I love the JB Clarke Rail Trail. That was part of my and all of our everyday life. It's maintained in our area of South Nyack. I want to thank the Village of South Nyack for that. I live in the Village of Nyack. And it's great. I'm really looking forward to having that little spur, and being able to go off onto the bridge. That's really exciting. I think we have something to look forward to there. While we've been so concerned about mitigating any negative impact from the parking, and this plan clearly gets us moving in the right direction, let's all take a moment also to be thrilled that
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this new recreational resource is going to be there. That's something to be happy about.

Number three, just sort of pointing out the elephant in the corner of the room here, the overall -- overhaul of the interchange is out there, and we know that that's got to happen at some point. It's a capital project. Where's the money going to come from? I don't know if anybody here knows. But as a capitol project, it really should be a part of a plan. You know, the state should be able to tell the community, you know, on "X" date, you know, it's in order. There's a pipeline. Capital projects cost a lot of money, but they get done eventually, because bridges wear out, roads to need be to replaced, that interchange, contingent on the successful study that South Nyack is doing about how that land should be used, it needs to be overhauled. And I think that we need to hear a commitment and some sense of a time frame that that
capital project is on a list, it is in the pipeline, and it will get done, because ultimately we're trying to build the best possible thing for the community around kind of a bowl of spaghetti, which was the interchange that was designed and is no longer, it was never really the right interchange I think for what got built. So can we please get a sense of when is that gonna happen. You know. And how is that decision going to be made, so that we at least know that it's in the pipeline.

Thank you very much.

MR. SAEED: Thank you.

Representing Senator David Carlucci is Patrick Sheehan.

MR. SHEEHAN: Good evening. The Senator isn't here tonight, so I'm going to be representing him. He's in Albany today, and will be there tomorrow. I'm going to be reading a letter he sent to Ms. Maria Lehman, New York State Thruway Authority.

Dear Ms. Lehman, I am writing to
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give my support to the Nyack -- excuse me -- to give my support of the Village of South Nyack Board of Trustees' resolution so January 12th, 2016 endorsing the South Nyack Tappan Zee Task Force recommendation Concept F for the proposed Shared-Use Path.

Concept F has several aspects that benefit the Village of South Nyack, would benefit -- have a benefit impact on the Village for years to come if the Thruway Authority chose this plan. Parking is a major concern for nearby residents, and Concept F will eliminate those concerns. The plan provides room for the parking lot to expand, puts the parking lot across from the SUP central point, and adds pedestrian crossing from the Shadyside Avenue to the parking lot. Traffic on Village roads is also a point of concern and constituents worry they will have to pay the price for years to come. Concept F eliminates that concern by removing the majority of the morning.
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commuter traffic from South Nyack and
adding more distance from Route 9W as well
as homes on the corner of Shadyside
Avenue.

Additionally, Concept F does not
close the northbound entrance to the
Thruway, which several other concepts
require. It also eliminates the
construction of overhead switchramps above
South Broadway at Cornelison or the
collection of an overpass at Franklin
Street.

For all these reasons just listed, I
support the Village Board's resolution
endorsing the Task Force recommendation
for Concept F. If you have any further
questions or concerns, please feel free to
contact my District Representative,
Patrick Sheehan, at my District Office in
New City at 845-623-3627. Sincerely,
Senator David Carlucci.

Thank you very much.

MR. SAEED: I understand we have a
comment from Assemblywoman Jaffee.
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Would you like to read it into the record?

MS. CHRISTIAN: Yes. Just for the record, Village of South Nyack is filming this. So if any of our residents or anybody else could not get here tonight, they can listen and view it on our website.

I write to you requesting -- this is directed to the New York Thruway Authority.

I write to you requesting that the New York State Thruway Authority, New York State Department of Transportation and the New New York Bridge Project accept Concept F for the New York Bridge Shared-Use Path Terminus in South Nyack, New York.

First, I want to thank the State for hearing the cries of the residents and agreeing to go back and revisit a concept that didn't address the real concerns and needs of the residents of South Nyack. In March of 2014, a "terminus" concept was
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presented to the residents of South Nyack for the New York Bridge project's shared-use path. The bike and pedestrian path would include six belvederes that would provide residents and visitors an opportunity to explore the beauty of the Hudson Valley. This addition to Rockland County will truly make us The Gateway to the Hudson Valley.

However, this concept was deeply flawed. The concept didn't coincide with the landscape of the Village. It didn't foresee or anticipate neither of the amount of visitors, and their parking needs, nor the safety of local pedestrians. It would have greatly disturbed the charming Village of South Nyack, a Village with fewer than 4,000 residents. A Village that still carries the scar of destruction when over 100 homes and the heart of its business district was destroyed by the State in 1952 for the then new Tappan Zee Bridge.

Second, the residents, the Mayor and
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the five members of the Tappan Zee Task Force, made up of the residents of South Nyack, including former County -- County Legislator, Chairman of the South Nyack Planning Board, a highway administrator, a local business leader, a professional survey -- surveyor, are to be commended for their constant and consistent dedication to finding the best possible solution for the location of the terminus.

Which brings me to the options as presented in December 2015 for the terminus. The Tappan Zee Task Force, after complete and thorough review, weighing all the concerns, concluded that Concept F was the best option for the Village. Subsequently, the Village Board concurred and voted to Concept F agreeing with the Task Force's findings. While there may be no perfect solution to handle traffic, visitors, parking, noise and safety, I trust that the Task Force and Village Board have done due diligence given the very reality of the project.
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I look forward to being one of the first Rockland County residents to walk out into the middle of the SUP and take in the beauty of our Hudson Valley.

Best regards, Ellen C. Jaffee.

MR. SAEED: We'll now move on to the public.

Our speaker is Bardyl Tirana.

MR. TIRANA: Bardyl Tirana. I'm a resident of South Nyack. I've prepared a written position, which I'll leave with you.

It seems to me that Concept F does everything that the Tappan Zee Bridge and the Department and the Thruway want done to take care of pedestrians, runners, and bicyclists, and the Concept F has a place where everybody can come, if they're headed to the west, and they can go immediately, safely, without any hazard north into Nyack, or they can go south, across the Thruway, easily to whatever their destination is. Or if they're coming by car, to park, in Exit 10, and
then use the SUP to go east. That is easy. Everything is co-located. It's a marvelous use of Exit 10.

Thank you.

MR. SAEED: Thank you very much.

Just a reminder, we're going to limit the comments to two minutes.

Mr. Floyd Lapp.

MR. LAPP: My name is Floyd Lapp. I've been an urban planner for more than half a century; probably more important to the discussion, a Rockland resident, celebrating our 44th anniversary today.

(Appause.)

MR. LAPP: Thank you very much.

Same wife, same family. Very rare these days. Thank you.

So I dare not take issue with the excellent work that's been done about the preferred alternative, but as a transportation planner, I would like to, on the one hand, congratulate the people who did the analysis for Rockland County to come up with 54 parking spaces, but
I'd seriously like you to take another look at what's called in the analysis, the catchment area. On average, based on the very fine analysis that was done of other locations up and down the Hudson, and even away from the region, the catchment area is only 15 miles. And having spent, unfortunately, a good part of my life commuting from New City, to the George Washington Bridge, that's about 25 or 30 minutes, at 50 miles an hour. So, clearly, somewhere to the south of us, in Orangetown, would be the termination of the southern boundary, let alone the elimination of New York City and environs.

And if you view the New New York Bridge, not with that awkward name, but with something more appropriate, like Hudson Gateway, I think it's going to lead to a lot of tourism, especially with the vein work in back of the bike and ped facility. So I'm asking the people involved to respectfully take another look at the catchment area, to enlarge it, so that the
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type of excellent description that could happen, if we don't gage the parking accurately, that Harriet Cornell eluded to, does not occur.

Thank you for the analysis. Please take an extra look at parking catchment area.

MR. SAEED: Thank you.

David Fleischmann.

MR. FLEISCHMANN: Yes, sir. Good evening. I hear a lot of good voices from the people who live in South Nyack. They say the bridge is all about South Nyack and the people who come to visit. I am, perhaps, a different voice. I'm one of the daily commuters. I live in New City. I take whatever Tappan Zee Bridge approach that has the least or worst traffic. Like many people along the bridge with me, we've moved here from Westchester or the Bronx or, you know, somewhere else because it was cheaper. Unfortunately, we're Westchester. We're not New York City. We're not the next Brooklyn or Hoboken.
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That, unfortunately, is Rockland's differentiate. It's cheaper. Unfortunately, that is no longer the case, or almost no longer the case, and the traffic has gotten much worse no matter what approach I take. I understand they're going to close one of the southbound Tappan Zee Bridge approaches. Traffic already is extremely bad.

And what I am suspecting is going to happen is that traffic, yes, it will go away from those South Nyack roads, in many ways though I think it's going to go away entirely, and they're going to say, you know what, why are we commuting to Westchester from here? It's no longer cheaper. The traffic is getting much worse. There is no particular reason to come here every night. Okay. Palisades Mall. Nyack. Theaters. We'll do that on the weekend. And then you're going to lose those 12,000 taxpayers, and what's going to happen? So what? Who cares, it's quiet. Yeah, but, you know what,
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it's going to get even harder here then
for the people who stay, because the
operating costs of the County are going to
be spread out among a smaller tax base.

I understand there are people who
are retired, they want it quiet. But,
remember, you had a job once, too. You
don't always have the option to work from
home. And the worse that commute gets,
the more people are going to question why
they do that. You know, the rolls are
going up. It's getting harder. The
conditions that were true when I came
here, almost 20 years ago, many people --
thousands of people I know have already
left. You know, they moved out.
There's no point in having this commute
anymore.

So just please keep that in mind.

You know, 12,000 daily commuters, versus a
couple hundred pedestrians and bicyclists
on the weekend. Please keep that in mind.

MR. SAEED: Thank you very much.

Jeff Hirsch will be our next
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speaker.

MR. HIRSCH: Hi. Good evening.

Thank you for having me up here.

First of all, I want to begin by saying, Concept E will not happen. We will not let it happen here. South Nyack will only accept Concept F. I repeat. E won't happen. If we have to seek legal measures, we will. If we have to do something worse, drastic than that, we will do that as well.

But I have several ways to make Concept F even more cost effective and beneficial. I sent an e-mail, that was responded to. Thank you for that, from Mr. Morrisey. I don't know if he's here.

But, number one, there's no need to have a paved section on Esposito Trail. There's no need to have a ramp connecting --

(Applause.)

MR. HIRSCH: Thank you.

-- the shared-use path to that. If you've been to -- I have a picture here.
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And I can submit this as well -- the Highline, in New York, they have lots of steps going up there. Anyone on a bike or a wheelchair, who needs wheeled access, is welcome to access the shared-use path through the parking lot, and feed into the town with their packs of bikers, that we don't want on our path. That path is used by children, dogs, walkers, people with kids in strollers, joggers. If they start sending packs of bikers on the path, there's going to be injuries and problems. So they can eliminate that, or not have a connection at all, and just have Esposito Trail go directly over the bridge, as it has. Anyone on the SUP can go into the parking lot. Or just put that set of steps right here, and anyone can see that little picture, simple steps. You got your mountain bike. Throw it on your shoulder, like we all know how to do, and walk up and down the stairs. Road bike. Whatever you want to do. The inexpensive staircase.
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So while I do think the new Tappan Zee Bridge is great. I think its construction is beautiful. I look forward to walking out there myself. I'd go down the steps or go through the parking lot.

But then the other concerns we have is with the ease that that parking lot is going to face -- we live on Clinton Avenue. I've been there for, what; 15 years now or so? Right? Something like that, hon. I got two boys over there. Our neighbors.

MR. SAEED: Mr. Hirsch, you have 15 seconds. Please wrap up.

MR. HIRSCH: So maintenance and security. There should be a policeman, a State Trooper there, 24/7. Who should be cleaning those bathrooms? And who is taking care of watching any sort of unsavory activity going on in that parking lot?

Thank you.

MR. SAEED: Thank you very much.

Barbara Valente.
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MS. VALENTE: Gosh, I have to fellow Jeff. My name is Barbara Valente. I'm a 20-year resident of 9W, in Grandview, and I'm very -- we've all sort of watched what South Nyack has done over the last two years, three years to work with you guys, and it's very impressive. Unfortunately, we're here -- I'm here tonight on behalf of some neighbors. We've noticed, over the last three years, two years, an increase in traffic on 9W, an incredibly increase in traffic. Since when you come around the curve and it goes down to one lane, where you go through the toll, we've had days where there has been, and some of our neighbors who are on that same path of the school bus, it backs up in front, all the way almost to the cul-de-sac at Treeline Terrace, and because people are all bottlenecking in to try to go onto the bridge. And so I'm sure that it will get worked out, as all of this happens and looking at the two different proposals, it seems like that
Proceedings
may, but we're just very concerned about
the traffic pattern. There's some days
where it feels like the streetlight at the
college and the street like down in
Sparkill are not combined, and so if
you're putting in more street lights, so
then we're sitting here, waiting to get
out of our driveways, and the school bus
is late because they're coming north, on
9W, and they can't get through because
bridge traffic is all the way backed up,
you know, almost a whole mile from the
bridge.

The other thing we're concerned
about is trucks. There's been an
increase in truck traffic. There's rumors
that that will get worse once the bridge
happens.

And, also, on that Old Mountain Road
path, that comes down at the blinking
light, bigger trucks coming down. They
may start coming down more often, to try
to get on the bridge, you know, bypass
whatever and take a sneak around to the
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bridge, and then they get stuck at the bottom, because it's not really setup for bigger trucks, and that's going to mess up traffic more.

So we very much, my neighbors and I, appreciate what you guys have all done, and all the community has done, but as sort of the step children of all of this, we're a little concerned about the traffic on 9W and the impact of that.

MR. SAEED: Thank you very much.

DeWitt Rulon.

MR. RULON: Good evening. Thank for the opportunity to speak tonight. I'd like to thank the Task Force, the Village Board Trustees, New York State Thruway Authority for reconsidering the placement of the shared-use path.

One of the solutions to satisfy all the residents of the Village, I hope you hear the voices tonight, and decide to move forward with Concept F. Concept F provides the best solution, considering the desires of the residents of South
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Nyack, and the need to solve parking, traffic and quality of life concerns.

Thank you.

MR. SAEED: Thank you very much.

Next speaker will be Judith Hirschhorn.

MS. HIRSCHHORN: Good evening.

I've been a resident of South Nyack for more than 25 years. I'll keep my remarks brief.

I would say that in the number of years all of you are going to go away, back to your homes, on to other new projects, we would ask that your legacy here be a positive one. Option F is the only positive one. Don't do to South Nyack what the first bridge did to South Nyack.

Thank you.

MR. SAEED: Thank you very much.

Jennifer Rothschild.

MS. ROTHSCILD: Congratulations, Khurram. I miss you at Low-Hud.

MR. SAEED: Thank you very much.
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MS. ROTHSCHILD: I'd also like to thank the Thruway Authority, and everyone else involved in making this space available, and in such a orderly way of allowing the public to speak, and all of the officials who have already spoken so eloquently, particularly our South Nyack Mayor and Village Trustees.

I do think the process has evolved just miraculously. And I can really, truly say that from my heart, because I've been one of those people who was involved. I live in the immediate neighborhood. And over the course of time I was part of a group called TZ Vis -- I mean -- nope -- TZ Gateway Alliance. And we did meet with Brian Conybeare and others at the Main Street office, and a number of people from outside of South Nyack. I also hosted Senator Carlucci in my home, and a number of people there. And about a year and a month or two ago I hosted a very large meeting of local residents, with the South Nyack Task Force. And it was very
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stressful, but it has come to a wonderful conclusion.

And so I would just like to reiterate what everybody said about Concept F. I think it is best for the South Nyack neighborhood and reconnecting the two sides of the Village. But I would also like to stress that Concept F is best for the Thruway Authority, because the current entrance to the eastbound, or is it southbound to the bridge from South Broadway, is very dangerous. It's dangerous for pedestrians. It's dangerous for cars in the area, particularly buses; they have a terrible time trying to make that hairpin turn. And I've witnessed, on many, many occasions, buses having to enter, backup, backup again. If you have so many increased numbers of people coming to this area, it would be highly dangerous to allow that situation to continue. If you do a Concept E, you'll have a lot of witnesses on that flyover to testify in any sort of ensuing lawsuit.
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I think you should keep that in mind. Thank you.

MR. SAEED: Thank you very much.

Thank you for your compliments.

Michael Hogan is our next speaker.

MR. HOGAN: My, I feel like a contrarian. I am a constituency perhaps of only one. I live on South Broadway, and on Livingston, and I get out -- it takes me about 30 seconds to get on the Exit 10, as it is currently constructed, to go east on the Tappan Zee Bridge.

The way Concept F is designed, I would have to go up to Clinton, turn left, to Franklin, across over to I guess it's Highland coming down. In essence, it's five traffic lights. A stop sign and five traffic lights. Which, you know, for a community in my particular situation is a significant issue from the current configuration.

Concept F to me would be very acceptable if we have some access to 9W at the very south end of South Broadway. As
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it appears, there are very strong, very obviously this evening or very few people in my situation, so there wouldn't be many people, cars needing to get on that way, but it certainly would avoid a tremendous 720-degree, five traffic light voyage as it currently looks in the representations.

Thank you very much.

MR. SAEED: Thank you. We appreciate your comments.

A VOICE: They closed the ramp to the bridge where the Thruway police used to be.

MR. SAEED: We have folks outside who will have the answers to all these questions.

Ian Russell will be our next speaker.

MR. RUSSELL: I'm Ian Russell. I live at 281 South Broadway, simply directly across from the Town Hall, and the exit that everybody was talking about.

First, I'd like to thank very much Bonnie and Trustees and the South Nyack
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Task Force. You've done an excellent job getting us to this point. I was very happy to see, in both the visualizations out there, of that entrance and non-entrance, the Concept F, a new sound wall basically covering between South Broadway bridge and the Esposito Trail. I would like to say that I expect that that would actually be part of the final construction. And not only will it be there, but that it will also ameliorate the sound levels emanating from the Thruway, such that the Thruway at that point would be in compliance with federal and state guidelines, which currently I'm certain it is not.

Thank you.

MR. SAEED: Thank you very much.

Roger Seiler.

MR. SEILER: I came here this evening with a few lingering questions. I'm happy to announce that they were satisfactorily answered by the people in the hallway.
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I want to thank Mayor Bonnie Christian and the members of the Task Force, including Gerry Eildelwich, Richard Kohlhouse, Nancy Wellen, Greg Tulen and Connie Coker, who put in hundreds of hours, over several years working on this Task Force. And having had my questions answered satisfactorily, I do support F.

And I have an important announcement, and that is, I have nothing further to say.

MR. SAEED: Thank you.

In that case, we'll move on to John Lockwood.

MR. LOCKWOOD: Hey, how you doing.

We have the best DPW in the area.

(Applause.)

MR. LOCKWOOD: Anybody who has moved from South Nyack to Nyack knows that. But so they're already burdened. Right now because of our tax burden, because our commercial area was stolen, 50 years ago, we don't have enough taxes to take care of that in perpetuity. Is it perpetuity? Is
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that the word? So we're going to run out of being able to afford that DPW. If we add an extra burden, it's absurd, to throw it on. If we can put it on a state road. If we can put all the burden and all that traffic onto our Village roads, we can't afford to do that. So, I mean, obviously, hopefully put bed and breakfasts back in. Maybe we could do that, to make some taxes come in. But right now we can't afford our DPW as it is. For you guys to extra an burden is just absurd. It's really not worth talking about. F is the only thing to do.

MR. SAEED: Thank you.
Thank you all for keeping your comments under two minutes.
Margaret Williams is our next speaker.

MS. WILLIAMS: I'm Margaret Williams. I want to repeat what I think just about everybody said, except that one gentleman who might change his mind, Concept F is the only option which meets
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the needs of the community of South Nyack. The 1955 bridge construction destroyed the
heart of South Nyack. Any concept, other
than Concept F, will add to the travesty
of 1955.

MR. SAEED: Thank you.

Next up is Faith Elliot.

MS. ELLIOT: I'd like to thank my
brother-in-law, John Cammeron, for making
the amazing banner that hung on the corner
of Cornelison for a long time.

(Applause)

MS. ELLIOT: And I would like to
thank Mr. John McCade, now retired from
Federal Highway, who, when I called, after
the original plan to take the Wisener's
tynd and spill hundreds of bikers onto
South Broadway, listened, responded, met
and worked with the Thruway, and with the
citizens. That's a very gutsy thing for a
government official to do. And I
certainly do appreciate it.

I'm here to lend my com -- my
support to Concept F. I don't believe
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it's a panacea, but I do think it's the best of a bad number of choices.

But I also want to say to the people, the Thruway, in a project of this magnitude, owes it to our region to do a good project. They owe it to the citizenry that it's going to affect, to work and to get down to the brass tacks, and to do something that is going to work for the community.

So while we are definitely grateful that the lines of communication have opened up so very much, we cannot take that as government doing us a favor.

And I would also urge the citizenry, who has become so active and so involved and so educated on this concept, to remain vigilant, to keep the channels of communication open with the government on all levels, and go for F. But don't stop at F, and because there will be many improvements that still need to be made. There will be unforeseen things that will happen, and it cannot stop there. For
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instance, tonight I learned that the
original concept is not completely off the
table. So let's join together in eternal
vigilance.

MR. SAEED: Thank you.

Kristy Leader.

MS. LEADER: Good evening. I'm
Kristy Leader. I'm a South Nyack
resident. I live on Clinton Avenue. I'm
here with many of my neighbors. We our
among the group that is to be most
affected by this shared-use path and what
you guys decide to do.

I just want to thank the Mayor and
my wonderful neighbors for the many, many
conversations that we've had. We live
right on Clinton and Franklin Avenue. I'm
here to speak on behalf of my children. I
have three children in Nyack School
District. Our youngest has not even
started kindergarten yet, so we plan to
be here for a long time. We love Nyack.
We moved here to raise our family because
we feel like it's a wonderful place. We
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hope for it to continue to be a wonderful place. So, as I said, I'm here to speak on behalf of the parents. Our small children love our block. They love being able to walk to the Franklin Park. They love to be able to walk to their friends' houses, in a safe community, where we can feel good about them doing that.

Concept E puts a parking lot and a bathroom in our backyard. Literally from where we live and from where our kids get on the bus stop, we would be able to see the bathroom. We have very grave concerns about who would be hanging out in that bathroom, in that parking lot, how they would be kept clean, who would be hanging out there at night. We all know what has happened to Memorial Park. It's been left with disgusting bathrooms and desolate. That's a whole nother meeting for us to get very involved in, for another day, but we don't want that to happen to our beautiful neighborhood. So we very, very strongly support Concept F. We hope that
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you guys will do right by our children, for the next 30 years, that hopefully they will be here and doing right by this community.

Thank you.

MR. SAEED: Thank you.

Next is Peter DeMaio.

MR. DeMAIO: I'll make this very brief.

When I heard about this concept last year, I was very alarmed that it would do a great harm to our Village, and as everyone has already mentioned. So I'm really here just to reinforce the F concept. I think that would do the least harm. And, I mean, after all, a lot of people have lived in this Village for a long time. My wife and I have been here for 40 years. We live on Piermont Avenue, close to Village Hall, and we just don't want to see the neighborhood destroyed or changed.

Everyone has been very eloquent about that, so I have nothing more to say,
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really. Just concept F is what I'm supporting.

Thank you.

MR. SAEED: Kendel Leader is our last speaker.

MR. LEADER: Good evening. I would like to start by thanking the Mayor and everybody involved. I would like to thank the Clinton crew.

(Applause.)

MR. LEADER: I would like to just offer a different perspective on this. We are babies of Nyack, because we just moved to Nyack, to South Nyack specifically, and one of the things that bothered us, or what we thought about before we moved here was the impact it would have on our property. Our property value. Everybody here cares about their property value. The thought of having Concept E scared us. We looked at, and the only thing that was on the Internet, and everything thing that we looked at was Concept E. Nothing else was available. And we took a risk,
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because we know that we come to a town
where everybody would fight and stand up
and say, we don't want it here.

So I'm just here to say, for the
good of all the Village, Mayor, please
let's fight this.

MS. CHRISTIAN:    You got me.

MR. SAEED:  Thank you.

MR. LEADER:  Concept F, people.

MR. SAEED:  Thank you.

If anybody else would like comment,
fill out a card. You have time in the
public hearing.

You're also welcome to go back
outside and look at the boards and ask
questions.

(Whereupon, there was a recess
taken.)

MR. SAEED:  Thank you for attending
tonight. You can provide any additional
comments in writing. Written statement
may be submitted in any of three different
ways: You can drop off these comments with
us tonight. There is a box at the
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registration table. You may send them to us by e-mail at info@newnybridge.com no later than April 1st; or, you can mail them to any of the addresses listed on the comment cards. They must be postmarked no later than Friday, April 1st, 2016.

Based on the findings of the Environmental Assessment, the oral comments received tonight and written comments received during the public comment period, the lead agencies will determine if the proposed action will result in any significant impacts that were not identified in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) prepared for the Tappan Zee Hudson River Crossing Project (TZHRCP). If it is determined that there will be no significant impacts, a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) and negative declaration will be prepared to conclude the environmental review process. The lead agencies will then decide which alternative will be progressed.

Thank you and good night.
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MS. RODRIGUEZ: I just want to say that I'm opposed to them closing the Exit 10 ra -- the entrance in South Nyack. Very opposed. That's how I get to work everyday.

That's basically it. I'm just very opposed to them closing the entrance.

*****
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MR. ALPERT: 2015 Concept E. We do not want this plan.

Advantage: Does not close Thruway northbound entrance.

Disadvantages: Parking, restrooms, lighting visible to homes on Clinton.

Parking furthest from SUP, encouraging parking on streets nearest Village Hall.

Three, no room for parking lot expansion.

Four, overhead switchback ramps, way of elevating 17 feet.

A, may be visually massive above South Broadway at Cornelison. B, may include street lights. C, emergency access gate install needed on Smith.

Five, paved bike/ped path built next to existing path on Esposito Trail from Clinton to Village Hall.

Six, morning commuter traffic will continue "as is" on South Broadway, Clinton, Cornelison, and River Road.

Seven, pedestrian crossing to
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parking lot in high traffic area by
Franklin and Clinton.

Eight, no pedestrian crossing near
Shadyside.

Thank you.

*****
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MR. HAYNES: I was wondering if this is ecologically friendly in some way.
That's my concern.
Is it ecologically friendly?
And is it going to have an effect on the animals?

*****
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DR. PRAH: I'm just going to say that I came to Rockland County in the late Fifties, and I feel that the Tappan Zee Bridge needed to be replaced, not to be repaired for the length of years that it has been here.

And I just think that they're doing a good job.

I'm the President of the NAACP, and I am Dr. Francis Prah, and I live in South Nyack.

*****
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MS. ROGERS: My concern is who is going to police or take the time to basically police that whole area of parking and bathrooms and the trail, the SUP.

That's one.

Number two, because if South Nyack becomes part of it, we already pay about 68 percent of our taxes for Village for police. Very small village.

The other thing is to have a time limit; that that trial is not open 24/7, otherwise folks will be out there at 11:00 and 12:00 nighttime, sitting down and enjoying themselves, and that's usually when trouble begins. They've had to close down Memorial Park after dark. They did that. It seems to me that we have to come up with something.

*****
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A-2 Written Comments
We are South Nyack residents and we support "Concept F" in South Nyack for the shared use path.
Barbara & Cliff Ackerson

Sent from my iPad
To the NYS Thruway Authority and NY State DOT,

We are South Nyack residents who support the Plan F design for the Shared Use Path. It is the best possible alternative to help our small community deal with the predicted increase in visitors to our village. It will help reduce not only traffic and parking, but wear and tear on our streets. At the same time, it will give visitors a safe place to park and restrooms in close proximity to the entrance of the SUP. Thank you for offering this plan as an option. It is the best possible solution to many of our concerns.

Sincerely,
Jack Adams and Katherine Carson
43 Elysian Avenue
South Nyack NY 10960

Sent from my iPhone
To whom it may concern:

I am writing to voice my concern regarding protection of south Nyack neighborhoods from car, bike, and foot traffic and parking, and my support for (and only for) the Plan F exit for the new bridge project.

Thank You,
Julie Agoos
I support "Concept F" in my home village of South Nyack for the Shared Use Path. I believe this plan will enhance the visitors experience as well as prevent difficult local situations. Thank you for all the hard work on this project.

Sent from my iPad
I support concept "F" as a resident of South Nyack, NY 10960 thank you, Thomas Aliken
49 Elystan Ave
South Nyack, NY 10969-4331
I am a resident of South Nyack and I support "Concept F" in South Nyack for the shared use path.

Louise Albertson

Sent from my iPad
As a resident of South Nyack for over 25 years, my wife and I support Concept F in South Nyack for the shared use path. We live on Smith Ave, in the shadows of the New Bridge, and feel this is by far the most suitable concept.

Thank You,

Mike Angarola and family
I support Concept F. My husband also supports Concept F. We feel it is
the best proposal especially for the residents of South Nyack. We just love living here and don't want to see our
neighborhood devastated because of a bad decision made by NYS Thruway Authority.

We are doing the best we can with all the construction that has been going on and continues to go on. The new Bridge
will be beautiful and is very much needed and so we had no choice. But now that we do have a choice, please listen to
our voices and choose Concept F.

Thank you.

Kate Armstrong
Licensed Real Estate Salesperson
Better Homes and Gardens Rand Realty
cell - 845-548-6729
www.randrealty.com
As south nyack residents, we support the Concept F for the terminus of the shared use path. We have concerns about the impact that the bridge has on our little village, both positive and negative. We are strongly in favor of all the benefits such a concept would bring us as well as helping to ameliorate all the damage that the original bridge did to our neighborhood. It has always stuck us that exit 10 was perhaps the worst-designed highway exit in the world. Concept F makes use of a lot of that wasted space in a way that brings our fractured village a little closer together, while allowing us to preserve our neighborhood, and to enjoy and share the access to the paths and trails that benefits residents and visitors alike.

Thank you for listening.

Elinor Bly
Michael J. Arougheti
51 Glen Byron Ave., South Nyack
Please meet the needs of all modes of transportation on the Tappan Zee Bridge.

Anything is missing a golden opportunity.

Most NYC and MTA bridges are open 24/7 for cyclists and pedestrians without any problems, but look at the disaster they have on the Verrazano Narrows, Throgs Neck, and Whitestone Bridges by denying cyclists and pedestrian any access at all!

You have a chance to solve the design and access correctly, right from the start.

Don't blow it!

Thanks,

Stephen
Please consider these two articles from popular cycling blogs as additional 'official' comments on the Tappan Zee SUP.

In short, we need

1) 24/7 access to the bridge SUP
2) sensible multiple access points to the SUP for both those who arrive by car (the parking lot), and those who bike to the SUP (River Road/Piermont Avenue/Bike Route 9 crossing), or live locally.

2016-03-20 BikeBlogNYC - "New Tappan Zee Bridge bike/ped path set to open in 2018, but…"

2016-03-21 - BikeSnobNYC - "Burning Bridges"
http://bikesnobnyc.blogspot.com/2016/03/burning-bridges.html

I can empathize with the local residents, as a huge ugly stadium that attracts millions of people per year was built right in my back yard (Barclay's Center), that I have yet to enter, under shady circumstances http://atlanticyardsreport.blogspot.com/

But in the case of the SUP, it is free to use for anyone, not charging exorbitant prices like at Barclay's, so my fear is that the local residents will be shooting themselves in the foot in the long run, once they see how wondering the SUP will be for them personally.

Why make it harder for them to walk their dog on the SUP, take a bike ride, or baby stroller? If their narrow view prevails, I think everyone will lose in the long run.

We can't let that happen!

Stephen
Hi,
I'm Margaret Auer, and live at 11 Voorhis Pt, S Nyack. I only want plan F,

Thanks,
Margaret

Sent from my iPhone
To: NYS Thruway Authority/NYS DOT

We are residents of South Nyack.
We support "Concept F" for the Shared Use Path.

Sharon & Tom Bailey
225 South Boulevard
South Nyack, NY 10960
To whom it may concern:
I am a South Nyack resident in favor of "Concept F" in South Nyack
Best regards,
Janice Baragwanath
Unfortunately I was not able to attend meeting earlier this month. I am definitely in favor of Plan F.
Sincerely,
Janice Baragwanath
South Nyack Resident
NYS Thruway Authority,

I have been a South Nyack resident for many years and firmly object to plan E. Our village was ravaged with the first TZ bridge due to poor planning and poor vision. I support plan F which will keep traffic and noise off our local streets with access on to Rte. 9W. There will also be room for parking expansion with plan F.

Diane Barbara
4 Salisbury Point
S Nyack NY 10960
It is unrealistic to have walkers on bridge unless they live within walking distance. There is no room to park and people will try to park on Salisbury property. As it is people from across the street try to park on our property.

Mrs. Elizabeth Barry

Sent from my iPhone
We support concept f for nyack

Sent from my iPad
Hello,

I am a south nyack resident and I fully support "Concept F" in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path.

Keep our village charm in tact and put the entrance to the interchange at Route 9W.

Thank you!

Theresa Breen
Thank you for giving me the opportunity to express my support for Concept F regarding the shared us path and the interchange of the NYS Throughway.

Thank you,

Amy Briamonte
South Nyack Resident

70 Clinton Ave
Nyack, NY 10960

Amy Briamonte
(O): 845 480 5760
(M): 917 981 1055
amybriamonte@icloud.com
I am a New Yorker who bicycles daily for transportation as well as recreation. My mother lives in Kendal on Hudson in Sleepy Hollow. Being able to bike to visit her would be a great opportunity to see her more often, as well as get some much-needed R and R.

A fully accessible bike lane on the new Tappan Zee bridge will enable me and my biker friends to make longer and more frequent journeys, since it will also give us the option of taking Metro North from the city. I strongly urge that the shared use path be as cyclist-friendly as possible, with no impediments to access.

With this in mind, I urge you to select Option F on the Nyack approach to the shared use path. Concept F is the only solution that is viable for cyclists. Without it, our travel will be impeded.

On the Westchester side, Concept B looks like a very viable solution. I have two concerns, however.

1) Are there provisions for cyclists traveling to and from the nearby North/South County Trailway? The most direct route is on NY-119 -- a busy, high-speed 4-lane roadway with mostly no shoulders. This would be extremely dangerous.

2) Are there any plans available for controlling the interaction between bikes and cars at the end of the access ramp?

A signalized crosswalk with a median refuge area is necessary at the intersection of Route 9 and the Shared Use Path. The Environmental Assessment explicitly says no changes will be made here. That opinion is dangerously mistaken.

Route 9 has significant vehicle counts and is over 50' wide at this location. Across the street from the path entrance is an apartment complex with 380 residents. There's also a shopping center and a bank. All of them will draw pedestrians across Route 9 at this intersection. The nearest crosswalk adds up to 1,300 feet to a journey and requires traversing a two lane wide free flowing right hand turn lane. The crosswalk in the other direction adds up to 1,500 feet to a trip.

Without a signal, cyclists coming off the bridge who are heading north on Route 9 will have a very hard time finding a safe gap in traffic between through traffic on Route 9, north bound turning movements from Route 119, plus vehicles exiting the gas station, bank, shopping center and apartment building.
Similarly, people riding bikes north on Route 9 heading onto the bridge will have a difficult time navigating that left turn.

Thank you for your time and consideration.
Sincerely,
Cindy Brome

75 Bank St.  #4D
New York, NY  10014
To Whom It May Concern:

My name is Beth E. Brown and I live at 79 Smith Avenue in South Nyack, New York along with my wife, Andrea F. Composto. We have been residents of South Nyack since 2008 and we love our neighborhood!!!!

"We support "Concept F" in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path."

We respectfully request that our support of Concept F become a reality. We wholeheartedly believe that this is the best option for South Nyack residents and that this plan will protect the integrity and character of our neighborhood!!!!

Thank you!

Beth E. Brown, Office Director
The Law Offices of
COMPOSTO & COMPOSTO
142 Joralemon Street, Suite 9C
Brooklyn, New York 11201
(718) 875-5199
(718) 855-6866 - fax

15 N. Mill Street; Suite 218
Nyack, New York 10960
(845) 639-7586
(845) 213-3901 - fax
bbrown@compostolaw.com
www.compostolaw.com

COMPOSTO & COMPOSTO is a
CERTIFIED WOMEN’S BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (WBE)
Through the NYS Department of Economic Development,
Division of Minority and Women’s Business Development

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information contained in this message and any attachments may be information protected by attorney-client and/or the attorney/work product privilege. It is intended only for the use of the individual named above. If the person actually receiving this email or any other reader of this message is not the named or intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the named recipient or intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify us by email and delete the message from your system.

IRS CIRCULAR 230 DISCLOSURE: To ensure compliance with requirements imposed by the IRS, we inform you that any U.S. federal tax advice contained in this communication (including any attachments) is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding penalties under the internal revenue code or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or matter addressed here.
To the NYS Thruway Authority/NYS Department of Transportation:

As residents of Grand View-on-Hudson residing just a half mile south of the new bridge on Piermont Road (a.k.a. River Road), my husband and I are very concerned about the proposed solutions to accommodating users of the pedestrian and biking lane wishing to access the bridge. We are strongly in favor of Concept F. We hope you will be too!

Sincerely,
Howard H. Brown, Jr.
Nancy A. Houghton Brown
We are residents of South Nyack and we support "Concept F" for the Shared Use Path. Its adoption will discourage visitor parking on our village streets and help to control wear and tear on our local roads.

Donald Burd
Shane Burd
4 Salisbury Point
South Nyack, New York
I am a resident and I approve concept F thank you Sent from my iPhone
We are South Nyack residents on 29 Division Avenue, and we support concept "t" for the shared use path.

Thank you very much,

Jason and Rhonda Campagna
29 Division Avenue
917-791-0671
March 4, 2016

Ms. Maria Lehman, Interim Executive Director
New York State Thruway Authority – Administrative Headquarters
200 Southern Boulevard
P.O. Box 189
Albany, NY 12201-0189

Dear Ms. Lehman,

I am writing to give my support of the Village of South Nyack Board of Trustees’ resolution on January 12th, 2016 endorsing the South Nyack Tappan Zee Task Force recommendation for Concept F for the proposed Shared-Use Path (SUP).

Concept F has several aspects the benefit the Village of South Nyack and would have a benefit impact on the village for years to come if the Thruway Authority chose this plan. Parking is major concern for nearby residents and Concept F eliminates those concerns. The plan provides room for the parking lot to expand, puts the parking lot across from the SUP’s entry point, and adds a pedestrian crossing from Shadyside Avenue to the parking lot. Traffic on village roads is also a point of concern and constituents worry they will have to pay the price for years to come. Concept F eliminates that concern by removing the majority of the morning commuter traffic from South Nyack and adding more distance from Route 9W as well as the homes on the corner of Shadyside Avenue.

Additionally, Concept F does not close the northbound entrance to the Thruway, which several other concepts require. It also eliminates the construction of overhead switchback ramps above South Broadway at Cornelison or the construction of an overpass at Franklin Street.

For all the reasons just listed, I support the Village Board’s Resolution endorsing the Task Force’s recommendation for Concept F. If you have any further questions or concerns, please feel free to contact my District Representative, Patrick J. Sheehan, at my District Office in New City at 845-623-3627.

Sincerely,

Senator David Carlucci
38th Senate District

DCS:PJS
Hi

I would like to see that an accommodation is made for South Nyack Residents to be able to park their during the week during business hours. I have not heard or seen any dialog in reference to how the TZ Express bus would be incorporated into these plans. This type of request needs to be thought out from the very beginning. It would really be a great perk for residents and a way to keep some cars off the bridge. Maybe save half the spots for South Nyack Residents. The path will receive the greatest use during the weekends and later afternoon early evenings during the week so saving some spots for the bus would not have a direct impact during the high use periods of the weekends.

Most of all the passion around this is the 20 or so residences who live in closest proximity to the path. The Greater community must be listened to. This will be a tremendous asset to Nyack and the NY Metro area. It needs to be done right.

Mike Chesterman
Hub Manager NY Boston
Summit Program Early Hire Professionals
Phone; 914-772-2224
e-mail: gmcheste@us.ibm.com
As a 4th generation resident of South Nyack and as the Mayor of South Nyack I support Concept F for the Shared Use Path.

Thank you,
Bonnie Christian
I live at 88 Clinton Ave, near the corner of Franklin.
I support my neighbor's plea for Alternative F.
However, I am concerned with the intertwining of the Sus and Esopus Trails and I am concerned with the ambiguity of the end of the shared use path at Clinton and Franklin.

Name: Diane Churchill
Interest Represented: 88 Clinton Ave, S. Myack
Address: 88 Clinton Ave S. Myack
Email: Diane@DianeChurchill.com

Here are the ways your written comments can be received and recorded:

- SUBMIT comment tonight. LEAVE COMPLETED COMMENT CARDS AT THE REGISTRATION TABLE
- EMAIL us at info@NewNYBridge.com;
- FAX comments to (914.524.5455); OR
- WRITE to any of the following agencies:

  Jamey Barbas, P.E.
  Project Director, New NY Bridge
  New York State Thruway Authority
  303 South Broadway, 4th Floor
  Tarrytown, NY 10663

  Peter Osborn
  Division Administrator
  Federal Highway Administration
  Leo W. O'Brien Federal Building
  11A Clinton Avenue, Room 715
  Albany, New York 12207

  Daniel D'Angelo, P.E.
  Deputy Chief Engineer
  New York State Department of Transportation
  50 Wolf Road
  Albany, NY 12232

Written comments may be submitted through 5:00 p.m. April 1, 2016.
I am writing to urge the Tappan Zee Bridge Authority to endorse PLAN F for the Nyack terminus. It is by far the best and most workable plan.
Thank you for your attention.

Best,
Dan Cohen
23 Clinton Ave.
South Nyack, NY
917-744-2358

Sent from my phone
You are invited to comment on the Proposed Action (parking and facilities for the shared-use path for the New NY Bridge) in the space below. If you need additional space, please feel free to use the back or additional sheets of paper.

Comments: Without question, I am all for "F." "E" will not direct the traffic - foot + auto parking - out of South Nyack residential neighborhoods. Although it will add a few minutes of looping to get onto the Turnpike going east, I personally don't mind trading that for our neighborhood. Option "E" is unacceptable.

Name: Mara J Cohen

Interest Represented: Resident

Address: 23 Clinton Ave

Email: maralinden@yahoo.com

Here are the ways your written comments can be received and recorded:

- **SUBMIT** comment tonight. LEAVE COMPLETED COMMENT CARDS AT THE REGISTRATION TABLE
- **EMAIL** us at info@NewNYBridge.com;
- **FAX** comments to (914.524.5455); OR
- **WRITE** to any of the following agencies:

  Jamey Barbas, P.E.
  Project Director, New NY Bridge
  New York State Thruway Authority
  303 South Broadway, 4th Floor
  Tarrytown, NY 10591

  Peter Osborn
  Division Administrator
  Federal Highway Administration
  Leo W. O'Brien Federal Building
  11A Clinton Avenue, Room 715
  Albany, New York 12207

  Daniel D'Angelo, P.E.
  Deputy Chief Engineer
  New York State Department of Transportation
  50 Wolf Road
  Albany, NY 12232

Written comments may be submitted through 5:00 p.m. April 1, 2016.
As a resident of South Nyack I support 'concept F' for the shared use plan.
Thank you,
Tahrah Cohen.

Sent from my highPhone
To whom it may concern,

We are South Nyack residents and fully support the Concept F in South Nyack for the shared use path.

Thank you,
Steven J. Collazuol, PE & LS
Dear Government Officials:

The Tappan Zee Bridge folks are holding a hearing about configuring access points for the new bridge's "Shared Use Path"

I'll start with my feedback on the proposals. Hearing information can be found at the bottom. It's important that you take a moment to send an email to info@NewNYBridge.com. Feel free to copy and paste. :) 

**MY FEEDBACK**

-------------

24 Hour Access

* The path needs to be open 24/7. It's a transportation resource, just like the roadway. Would the Thruway Authority close down the road overnight? No! Similarly, around the clock access is required for people cycling and walking. For example, this opens up job opportunities for low income individuals and those who don't drive or don't have access to a car.

**Westchester County Side**

* A signalized crosswalk with a median refuge area is necessary at the intersection of Route 9 and the Shared Use Path. The Environmental Assessment explicitly says no changes will be made here. That opinion is dangerously mistaken.

Route 9 has significant vehicle counts and is over 50' wide at this location.

Across the street from the path entrance is an apartment complex with 380 residents. There's also a shopping center and a bank. All of them will draw pedestrians across Route 9 at this intersection. The nearest crosswalk adds up to 1,300 feet to a journey and requires traversing a two lane wide free flowing right hand turn lane. The crosswalk in the other direction adds up to 1,500 feet to a trip.
Without a signal, cyclists coming off the bridge who are heading north on Route 9 will have a very hard time finding a safe gap in traffic between through traffic on Route 9, north bound turning movements from Route 119, plus vehicles exiting the gas station, bank, shopping center and apartment building.

Similarly, people riding bikes north on Route 9 heading onto the bridge will have a difficult time navigating that left turn.

Rockland County Side

* Alternative E should be rejected because the narrow switchback ramps and stairs significantly reduce the attractiveness of cycling or walking the bridge.

* An access point needs to be added at River Road (State Bicycle Route 9) in Grand View on Hudson. The area is presently being used for bridge construction. Entering the bridge here is 1.3 miles shorter and has 80 feet less climbing for people walking and cycling from points south. The emergency access point can be here as well, instead of Smith Ave.

Between the new parking lot being discussed in the Environmental Assessment, signage of that lot existing and proper parking regulations will dissuade people from parking cars at this path entrance.

* Similarly, if Alternatives E or F are chosen, there is value to having the initially proposed bicycle/pedestrian ramp at South Broadway / Comelison Ave as an additional access point for people traveling to/from the south on Route 9 and those living in neighborhoods south and southwest of the bridge.

HEARING DETAILS

---------------------
Sleepy Hollow High School, 210 North Broadway

---------------------
Nyack Middle School, 98 South Highland Ave

Open house at both locations from .
Public hearing starts at .

You can also comment by emailing Info@NewNYBridge.com
If you want to read about the proposals and/or see the diagrams, the essential information is on PDF pages 35 - 41 in this document:


Thanks,

–Dan
Comments on the Environmental Assessment of
Tappan Zee Shared-Use Path and Bicycle/Pedestrian Connections
Sleepy Hollow High School, March 15, 2016
by Daniel Convisser (Email: daniel@panix.com Twitter: @DanielConvisser)

24 Hour Access is Necessary

The path needs to be open 24/7. It’s a transportation resource, just like the roadway. Would the Thruway Authority close down the road overnight? No! Similarly, around the clock access is required for people cycling and walking. For example, this opens up job opportunities for low income individuals and those who don’t drive or don’t have access to a car.

Add Signal & Crosswalk at Westchester End

A signalized crosswalk with a median refuge area is necessary at the intersection of Route 9 and the Shared Use Path. The Environmental Assessment explicitly says no changes will be made here. That opinion is dangerously mistaken.

Route 9 here is a ~52 foot wide, five-lane, road with significant vehicle counts.

Across the street from the path entrance is an apartment complex with 380 residents. There’s also a shopping center and a bank. All of them will draw pedestrians across Route 9 at this intersection. The nearest crosswalk adds up to 1,300 feet to a journey and requires traversing a two lane wide free flowing right hand turn lane. The crosswalk in the other direction adds up to 1,500 feet to a trip.

Without a signal, cyclists coming off the bridge who are heading north on Route 9 will have a very hard time finding a safe gap in traffic between through traffic on Route 9, north bound turning movements from Route 119, plus vehicles exiting the gas station, bank, shopping center and apartment building.

Similarly, people riding bikes north on Route 9 heading onto the bridge will experience difficulty navigating the left turn.

Pick Alternative F

On the Rockland County side, Alternative F offers simple path access and off-street parking. Alternative E should be rejected because the narrow switchback ramps and stairs would significantly reduce the attractiveness of cycling or walking the bridge.

Add Access at Bicycle Route 9

An access point needs to be added at River Road (State Bicycle Route 9) in Grand View on Hudson. Entering the bridge here is 1.3 miles shorter and has 80 feet less climbing for people coming from the south on this enormously popular bicycle route. The area is presently being used for bridge construction. The grade from the road to the bridge makes building a ramp pretty easy. The emergency access point could probably be here as well, instead of Smith Ave.

Between the new parking lot being discussed in the Environmental Assessment, signage of that lot’s existence and proper parking regulations will dissuade people from parking cars at this path entrance.

Add Access at Route 9W

If Alternatives E or F are chosen, there is value to having the initially proposed bicycle/pedestrian ramp at South Broadway / Cornelison Ave as an additional access point for people walking and biking to/from the south on Route 9W and those living in neighborhoods south and southwest of the bridge.
You are invited to comment on the Proposed Action (parking and facilities for the shared-use path for the New NY Bridge) in the space below. If you need additional space, please feel free to use the back or additional sheets of paper.

Comments: Apart from the vehicle access issue, the ability to have bicycle access on the bridge will encourage recreation, reduce vehicle usage, and promote tourism. Internationally, promoting cycling is seen as a universal good, we are often behind most European countries in promoting cycling as a healthy lifestyle and a way to reduce carbon emissions.

The bike access would include major cycling routes on both sides of the river, greatly enhancing the local cycling experience.

Name: David Copsey
Interest Represented: Westchester Cycling Club
Address: 50 West Elizabeth St, Tarrytown, NY 10591
Email: revdavidc@gmail.com

Here are the ways your written comments can be received and recorded:

- **SUBMIT** comment tonight. LEAVE COMPLETED COMMENT CARDS AT THE REGISTRATION TABLE
- **EMAIL** us at info@NewNYBridge.com;
- **FAX** comments to (914.524.5455); OR
- **WRITE** to any of the following agencies:
  - Jamey Barbas, P.E.
    Project Director, New NY Bridge
    New York State Thruway Authority
    503 South Broadway, 4th Floor
    Tarrytown, NY 10591
  - Peter Osborn
    Division Administrator
    Federal Highway Administration
    Leo W. O'Brien Federal Building
    11A Clinton Avenue, Room 715
    Albany, New York 12207
  - Daniel D'Angelo, P.E.
    Deputy Chief Engineer
    New York State Department of Transportation
    50 Wolf Road
    Albany, NY 12232

Written comments may be submitted through 5:00 p.m. April 1, 2016.
As a cyclist with limited access to a vehicle this bridge will be a great boon. I would envision that lower income families may see this bridge option as improving local access as well as general recreational usage.

I see this bridge access as improving the lifestyle of local residents and be a greater good for the local communities.

Access - 24 hr access would be ideal and closing potentially limiting usage.
I support "concept F" in South Nyack for the shared use path.
I am John Cowan, a 10 year resident of South Nyack, and I strongly support "Concept F" for the Shared Use Path in South Nyack. Our town's commercial center was destroyed by the original 1955 bridge, but a neighborhood feeling remains and can be sustained most effectively utilizing "Concept F". And, just to put in a vote for retaining the Tappan Zee name, we should value and hold dear our Dutch settlers and our wonderfully diverse New York history. A New New York Bridge? How sadly unimaginative and anti-history of Our New New York fathers. For what it's worth. Thanks for your time. John B Cowan RN, MS, retired after 31 years psychiatric nursing for New York State.
To whom it may concern,

I think it would be a serious mistake to not provide a cycle path on the new Tappan Zee bridge. As you well know, the bridge is subject to major traffic delays during rush hour, which presents an environmental cost due to cars idling, noise pollution for nearby residents, etc. Anything that can be done cost effectively to help reduce the infrastructure load or anxiety load for someone wanting to get from Nyack to Tarrytown would be a good idea.

Furthermore, providing a bike path would help engender local tourism, with people able to easily move between Rockland and Westchester Counties. I could nip over the the Runcible Spoon for a coffee and pastry, something I definitely wouldn’t consider if I had to get in my car and pay a toll/parking/gas etc.

We are in the 21st century, evolving towards a more sustainable lifestyle and economic model. Leaving off a bike path puts us squarely back in the 20th century. Even the builders of the George Washington Bridge had the foresight to include a pedestrian pathway. If cost is considered an obstacle, well, painting the bridge is a maintenance cost the government chose to assume. The bridge could easily have been built without paint, but they chose a more aesthetically costly option.

Best regards,

Tom Cromie
To Whom It May Concern,

We are 45 year residents of South Nyack and very concerned that the Thruway Authority/Department of Transportation is still considering Concept E for the shared-use path terminus in South Nyack. Under that option the visitor parking is much too far away from the path terminus to be of practical use, the paving over of the grassy area along Road F would be very unattractive and eliminate what is now a visual barrier between a residential area of the village and the roadbed of the Thruway and the proposed tunnel under Broadway would be a potentially dangerous site completely outside of the view of the local police as an attractive nuisance for vagrants in inclement weather and a site of criminal activity year-round.

Concept F is a far better alternative both for potential visitors to the shared-use path and for the residents of South Nyack with far less negative impact on the community. We strongly urge you to adopt Concept F.

Very Truly Yours,
Charles and Barbara Cross
14 Gesner Ave.
South Nyack
My family lives in South Nyack and we strongly support Concept F and urge that that plan be selected and implemented.

Jeff Croye
Partner
ISG INFORMATION SERVICES GROUP
+1 845 323 0039 Mobile
jeff.croye@isg-one.com | www.isg-one.com

knowledge powering results®

Confidentiality note: The above email contains information that is confidential and/or privileged. The information is for the use of the individual or entity originally intended. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of this information is prohibited.

Please consider the environment before printing this email or attachment.
March 31, 2016

New NY Bridge Outreach Team
303 South Broadway, Suite 413
Tarrytown, New York 10591
Email: Info@NewNYBridge.com

I am a resident of Nyack, New York who commutes over the Tappan Zee Bridge each day using Interchange 10. I am vehemently opposed to "Alternative F".

Currently, Interchange 10 is poorly designed. "Alternative F" will make it much worse, and will result in an environmental disaster.

The Environmental Assessment wrongly concludes that "Alternative F" will not result in any adverse traffic impacts and therefore there is no need to study issues such as increased CO emissions. According to the Assessment: "While closing the local access ramp from South Broadway may inconvenience some motorists...the diversion of vehicles [to Route 9W] would not result in significant adverse impacts to traffic conditions."

This is obviously false. "Alternative F" will cause the morning rush hour traffic to be dramatically worse. Currently, there are 3 main sources of traffic approaching this Interchange in the morning: (1) South Broadway/Cornelison Ave, (2) Route 9W southbound and (3) Route 9W northbound. "Alternative F" will divert hundreds of vehicles that approach from South Broadway/Cornelison Avenue onto Route 9W, where they will join southbound traffic. This increased volume will then come to a standstill at a new traffic light at S. Franklin St. extension. The traffic back-ups approaching this intersection will be incredible, resulting in a waste of time, waste of fuel, and increased emissions from idling vehicles.

Then, once these vehicles get through the new traffic light, they will merge with third group, Route 9W northbound traffic, and begin a slow-motion circular odyssey, crossing from the west side of the Thruway to the east side of the Thruway, then crossing back to the west side, before making a heavy merge onto the highway itself.

Those of us whose daily commute begins on the east side of the Thruway will actually be required to cross the Thruway an astonishing 3 times before entering. This is more than an "inconvenience". Travelling back and forth over the highway in a wide circle, while stuck in congested traffic, will be an incredible collective waste of time and fossil fuel and will result in an immense increase in vehicle emissions in the area. It will be harmful to the environment and destructive of the quality of life of the entire community.
“Alternative F” is a bad idea, and the process by which it has been pushed forward has also been flawed. Changes to Interchange 10 have been presented as a local South Nyack issue, even though this will affect traffic patterns well beyond South Nyack. Many Nyack residents use this interchange to get on the bridge, but we have been largely ignored in this process. Instead, the anxieties of South Nyack residents, fearful of SUP tourism, have been allowed to monopolize the discussion. For reasons that I cannot comprehend, many South Nyack residents seem obsessed over SUP parking, but not at all interested about the daily traffic on their streets, the negative effect on air quality, and damage to the quality of life of thousands of area commuters every day.

In conclusion, I strongly object to every aspect of “Alternative F”. The design is simply ridiculous. And I believe the Environmental Assessment is deeply flawed. “Alternative F” will result in a traffic nightmare and will be an environmental tragedy for South Nyack and beyond.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Paul J. Curley

Cc: Jamey Barbas, P.E.
Peter Osborn
Daniel D’Angelo, P.E.
I am a resident of Nyack, New York who commutes over the Tappan Zee Bridge each day using Interchange 10. I am vehemently opposed to “Alternative F”.

Currently, Interchange 10 is poorly designed. “Alternative F” will make it much worse, and will result in an environmental disaster.

The Environmental Assessment wrongly concludes that “Alternative F” will not result in any adverse traffic impacts and therefore there is no need to study issues such as increased CO emissions. According to the Assessment: “While closing the local access ramp from South Broadway may inconvenience some motorists...the diversion of vehicles [to Route 9W] would not result in significant adverse impacts to traffic conditions.”

This is obviously false. “Alternative F” will cause the morning rush hour traffic to be dramatically worse. Currently, there are 3 main sources of traffic approaching this Interchange in the morning: (1) South Broadway/Cornelison Ave, (2) Route 9W southbound and (3) Route 9W northbound. “Alternative F” will divert hundreds of vehicles that approach from South Broadway/Cornelison Avenue onto Route 9W, where they will join southbound traffic. This increased volume will then come to a standstill at a new traffic light at S. Franklin St. extension. The traffic back-ups approaching this intersection will be incredible, resulting in a waste of time, waste of fuel, and increased emissions from idling vehicles.

Then, once these vehicles get through the new traffic light, they will merge with third group, Route 9W northbound traffic, and begin a slow-motion circular odyssey, crossing from the west side of the Thruway to the east side of the Thruway, then crossing back to the west side, before making a heavy merge onto the highway itself.

Those of us whose daily commute begins on the east side of the Thruway will actually be required to cross the Thruway an astonishing 3 times before entering. This is more than an “inconvenience”. Travelling back and forth over the highway in a wide circle, while stuck in congested traffic, will be an incredible collective waste of time and fossil fuel and will result in an immense increase in vehicle emissions in the area. It will be harmful to the environment and destructive of the quality of life of the entire community.

“Alternative F” is a bad idea, and the process by which it has been pushed forward has also been flawed. Changes to Interchange 10 have been presented as a local South Nyack issue, even though this will affect traffic patterns well beyond South Nyack. Many Nyack residents use this interchange to get on the bridge, but we have been largely ignored in this process. Instead, the anxieties of South Nyack residents, fearful of SUP tourism, have been allowed to monopolize the discussion. For reasons that I cannot comprehend, many South Nyack residents seem obsessed over SUP parking, but not at all interested about the daily traffic on their streets, the negative effect on air quality, and damage to the quality of life of thousands of area commuters every day.

In conclusion, I strongly object to every aspect of “Alternative F”. The design is simply ridiculous. And I believe the Environmental Assessment is deeply flawed. “Alternative F” will result in a traffic nightmare and will be an environmental tragedy for South Nyack and beyond.
This message contains information which may be confidential and privileged. Unless you are the intended recipient (or authorized to receive this message for the intended recipient), you may not use, copy, disseminate or disclose to anyone the message or any information contained in the message. If you have received the message in error, please advise the sender by reply e-mail, and delete the message. Thank you very much.
January 29, 2016

Ms. Maria Lehman, Interim Executive Director
NYS Thruway Authority
220 Southern Boulevard
PO Box 189
Albany, New York 12207-0189

Re: South Nyack Shared-Use Path Concept

Dear Ms. Lehman:

The Village of South Nyack Board of Trustees' passed a resolution on January 12th, endorsing the South Nyack Tappan Zee Task Force recommendation for Concept F for the proposed Shared-Use Path (SUP), which I support. Concept F provides adequate parking for SUP users and reduces the traffic load on local Village streets.

Concept F was one of more than a dozen concepts that were reviewed by the Village Task Force. Concept F removed the majority of morning commuter traffic from the Village, while adding more distance between Route 9W and the homes on the corner of Shadyside Avenue. It also has room to expand parking capacity, and adds a pedestrian crossing from Shadyside Avenue to the SUP parking area.

Concept F does not close the northbound entrance to the Thruway, nor does it require the construction of overhead switchback ramps above South Broadway at Cornelison or the construction of an overpass at Franklin Street.

Due to the above, I support the Village Board's resolution endorsing the recommendation for Concept F for the proposed SUP. If you need more information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,

Edwin J. Day
COUNTY EXECUTIVE
"We support “Concept F” in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path.”

As a resident at Salisbury Point that will be effected by the decision concerning the Shared Use Path, I am urging that “Concept F” be the chosen method. Please let me know how I can assist with the assurance that this decision, which is the correct one for those of us that live in South Nyack is selected.

Thank you,

Elizabeth Declet-Petrossian
Hello,

Can you please tell me what studies have been done as to the traffic impact of closing the access to the bridge from South Broadway? That closure will move traffic into other surface roads in town and onto Route 59 in Nyack in order to get to the entrance at Exit 11. That entrance is already very overburdened, particularly at rush hour. I did not see any indication in the Environmental Assessment or elsewhere that this impact has been considered or studied.

I can be reached at this email address and at 845-304-9738.

Thanks.

John Dedyo
My wife, Alison Lee, and I are both residents of South Nyack. In addition, I have a professional business in South Nyack. We support "Concept F" for the shared use path.

Jan Degenshein  AIA AICP LEED AP

Jan Degenshein
ARCHITECT PLANNER PC
205 S. Broadway
Nyack, NY 10960
tel: 845-358-8400
e-mail: jan@degenshein.com

The information transmitted in this e-mail is intended solely for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use, or any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you received this communication in error, please contact the sender immediately, delete the material from any computer and destroy any hard copy. Thank You.
To Whom It May Concern,

We live in South Nyack, at Salisbury Point, NY and we support "concept F" in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path.

Thank you in advance for your prompt attention.

Ed & Betty Dempsey
Please, will someone in Albany "LOOK" and "SEE" the impending disaster our small community may endure if the NYThruway's cruel Concept E is activated. Concept F is the sane, popular & correct choice. Please do the right thing and support the people.

Betty & Ed Dempsey of South Nyack
Please don't make this intolerable for South Nyack residents! Choose Plan F, that's PLAN "F". Thank you for your consideration.

Betty & Ed Dempsey

Sent from my iPhone
COMMENT CARD

You are invited to comment on the Proposed Action (parking and facilities for the shared-use path for the New NY Bridge) in the space below. If you need additional space, please feel free to use the back or additional sheets of paper.

Comments: CONCERN WITH PEOPLE VENTURING ACROSS A 3 MILE RIVER IN THE COLD OF WINTER OR THE HEAT OF SUMMER IN THE NORTH EAST OF THE USA. HAS THIS WORKED ELSEWHERE IN THIS CLIMATE ZONE? SHELTER FROM Sudden Storms, Medical Emergencies, Crime, Three Miles of A LONG TREK. INTERACTION WITH BIKERS, DID ANYONE OBSERVE THE CIRCUS ON THE...

Name: ED DEMPSKY
Interest Represented: Live close to Proposed Path
Address: 4 Santiago Pl, S. Plain 10960
Email: 845-358-8492 - Snail Mail, Please

Here are the ways your written comments can be received and recorded:

- SUBMIT comment tonight. LEAVE COMPLETED COMMENT CARDS AT THE REGISTRATION TABLE
- EMAIL us at info@NewNYBridge.com;
- FAX comments to (914.524.5455); OR
- WRITE to any of the following agencies:

  Jamey Barbas, P.E.,
  Project Director, New NY Bridge
  New York State Thruway Authority
  303 South Broadway, 4th Floor
  Tarrytown, NY 10591

  Peter Osborn
  Division Administrator
  Federal Highway Administration
  Leo W. O'Brien Federal Building
  11A Clinton Avenue, Room 715
  Albany, New York 12207

  Daniel D'Angelo, P.E.
  Deputy Chief Engineer
  New York State Department of Transportation
  50 Wolf Road
  Albany, NY 12232

Written comments may be submitted through 5:00 p.m. April 1, 2016.
COMMENT CARD

You are invited to comment on the Proposed Action (parking and facilities for the shared-use path for the New NY Bridge) in the space below. If you need additional space, please feel free to use the back or additional sheets of paper.

Comments: **Brooklyn Bridge Problems Every Day**
(Speedy Bikers vs Tourists)

Name: **Ed Dempsey**

Interest Represented: **Close to Proposed Path**

Address: 4 Salisbury St, Abrams, 10605

Phone: **(845-358-8482)**

Here are the ways your written comments can be received and recorded:

- **SUBMIT** comment tonight. LEAVE COMPLETED COMMENT CARDS AT THE REGISTRATION TABLE
- **EMAIL** us at info@NewNYBridge.com;
- **FAX** comments to (914.524.5455); OR
- **WRITE** to any of the following agencies:

  Jamey Barbas, P.E.
  Project Director, New NY Bridge
  New York State Thruway Authority
  303 South Broadway, 4th Floor
  Tarrytown, NY 10591

  Peter Osborn
  Division Administrator
  Federal Highway Administration
  Lec W. O'Brien Federal Building
  11A Clinton Avenue, Room 715
  Albany, New York 12207

  Daniel D'Angelo, P.E.
  Deputy Chief Engineer
  New York State Department of Transportation
  50 Wolf Road
  Albany, NY 12223

Written comments may be submitted through 5:00 p.m. April 1, 2016.
Hi New Bridge people,

I heard that you’re having some trouble setting suitable access for the new pedestrian/cycling path. I’d like to add my name to the request that an additional access point be added at the River Road/Piermont Avenue/Bike Route 9 crossing for the SUP. 24 hour access would be best for those who need to get to early morning trains/work but an early morning (4:30am) opening could also suffice.

You guys and gals are planning a major infrastructure artery and there is no sense in artificially limiting it as it will be more difficult to “fix” later vs. doing it right the first time.

Thanks,

--
Aaron R. Deutsch
Haus Interactive
Planetarium Station, PO Box 250
New York, NY 10024
347-560-4429
www.hausinteractive.com
To Whom It May Concern,
I am a South Nyack resident and unfortunately missed the meeting on March 16th. My husband and I are in favor of concept F which we believe will serve our lovely village the best. We certainly hope the Thruway Authority and the NYS Department of Transportation acts in good faith to build a walkway that enhances the bridge while protecting the quiet and safety of our home.
Sincerely,
Diane Deveau and Kevin Fletcher
23 Washington Ave
South Nyack
please put me down for PLAN F.

thanks

Lisa Devo
Soap & Paper Factory
229 N Rte 303
Suite 101
Congers NY 10920
845.353.4566 P
917.591.6114 F
http://www.soapandpaperfactory.com

FB: Soap and Paper Factory
INSTA: SoapandPaperFactory
As a South Nyack resident I am in support of "Concept F" for the shared use path. My family’s home was taken when the current TZ bridge was constructed and now is the time to keep the new bridge from destroying our neighborhood again.

Carol Drummond
March 29, 2016

Dear Jamey Barbas,

My name is Isabel Ebrahimi. I reside at 220 Piermont Avenue in South Nyack, NY, and I am writing to you regarding the proposal of the Shared Use Path Parking for South Nyack for the New Tappan Zee Bridge. I live one block away from the proposed parking lot on South Franklin and Clinton Avenue, and I am affirmatively against the proposal of the Thruway Authority removing the path and trees and instead build a parking lot. I am against the traffic and congestion it will bring to our village. In addition to how it will negatively impact our village.

I request and support the recently developed plan F, the Proposal of Plan F keeps traffic away from Broadway and our Village. I respectfully request Concept F which utilizes DOT owned land at Exit 10.

Thank you for considering our community's interests and honoring our request to preserve our village.

Sincerely,

Isabel Ebrahimi
Please implement Plan F

Isabel Ebrahimi

220 Permanet Pkwy NY 10960

Isabel_Ebrahimi@yahoo.com

SUBMIT comment tonight. LEAVE COMPLETED COMMENT CARDS AT THE REGISTRATION TABLE.

EMAIL us at info@NewNYBridge.com.

FAX comments to (914) 524-5455; OR

WRITE to any of the following agencies:

Jamey Barbas, P.E.
Project Director, New NY Bridge
New York State Thruway Authority
303 South Broadway, 4th Floor
Tarrytown, NY 10591

Peter Osborn
Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration
Leo W. O'Brien Federal Building
11A Clinton Avenue, Room 715
Albany, New York 12207

Daniel D'Angelo, P.E.
Deputy Chief Engineer
New York State Department of Transportation
50 Wolf Road
Albany, NY 12232

Written comments may be submitted through 5:00 p.m. April 1, 2016.
March 29, 2016

Dear Mr. Osborn,

My name is Isabel Ebrahimi I reside at 220 Piermont Avenue in South Nyack NY and I am writing to you regarding the proposal of the Shared Use Path Parking for South Nyack for the New Tappan Zee Bridge. I live one block away from the proposed parking lot on South Franklin and Clinton Avenue and I am affirmatively against the proposal of the Thruway Authority removing the path and trees and instead build a parking lot. I am against the traffic and congestion it will bring to our village. In addition to how it will negatively impact our village.

I request and support the recently developed plan F, the Proposal of Plan F keeps traffic away from Broadway and our Village. I respectfully request Concept F which utilizes DOT owned land at Exit 10.

Thank you for considering our communities interests and honoring our request to preserve our village.

Sincerely,

Isabel Ebrahimi
COMMENT CARD

You are invited to comment on the Proposed Action (parking and facilities for the shared-use path for the New NY Bridge) in the space below. If you need additional space, please feel free to use the back or additional sheets of paper.

Comments:  
I SUPPORT PLAN F 
Please take into consideration of the impact of the traffic and congestion of placing a 52 car parking lot on Clinton between South Broadway & Franklin on our community. Please implement Plan F. Thank you.

Name:  Isabel Ebrahimi
Interest Represented:  My Community
Address:  220 Piermont Ave, Nyack, NY 10960
Email: 

Here are the ways your written comments can be received and recorded:

- SUBMIT comment tonight. LEAVE COMPLETED COMMENT CARDS AT THE REGISTRATION TABLE
- EMAIL us at info@NewNYBridge.com;
- FAX comments to (914.524.5455); OR
- WRITE to any of the following agencies:

  Jamey Barbas, P.E.
  Project Director, New NY Bridge
  New York State Thruway Authority
  303 South Broadway, 4th Floor
  Tarrytown, NY 10591

  Peter Osborn
  Division Administrator
  Federal Highways Administration
  Leo W. O’Brien Federal Building
  11A Clinton Avenue, Room 715
  Albany, New York 12207

  Daniel D’Angelo, P.E.
  Deputy Chief Engineer
  New York State Department of Transportation
  50 Wolf Road
  Albany, NY 12232

Written comments may be submitted through 5:00 p.m. April 1, 2016.
To whom it may concern,

My name is Isabel Ebrahimi I reside at 220 Piermont Avenue in South Nyack NY and I am writing to you regarding the proposal of the Shared Use Path Parking for South Nyack for the New Tappan Zee Bridge. I live one block away from the proposed parking lot on South Franklin and Clinton Avenue and I am affirmatively against the proposal of the Thruway Authority removing the path and trees and instead build a parking lot. I am against the traffic and congestion it will bring to our village. In addition to how it will negatively impact our village.

I request and support the recently developed plan F, the Proposal of Plan F keeps traffic away from Broadway and our Village. I respectfully request Concept F which utilizes DOT owned land at Exit 10.

Thank you for considering our communities interests and honoring our request to preserve our village.

Sincerely,

Isabel Ebrahimi
Greetings. I am a South Nyack resident and I support “Concept F” in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path. Thank you.

--Daphne Estwick
Being a South Nyack resident for over 50 years I am very invested in our community. I do not want to see the village of South Nyack destroyed by reckless planning that would destroy the physical beauty or peaceful environment that is very much a part of South Nyack.

My mother Marguerite Fernando was President of The Village Party and oversaw fundraising and construction of The Children's Park of South Nyack on Elizabeth Place where I would play as a child.

It is for these reasons I support Concept F which would minimize the impact of the new bridge to the residents of South Nyack and our community preserving the beauty and pristine complexion of our beloved village.

Please listen to the concerns of the people of South Nyack. We love our home and want to keep it beautiful and peaceful.

Sincerely,

Russell Paul Fernando

35 Smith Avenue
South Nyack, NY. 10960

845/499-3934

Resident of South Nyack since 1963!

Sent from my iPhone
As South Nyack residents since 1996, we have been constantly having to adjust to the changes that the Thruway has in store for us. The residents of South Nyack, and Salisbury Point in particular, are now going to be exposed to increasing local traffic, and increased visitor parking on village streets, should the Thruway Authority persist in pushing through Concept E. We have read the information the Authority has provided, but respectfully request that Concept F be the one chosen for the SUP.

Victoria Ficco-Panzer
2 Salisbury Point, Apt. 1-C
Nyack, NY 10960
Sent from my iPad
From: richard fine
Subject: Bike and pedestrian path parking concepts

Message is regarding: Bike and pedestrian path parking concepts

Contact Information
First Name: richard
Last Name: fine
Email Address: richardfine42@hotmail.com
Join Mailing List?: Subscribe to New NY Bridge Project Updates
Telephone: 914-523-3207
Organization:

Address
Street: 107 w 86 st 10g
City: ny
State: New York
Zipcode: 10024

Message Body:
just wanted to say that i hope the bike / ped extension on the new bridge remains. as a former [40 year] rockland resident, i still look forward to joining biking friends on this new outlet for enjoyable riding. best of luck and thanks, richard fine

--
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on New NY Bridge (http://www.newnybridge.com)
To whom it may concern at that New NY Bridge and NY State Thruway authority,

I am a South Nyack resident who is and will continue to be affected by the new construction of the bridge and its future shared use path. As much as I am delighted about the future of the bridge and it new uses for pedestrian usage, I urge the overseeing departments to consider adapting the shared use path, ‘Concept F’ to be the only reasonable solution for interconnecting the shared use path to the bridge and the South Nyack community.

This adaptation will best integrate the South Nyack community, as well as enable the absorption of throngs of visitors who will need to utilize and pass through South Nyack to use the vehicular as well as pedestrian outlets to the bridge.

Concept F would enable not only a solution for today, but for the future of South Nyack and visitors for generations to come.

Please do not repeat the legacy of the original bridge and how it decimated South Nyack’s community, pride and sense of place.

Scott Fine
South Nyack, NY
I am a resident of South Nyack and I am displeased with your choice for new interchange layout.

My vote is for PLAN F. This is a much better choice for our small community.

Regards,

Denise Finnigan

Sent from my iPad
Dear New NY Bridge Authority,

As a resident of Upper Grandview, I am aghast that there is consideration being given to Plan F for the new bridge. Those of us living in Upper Grandview do not have an elected official to represent us in this matter as the residents of South Nyack do, however we are taxpayers and should be given our say. Plan E is the most beneficial (and cost efficient) for the many residents of Upper Grandview, Grandview, Nyack and Piermont.

Plan E is the most cost efficient and best plan being put forward. It disrupts the fewest people and allows the best flow on and off the bridge. I live with my family on 9W, not far from the main onramp. I have seen first hand how quickly 9W, a main thoroughfare for school buses, trucks and cars can back up with the smallest accident or sun glare on the bridge. We are a commuting town and to close off one entrance ramp to the bridge and not replace it with another will cause a ripple effect of massive traffic all the way down 9W and up Broadway.

My husband and I would have been at the open houses to voice this opinion, but we were working and unable to attend.

PLEASE DO NOT USE PLAN F. IT IS A PLAN THAT SEEMS TO HELP VERY FEW AT THE EXPENSE OF MANY TAX PAYING RESIDENTS OF UPPER GRANDVIEW, GRANDVIEW, NYACK AND PIERMONT. PLAN E IS CLEARLY THE BEST CHOICE.

many thanks,
Jill Footlick-Shaw
Resident of Upper Grandview
I regret that neither of us shall be able to attend meeting at the Nyack Middle School on March 16th, 2016.

However, through this email, I wish it to be recognized that both of us fully support “Concept F” in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path.

We are both residents of the Village of South Nyack and I (Bruce Forrest) am a member of the Zoning Board of Appeals for the Village of South Nyack.

regards,

Bruce D. Forrest, MD, MBA
Eva B. Schadeck, PhD

135 Piermont Avenue
South Nyack, NY 10960
From: John Forster <johnforster@verizon.net>
Sent: Wednesday, March 16, 2016 9:27 AM
To: NNYB Info
Cc: bonnie.christian@southnyack.ny.gov
Subject: South Nyack Shared Use Path

Categories: handled

Dear NYS ThruWay Authority/NYS Dept if Transportation:

We want to go on record: We strongly support CONCEPT F.

We are 27-year residents of South Nyack, living on South Broadway. We see this as a very important decision. And it is clear to us that CONCEPT F is the proposal that would leave the character of our neighborhood intact. A SUP terminus on South Broadway would be devastating.

Thanks,

John and Vicky Forster
Hello,

I am a South Nyack resident, and am very concerned about the character of my town.

I support Concept F for the shared use path. And I vote!

Thanks,
Margaret Fraser MD
92 Washington Street
Nyack, NY 10960
I think the designers are not going to realize the overcrowding this will bring. The parks in Rockland County are all full with overflow crowds. Bicycles and joggers will bring havoc with traffic flow and residents.

Name: Geo Galione
Interest Represented:
Address: 234 S. Blvd, So N.Yack
Email: babep@316opt@nrc.net

Here are the ways your written comments can be received and recorded:

- **SUBMIT** comment tonight. LEAVE COMPLETED COMMENT CARDS AT THE REGISTRATION TABLE
- **EMAIL** us at info@NewNYBridge.com;
- **FAX** comments to (914.524.5455); OR
- **WRITE** to any of the following agencies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jamey Barbae, P.E.</td>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td>New NY Bridge</td>
<td>303 South Broadway, 4th Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New York State Thruway Authority</td>
<td>Tarrytown, NY 10591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Osborn</td>
<td>Division Administrator</td>
<td>Federal Highway Administration</td>
<td>11A Clinton Avenue, Room 715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leo W. O'Brien Federal Building</td>
<td>Albany, New York 12207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel D'Angelo, P.E.</td>
<td>Deputy Chief Engineer</td>
<td>New York State Department of Transportation</td>
<td>50 Wolf Road, Albany, NY 12232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written comments may be submitted through 5:00 p.m. April 1, 2016.
I AM A RESIDENT OF SOUTH NYACK AND SUPPORT CONCEPT F IN SOUTH NYACK FOR THE SHARED USE PATH.......GEORGE GALIONE 234 SO BLVD.
COMMENT CARD

You are invited to comment on the Proposed Action (parking and facilities for the shared-use path for the New NY Bridge) in the space below. If you need additional space, please feel free to use the back or additional sheets of paper.

Comments: inclusion of porous pavement wherever possible.
Lighting on esposito trail. Fencing, or fence separation on esposito trail - is it necessary?
It looks as if you've added some parking from earlier iterations - that's good! Please don't underestimate the potential for parking needs.

Name: Kathy Galione
Interest Represented: South Nyack resident
Address: 234 S. Blvd S. Nyack NY 10960
Email: peace.mosaic@hotmail.com

Here are the ways your written comments can be received and recorded:

- SUBMIT comment tonight. LEAVE COMPLETED COMMENT CARDS AT THE REGISTRATION TABLE
- EMAIL us at info@NewNYBridge.com;
- FAX comments to (914.524.5455); OR
- WRITE to any of the following agencies:

  Jamey Barbas, P.E.
  Project Director, New NY Bridge
  New York State Thruway Authority
  303 South Broadway, 4th Floor
  Tarrytown, NY 10591

  Peter Osborn
  Division Administrator
  Federal Highway Administration
  Leo W. O'Brien Federal Building
  11A Clinton Avenue, Room 715
  Albany, New York 12207

  Daniel D'Angelo, P.E.
  Deputy Chief Engineer
  New York State Department of Transportation
  50 Wolf Road
  Albany, NY 12232

Written comments may be submitted through 5:00 p.m. April 1, 2016.
An additional access point is needed at the River Road/Piermont Avenue/Bike Route 9 crossing for the SUP, and keep it open 24/7.

As a Bicycle rider who does use Metro-North to get out of the City when the urge moves me, I feel it is a no-brainer to connect the New Tappen Zee Bridge path to River Road and not end it in a Parking lot. Bicycle are a mode of Transportation and have the same right to the Street as Cars.

Michael P. Gaughan
Brooklyn
To The NYS Thruway Authority:
I am a 26-year resident and homeowner in South Nyack. My family and I support Concept F in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path.

Thank you,

David Geber
59 Elysian Avenue
South Nyack
NYS Thruway Authority/NYS Department of Transportation-

"We support "Concept F" in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path."

South Nyack Resident
Ken Geles
From: Desiree Giler Mann  
Subject: Bike and pedestrian path parking concepts

Message is regarding: Bike and pedestrian path parking concepts

Contact Information
First Name: Desiree  
Last Name: Giler Mann  
Email Address: desireegilermann@hotmail.com  
Join Mailing List?: Subscribe to New NY Bridge Project Updates  
Telephone: 9179398802  
Organization: Resident of South Nyack

Address  
Street: 275 Piermont Ave  
City: South Nyack  
State: New York  
Zipcode: 10960

Message Body:  
I wish to express my support for Alternative E for Bike/Pedestrian Path parking. This is primarily because it keeps open the Thruway on-ramp near South Nyack Village Hall, which I have used as a commuter into NYC/Westchester since 1994, when I first moved to South Nyack. It is for the same reason that I do NOT support Alternative E for Bike/Pedestrian Path parking, which closes said on-ramp. Both alternatives provide essentially the same amount of parking space and the same amenities, so I advocate for Alternative E, which will have the least impact to the community, will maintain our current access and will cost less (leaving funds for projects with more substantive benefits). Moreover, the location of the parking nearest to Franklin invites users to come into the villages of The Nyacks and meaningfully engage in the community (as opposed to merely veering into the shoulder of the Thruway, as Alternative F would have users do). I note that the additional expense associated with re-routing roads to accommodate Alternative F does not seem like money well spent for the benefit of the South Nyack community — I appreciate that the construction companies and their suppliers will realize short-term benefit from this, but I cannot see how that additional money for Alternative F will be making South Nyack a better place for residents. The residents of South Nyack have suffered greatly during the building of the new bridge — from the construction noise, to traffic (i.e., air pollution, noise pollution, congestion, re-routing, etc, which lead to lower enjoyment of our homes and lost productivity in our jobs, whether they be work-at-home or commuting) — and permanently closing our access to the very bridge which has tortured the community seems unjust. I personally selected my homes in South Nyack over the last 20 years (having always been within 1/3 mile from the on-ramp) for their proximity to the bridge and I can attest that when the on-ramp has been closed in the past for maintenance/construction, it added 10 min to my
morning commute, re-routing me through Nyack via various traffic signals. Alternative F will have negative impacts on South Nyack residents by adding 2+ miles to access the bridge (appx. an extra 500 miles per year for commuters who used the Village Hall on-ramp), which will increase commute times (when every minute counts!), increase fuel costs as our mileage increases, and increased pollution in our community as we have to travel out of our way to get to the same destinations over the bridge. Whilst those incremental increases may seem negligible to someone outside the community, they add up over the days, weeks, years and decades many of us homeowners plan to remain in South Nyack. Do not punish us further for living here, and don’t waste our money – tax-payer money – on boondoggles that do not make a material difference to the community.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on New NY Bridge (http://www.newnybridge.com)
We support “Concept F” in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path. Please do not let the bridge destroy our neighborhood and our local streets (at our expense!). I just moved to South Nyack because of the peaceful, beautiful neighborhood, and do not want our local roads to become crowded with traffic and cars from visitors. Highway entrances belong on Thruway or state property, not in the middle of neighborhoods and local roads.

Thank you for your consideration of our neighborhood! Please help us preserve it!

Lanie Goldberg
South Nyack Resident
I am a South Nyack resident and sending this email to support Concept F for the Shared Use Path

Patricia Grippo Gonzalez
3 Salisbury Point 4D
Nyack NY
Hello,

I have been cycling from Brooklyn to Piermont, Nyack, and Bear mountain regularly since 2008. I very much enjoy visiting Nyack and its businesses. I think you guys have a gem of a community, and I would hate to see it changed. I would be thrilled to see a new Tappan Zee bridge bike route that allowed easy between Rockland and Westchester counties.

I very much hope that the new shared use path is safely and easily accessible to cyclists and pedestrians, and particularly those with disabilities. This naturally would preclude the use of stairs, steep ramps, or tight switchbacks (like we have on the George Washington Bridge).

I think any demands for additional parking areas in your community are superfluous. I do not think residents of Nyack should be made to accommodate those who want to park and ride. The majority of competitive cyclists just want to ride their bikes. Cycle commuters should also ride their entire commute or use a multi-modal commute combining cycling and public transport, but not driving, parking in your community, and then cycling into the city.

I hope that cyclists like myself can continue to respectfully enjoy your lovely town and be good patrons for your businesses.

Sean Gordon
Industrial Designer
Crye Precision
718-246-1515 x27 lab
207-233-2143 cell

63 Flushing Ave
BNY Bldg 275 Suite 303
Brooklyn, NY 11205

CRYE PRECISION

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message from Crye Precision LLC (or one of its affiliated companies) is intended solely for the named recipient(s). It and any attachments to it contain information that may be confidential, privileged and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. Additionally, this email may contain information controlled for export purposes under the U.S. International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR) and/or the Export Administration Regulations. No export, sale, transfer, release or other disposition of such information is permitted without first complying with applicable export control requirements. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, be advised that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication or any attachments hereto is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please delete it and its attachments, and notify Crye Precision LLC immediately by email to legal@cryeprecision.com.
I am a South Nyack resident and I support “Concept F” in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path. Suzanne Hope Graham
We support “Concept F” in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path.”

--

Theresa A. Graves  
(South Nyack Resident)  
2 Salisbury Point  
#1D  
South Nyack, NY 10960

914.584.0997 (cell)  
email:  tanngraves@gmail.com
As a South Nyack homeowner and resident I am VEHEMENTLY opposed to Concept E. I support Concept F because Concept E will negatively impact our way of life in our Village.

As a long time Village resident said "The 1955 bridge destroyed our commercial center. Don't let the new bridge destroy our neighborhood".

Sent from my iPad
To Whom It May Concern,

I am a South Nyack resident and I support "Concept F" in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path.

Sincerely,
Michelle Grondahl
I support Concept F in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path.

Mary Hagan
I am a resident of South Nyack, and I am writing to tell you that I support "Concept F" in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Hanson
245 South Broadway
I am a New Yorker who bicycles daily for transportation as well as recreation. Being able to bike out of the city for a few hours or days is an emotional lifeline and also good for the state’s tourist economy. Points north, in Rockland, Westchester, and counties north, are frequent destinations for me and all of my cycling friends.

A fully accessible bike lane on the new Tappan Zee bridge will enable us to make longer and more frequent journeys, since it will also give us the option of taking Metro North from the city. I strongly urge that the shared use path be as cyclist-friendly as possible, with no impediments to access.

With this in mind, I urge you to select Option F on the Nyack approach to the shared use path. Concept F is the only solution that is viable for cyclists. Without it, our travel will be impeded.

On the Westchester side, Concept B looks like a very viable solution. I have two concerns, however.

1) Are there provisions for cyclists traveling to and from the nearby North/South County Trailway? The most direct route is on NY-119 -- a busy, high-speed 4-lane roadway with mostly no shoulders. This would be extremely dangerous.

2) Are there any plans available for controlling the interaction between bikes and cars at the end of the access ramp?

A signalized crosswalk with a median refuge area is necessary at the intersection of Route 9 and the Shared Use Path. The Environmental Assessment explicitly says no changes will be made here. That opinion is dangerously mistaken.

Route 9 has significant vehicle counts and is over 50' wide at this location.

Across the street from the path entrance is an apartment complex with 380 residents. There's also a shopping center and a bank. All of them will draw pedestrians across Route 9 at this intersection. The nearest crosswalk adds up to 1,300 feet to a journey and requires traversing a two lane wide free flowing right hand turn lane. The crosswalk in the other direction adds up to 1,500 feet to a trip.

Without a signal, cyclists coming off the bridge who are heading north on Route 9 will have a very hard time finding a safe gap in traffic between through traffic on Route 9, north bound turning movements from Route 119, plus vehicles exiting the gas station, bank, shopping center and apartment building.
Similarly, people riding bikes north on Route 9 heading onto the bridge will have a difficult time navigating that left turn.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

--

Christopher Hartmann, M.A. SpEd, M.A. EdL

Co-founder of the

www.indefianceseries.com
TO: The NYS Thruway Authority NYS Department of Transportation

I am a South Nyack resident and I support Concept F for the Shared Use Path for the bridge.

Thank you.

Noreen Hasslinger
3 Salisbury Point, Apt 5D
Nyack, N.Y. 10960
We live at Salisbury Point 1 in unit LB. We would like you to know that we support Concept F.

Thank you, Virginia Heagney, Scot Heagney, Scot Heagney Jr. and Ran Williams
Alternative F: not good planning.
RE: New TZ Bridge : Shared pathway
Hello,
I was not able to attend the Open House / Public meeting since I commute to NYC every day for work and get home to late for the meeting.
Please read and consider my comments below as official concerns regarding the Plan.
Upon review of the 'favored' Plan F, there are serious objections / concerns.

1. No one can get to the parking lot! Look at the map and try to figure out how somebody gets to the parking lot from the highway? They can't! So only locals can use the parking lot?!? Wouldn't they take their bike? Seems like something the entire community is paying for should be able to be used by the entire community. We want to encourage people from outside the area to come, use the path, shop in our store, eat in our restaurants. Not having access to the lot from the highway does not make any sense.

2. The meeting time for hearing public opinion on the plans which drastically impact commuting is at a time when commuters cannot attend. It does not seem logical to have a meeting concerning people who use the ramp / intersection daily starts at 5:00 when only people who stay locally can attend. Anybody who uses the on ramp knows that traffic gets backed up all the way to lower Broadway some days. Where is the traffic going to back up now? It seems a study with some data and a plan for the traffic, needs to take place, rather than the opinion on a few people who live on the street.

Greg Healey, Nyack resident
greghealey@hotmail.com
As South Nyack residents, "We support "Concept F" in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path."

Debbie and Gary Hecht
64 Clinton Ave.
South Nyack, NY

Sent from my iPad
To the NYS Thruway Authority/NYS Department of Transportation:

I am a South Nyack resident who lives next to the Tappan Zee Bridge and the construction site for the new NY bridge across the Hudson.

I STRONGLY SUPPORT CONCEPT F IN SOUTH NYACK FOR THE SHARED USE PATH.

It is the only alternative that is acceptable to residents here, who fear that any other option will destroy our village neighborhoods.

Sincerely,

Susan D. Hendricks
1 Saltaire Point
South Nyack, NY 10960
"We support "Concept F" in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path."

Linda and Terry Higgins
South Nyack residents
Dear NYS Thruway Authority/NYS Dept of Transportation:

I am a South Nyack Resident and live right off Interchange 10 and Esposito trail. My wife and I firmly support “Concept F” as the only viable, cost effective plan for the New TZB South Nyack SUP Terminus. Other more costly alternatives would be more desirable but “F” is a reasonable compromise. In fact I think there are several changes to “F” that would be cost saving and make “F” less expensive.

1. Remove the paved section on Esposito trail
2. Remove the ramp connecting SUP to Esposito trail
3. Either have no connection at all from the SUP to Esposito trail or,
4. Put up an inexpensive staircase like they have for the [http://www.thehighline.org/](http://www.thehighline.org/) in NYC. (see picture below)

Send bikes and people who need wheeled access into parking lot and packs of street bikers can then access Nyack like the other motor vehicles they are supposed to. Foot Traffic and folks that can throw their bike on their shoulder and ride on gravel path are welcome to use steps. Or have no access to Esposito trail from SUP at all. There will be sidewalks to parking lot for access on foot. Esposito trail is currently used by joggers, dog walkers, parents with babies in strollers and young children and families playing. It is no place for packs of street bikers that will hog the trail as they do on the roads already.
Thank you kindly in advance!

Jeffrey A. Hirsch
CEO: Hirsch Holdings | Editor in Chief: *Stock Trader’s Almanac*
Investment Committee Member: Probabilities Fund Management, LLC
84 Clinton Ave | Nyack NY 10960
M: 845-358-4220 | Jeff.hirsch@hirschorg.com
http://www.stocktradersalmanac.com | @AlmanacTrader
Dear Mr. Marcy and NYS Thruway Authority/NYS Dept of Transportation:

Please forgive the last minute submission. But myself and my fellow residents of South Nyack, especially my neighbors on Clinton Ave and the surrounding neighborhood want to reaffirm our support of Concept F, BUT WITH SOME CHANGES. As I conveyed in my comments at the meeting, the paved section and wheeled access to Esposito trail is unacceptable and disruptive to our neighborhood. There is no reason packs of street cyclists need access or should be on that trail and furthermore the changes and expansion of the trail as proposed in Concept F completely ruin the trail. Any handicapped and road cycle access can come from the connection to the parking facility. Please save us all some time, effort and money and leave Esposito Trail untouched with a possible staircase as I have recommend below. No need for a ramp.

We will vehemently fight for this change to F. Leave Esposito Trail alone. It saves you money and its saves our neighborhood.

In addition we need confirmation from you, the Thruway Authority and the NYS DOT that this facility with be manned 24/7 by a NYS Trooper at no cost to South Nyack and it will also be maintained, especially the bathrooms on a daily basis by the Thruway Authority and the NYS DOT at no cost to South Nyack.

As for the bus routes, they need to be rerouted so they do not turn down Clinton Avenue in either direction. The street is too narrow and the bus cannot make the turn without going completely in the oncoming traffic lane. They should be rerouted to Franklin entirely from downtown Nyack or better yet put the stop on 9W, the thruway itself like they do in I-95 in Fort Lee NJ or in the parking lot on Interchange 10.

Also please heed the words of the Senior Senator from NY and get this plan on the schedule without further ado. http://www.lohud.com/story/news/local/tappan-zee-bridge/2016/03/29/schumer-path-tappan-zee/82394444/

We need to hear from you immediately on confirmation that F with our changes will be implemented. If construction starts without our prior knowledge of what is being done or anything other than F with these changes is pushed through, we will be forced to take legal action. So please, do the right thing.

Thank you in advance.

Yours sincerely,

Jeffrey A. Hirsch
CEO: Hirsch Holdings | Editor in Chief: Stock Trader’s Almanac
Investment Committee Consultant: Probabilities Fund Management, LLC
84 Clinton Ave | Nyack NY 10960
From: Jeffrey Hirsch [mailto:jeff.hirsch@hirschorg.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 15, 2016 12:51 PM
To: NNYB Info
Cc: Bonnie.Christian@southnyack.ny.gov; Jennifer Hirsch
Subject: We Support “Concept F” in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path

Dear NYS Thruway Authority/NYS Dept of Transportation:

I am a South Nyack Resident and live right off Interchange 10 and Esposito trail. My wife and I firmly support “Concept F” as the only viable, cost effective plan for the New TZB South Nyack SUP Terminus. Other more costly alternatives would be more desirable but “F” is a reasonable compromise. In fact I think there are several changes to “F” that would be cost saving and make “F” less expensive.

1. Remove the paved section on Esposito trail
2. Remove the ramp connecting SUP to Esposito trail
3. Either have no connection at all from the SUP to Esposito trail or,
4. Put up an inexpensive staircase like they have for the [http://www.thehighline.org/] in NYC. (see picture below)

Send bikes and people who need wheeled access into parking lot and packs of street bikers can then access Nyack like the other motor vehicles they are supposed to. Foot Traffic and folks that can throw their bike on their shoulder and ride on gravel path are welcome to use steps. Or have no access to Esposito trail from SUP at all. There will be sidewalks to parking lot for access on foot. Esposito trail is currently used by joggers, dog walkers, parents with babies in strollers and young children and families playing. It is no place for packs of street bikers that will hog the trail as they do on the roads already.
Thank you kindly in advance!

Jeffrey A. Hirsch
CEO: Hirsch Holdings | Editor in Chief: Stock Trader’s Almanac
Investment Committee Member: Probabilities Fund Management, LLC
84 Clinton Ave | Nyack NY 10960
M: 845-358-4220 | jeff.hirsch@hirschorg.com
http://www.stocktradersalmanac.com | @AlmanacTrader

The information contained in this electronic message and any attachments to this message are intended for the exclusive use of the addressee(s) and may contain information that is confidential, privileged, and/or otherwise exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If this electronic message is from an attorney or someone in the Legal Department, it may also contain confidential attorney-client communications which may be privileged and protected from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, be advised that you have received this message in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying is strictly prohibited. Please notify the New York State Thruway Authority immediately by either responding to this e-mail or calling (518) 436-2700, and destroy all copies of this message and any attachments.
We support "Concept F" in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path.

Jennifer Hirsch

Sent using the mail.com mail app
COMMENTS

In support of plan F bus routes for the TZExpress and NYC buses need to be moved to W. The stops should no longer be on South Broadway and Clinton. There is no need for buses to turn on Clinton Avenue with the new concept F.

Name: Jennifer Hirsh
Interest Represented: Plan F
Address: 84 Clinton Ave
Email: jenhutt@gmail.com

Here are the ways your written comments can be received and recorded:

- SUBMIT comment tonight. LEAVE COMPLETED COMMENT CARDS AT THE REGISTRATION TABLE
- EMAIL us at info@NewNYBridge.com;
- FAX comments to (914.524.5455); OR
- WRITE to any of the following agencies:

  Jamey Barbas, P.E.
  Project Director, New NY Bridge
  New York State Thruway Authority
  303 South Broadway, 4th Floor
  Tarrytown, NY 10591

  Peter Osborn
  Division Administrator
  Federal Highway Administration
  Lee W. O'Brien Federal Building
  11A Clinton Avenue, Room 715
  Albany, New York 12207

  Daniel D'Angelo, P.E.
  Deputy Chief Engineer
  New York State Department of Transportation
  50 Wolf Road
  Albany, NY 12232

Written comments may be submitted through 5:00 p.m. April 1, 2016.
As a resident of South Nyack for more than 25 years, I am writing to support option F for the SUP on the new TZ bridge. I have closely studied the two options for the SUP for the new TZ bridge, and only option F would protect the integrity of the village of South Nyack. I can’t help but reflect on the fact that the construction of the current bridge destroyed all of the commercial area in South Nyack. Option E would effectively destroy the residential part of South Nyack. I am hoping that you will learn from the mistakes of the first bridge and do better this time. It is unfair to make this small village the sacrificial lamb again.

Thank you.

Judith Hirschhorn
I am a resident of South Nyack.
I strongly support Plan “F” for the SUP terminus – any other plan will have significant negative impacts on our community.
These negative impacts (traffic, trash, police oversight, etc) would be unfunded mandates – costs imposed upon the Village of South Nyack and perhaps the Villages of Nyack and Grandview-on-Hudson and the Town of Orangetown, without any guarantee of reimbursement from New York State.
The entire terminus complex should be on state or Thruway Authority land so the state, not local municipalities, is responsible for the expenses associated with the terminus.

PLEASE NOTE MY NEW EMAIL ADDRESS
lhoffman@hkelderlaw.com

Lee A. Hoffman, Jr.
Hoffman & Keating
82 Maple Avenue
New City, NY 10956

845 634 8169 (ph)
845 634 7963 (fax)
I am writing to let you know that I am in favor of Plan F. None of the other options are appropriate or good for South Nyack. Please honor Plan F.

Mimi Hoffman
221 Piermont
S. Nyack, NY
The Hollands, 144 Clinton Ave.

Phillip Holland
GoAway Travel, Inc.
845-353-3447 Phone only
845-323-5247 Text/Mobile/Email.
goawaymore@msn.com (email)
www.goawaytravel.cc (website)
COMMENT CARD

You are invited to comment on the Proposed Action (parking and facilities for the shared-use path for the New NY Bridge) in the space below. If you need additional space, please feel free to use the back or additional sheets of paper.

Comments: I support concept F. I request that serious consideration be given to NOT connecting the SUP and the existing Esposito trail. I expect that use by bicyclists of the Esposito trail will go up tremendously and it will become an unsafe "highway" for them to explore the community. We use it to stroll, jog, take kids into nature and would maximize tourism. To attract not designed for that.

Name: Rebecca Holt Fine, South Nyack resident

Interest Represented: 55 Glen Byron Ave, South Nyack

Address: becky10@ix.netcom.com

Here are the ways your written comments can be received and recorded:

- SUBMIT comment tonight. LEAVE COMPLETED COMMENT CARDS AT THE REGISTRATION TABLE
- EMAIL us at info@NewNYBridge.com;
- FAX comments to (914.524.5455); OR
- WRITE to any of the following agencies:

  Jamey Barbosa, P.E.
  Project Director, New NY Bridge
  New York State Thruway Authority
  303 South Broadway, 4th Floor
  Tarrytown, NY 10591

  Peter Osborn
  Division Administrator
  Federal Highway Administration
  Leo W. O'Brien Federal Building
  11A Clinton Avenue, Room 715
  Albany, New York 12207

  Daniel D'Angelo, P.E.
  Deputy Chief Engineer
  New York State Department of Transportation
  50 Wolf Road
  Albany, NY 12232

Written comments may be submitted through 5:00 p.m. April 1, 2016.
We support "Concept F" in South Nyack for the Shared Use Plan.
I am a resident of South Nyack, NY and support “Concept F” in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path. I look forward to the meeting on March 16th!

Many thanks for listening to the residents of our village.

Karen Houghton
148 South Broadway
South Nyack NY 10960
Dear NYS Thruway Authority,
As the homeowner at 70 Smith Ave in South Nyack, NY, I would like you to know that I support ‘Concept F’ for the Shared Use Path. This is the option that is best for myself and my community.

Regards,

Allison Howitt
Cell phone: +1.203.918.8466
I am adamantly opposed to you Plan "E"! We think Plan "F" is much more sensible for the benefit of South Nyack. Are you really so determined to destroy a residential area of South Nyack?

Rita Ibrahim
4 Salisbury Pt. #3B
Nyack, NY 10960
From: ji liong tjhia <hakkanesecyclist724@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 16, 2016 10:15 AM
To: NNYB Info
Subject: Biking path
Categories: handled

I Live in Clifton Nj
As ado cyclist, I like doing long distance bike riding along the Hudson river corridor, trails such OCA(old croton aqueduct) and north county trails is my regular route, my route usually from Clifton to fort lee then x-ing into city via van Cortland park in Bronx, from there I can choose either to go on North county trails or OCA
If the Tappan zee bike path is built, it would be an important route for all cyclist like myself and my friends also hundreds of others bicycles club from NY and NJ as well, not only benefiting for the local economic but also for all users health being, also tourist from enjoying the Hudson river views,.. please, to whom in charge of this great project to make it reality for all of us, every time I drove by on this bridge, I imagine myself one day will be able to crossing it on my bicycles along with my friends and my kids

Thank you

Sincerely yours
Ji liong
Sent from Mail for Windows 10
Dear New Tappan Zee Bridge Planners,

I'm a recreational cyclist who lives in Manhattan and loves to ride in both Rockland and Westchester, where there are many scenic routes.

I'm really looking forward to the opportunities provided by the pedestrian/bike facilities on the new bridge, and would like to respectfully submit input regarding the design of the proposed pedestrian/bike approaches to the bridge.

As I understand it, Concept F on the Rockland side would make it possible and safe for bikes to get access to the bridge. Concept E, by contrast, with switchbacks and stairs, would impede access for experienced cyclists and possibly prevent access for less experienced cyclists and children riding bikes, as well as severely complicating access for elderly or disabled pedestrians. It would also hamper safe traffic flow by both bikes and pedestrians/runners by impeding the line of sight. It just seems unnecessarily dangerous for all users.

On the Westchester side, Concept B looks good, although it would be best if it provided for some connection with the North/South County Trailway.

Thanks for listening,

-Erica Jacobs
NYS Thruway Authority/NYS Department of Transportation/New NY Bridge,

Please find Assemblymember Ellen Jaffee's comments on the proposals for the SUP Terminus in South Nyack. Thank you,

Tiffany Card  
Chief of Staff  
Assemblymember Jaffee  
97th District
March 15, 2016

The NYS Thruway Authority/NYS Department of Transportation
The New NY Bridge
303 South Broadway, Suite 413
Tarrytown, New York, 10591

I write to you requesting that the NYS Thruway Authority/ NYS Department of Transportation and the New NY Bridge Project accept “Concept F” for the New NY Bridge Shared Use Path Terminus in South Nyack, NY.

First, I want to thank the State for hearing the cries of the residents and agreeing to go back and revisit a concept that didn’t address the real concerns and needs of the residents of South Nyack. In March of 2014, a “terminus” concept was presented to the residents of South Nyack for the New NY Bridge project’s Shared Use Path. The bike and pedestrian path would include six belvederes that would provide residents and visitors an opportunity to explore the beauty of the Hudson Valley. This addition to Rockland County would truly make us The Gateway to the Hudson Valley.

However, this concept was deeply flawed. The concept didn’t coincide with the landscape of the Village. It didn’t foresee or anticipate neither the amount of visitors, and their parking needs, nor the safety of local pedestrians. It would have greatly disturbed the charming Village of South Nyack, a Village with fewer than 4,000 residents. A Village that still carries the scar of destruction when over 100 homes and the heart of its business district was destroyed by the State in 1952 for the then New Tappan Zee Bridge.

Second, the residents, the Mayor and the five members of the Tappan Zee Task Force, made up of residents of S. Nyack including a former country legislator, chairman of the South Nyack planning board, a highway administrator, a local business leader and a professional surveyor, are to be commended for their constant and consistent dedication to finding the best possible solution for the location of the terminus.

Which brings me to the options as presented in December 2015 for the terminus. The Tappan Zee Task Force, after complete and thorough review, weighing all the concerns, concluded that Concept F was the best option for the Village. Subsequently, the Village Board concurred and voted for Concept F agreeing with the Task Force’s findings. While there may be no perfect solution to handle traffic, visitors, parking, noise, and safety, I trust that the Task Force and Village Board have done due diligence given the very reality of the project.

I look forward to being one of the first Rockland County residents to walk out into the middle of the SUP and take in the beauty of our Hudson Valley.

Best regards,

Assemblymember Ellen C. Jaffee
From: Ellen K Jaffe <ellen.k.jaffe@verizon.net>  
Sent: Thursday, March 17, 2016 4:39 PM  
To: NNYB Info  
Subject: I urge you to select Option F on the Nyack approach to the shared use path  
Categories: handled

I am a New Yorker who bicycles daily for transportation as well as recreation. Being able to bike out of the city for a few hours or days is an emotional lifeline and also good for the state’s tourist economy. Points north, in Rockland, Westchester, and counties north, are frequent destinations for me and all of my cycling friends.

A fully accessible bike lane on the new Tappan Zee bridge will enable us to make longer and more frequent journeys, since it will also give us the option of taking Metro North from the city. I strongly urge that the shared use path be as cyclist-friendly as possible, with no impediments to access. With this in mind, I urge you to select Option F on the Nyack approach to the shared use path.

Concept F is the only solution that is viable for cyclists. Without it, our travel will be impeded.

On the Westchester side, Concept B looks like a very viable solution. I have two concerns, however.

1) Are there provisions for cyclists traveling to and from the nearby North/South County Trailway? The most direct route is on NY-119 -- a busy, high-speed 4-lane roadway with mostly no shoulders. This would be extremely dangerous.

2) Are there any plans available for controlling the interaction between bikes and cars at the end of the access ramp?

A signalized crosswalk with a median refuge area is necessary at the intersection of Route 9 and the Shared Use Path. The Environmental Assessment explicitly says no changes will be made here. That opinion is dangerously mistaken.

Route 9 has significant vehicle counts and is over 50' wide at this location. Across the street from the path entrance is an apartment complex with 380 residents. There's also a shopping center and a bank. All of them will draw pedestrians across Route 9 at this intersection. The nearest crosswalk adds up to 1,300 feet to a journey and requires traversing a two lane wide free flowing right hand turn lane. The crosswalk in the other direction adds up to 1,500 feet to a trip.

Without a signal, cyclists coming off the bridge who are heading north on Route 9 will have a very hard time finding a safe gap in traffic between through traffic on Route 9, north bound turning movements from Route 119, plus vehicles exiting the gas station, bank, shopping center and apartment building.
Similarly, people riding bikes north on Route 9 heading onto the bridge will have a difficult time navigating that left turn.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Ellen Jaffe
248 Lafayette Street
NY NY 10012
We reside at 3D Shadyside Avenue, South Nyack, NY and have lived here for 42 years. We support "Concept F" in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path. We would also support any noise abatement measures.

Richard and Joan Jansen
I am a South Nyack resident and support Concept F in south Nyack for the shared use path.
I heard there was some question about the Tappan Zee Bridge SUP. I don't know what the controversy is. If people want to bike over the bridge, it decreases the congestion for the rest of us. Give them a great facility 24/7 and it will help decrease traffic. I don't get why you need so many parking spots for a bike facility. Maybe more of a standing zone to pick up someone. That's my public comment: create a great bike facility to relieve the bridge traffic. Give easy access to some local stores and it might even bring some money in.
To whom it may concern:

I am writing to express my strong support for Concept F for the South Nyack entrance to the Shared Use Pathway over the new TZ Bridge. This is by far the better option for the users of the new path, as it offers good (and safe, from a traffic perspective) parking as well as restroom facilities. And it's far better for South Nyack, protecting our small village roads from being overrun with the influx of cars that the exciting SUP is expected to bring to us.

Patricia Kahn
To New York State thruway authority:

I am a south nyack resident and I support "concept F" in south nyack for the shared path.

Sincerely,
Dan Kaplan
121 depot place

Sent from my iPhone
On the Nyack approach to the shared use path, Concept F is the only solution that is viable for cyclists. Please go with Concept F.

regards.
Geo Carl Kaplan
347 597 7166
I am a South Nyack resident and support "concept F" in South Nyack for the shared use path. This is of upmost importance in our Village for quality of life issues. Thank you for your consideration.

Debra karten

Sent from my iPad
I am a South Nyack resident and my husband and I Support Concept F in South Nyack for the shared use path.

Bonnie Kelly

Bonnie Kelly
Wright Bros. Real Estate
845-304-8856
bonnie.kelly@wrightinnvack.com
bonnie.wrightinnvack.com

Wright Bros. is now on Facebook & Twitter! Please 'Like' us and 'Follow' us there!
I am a South Nyack resident for 30 years. I support Concept F only. Do NOT implement concept E. Our village has been compromised by the existing and now new bridge. We deserve a break from over 50 years of traffic, sound and air pollution.

Chris Kelly
845-596-5165
40 Glen byron ave
South nyack
To whom it may concern:

Please make sure that the new Tappan Zee Bridge shared use path is well connected to adjacent towns, bike paths, and public transportation, including an access point at the River Road/Piermont Avenue/Bike Route 9 crossing. Also the path absolutely NEEDS to be open 24 hours a day! If you close it you could very well strand unsuspecting bicycle and pedestrian users on the wrong side of the river!

Thank you for your consideration.

Best,
Quinn Kelly
Hudson Valley cyclist, driver, & hiker
As a resident of the village of South Nyack, I support "Concept F" for the Shared Use Plan for the new bridge.

Maeve Kinkead Streep  
24 Division Avenue  
South Nyack, N.Y. 10960

--  
Maeve Kinkead
mtkinkead@gmail.com
845-729-1014
"We support "Concept F" in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path."

As a south nyack resident, I feel strongly that "concept F is the right choice for the shared use path. Please consider the lives you change with this decision. Please make the right decision for the right reasons. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Randy Krangel
To whom it may concern,

My name is Rebecca Lang, and I am writing to you regarding the proposal of the Shared Use Path Parking for South Nyack for the New Tappan Zee Bridge. I live in Upper Nyack close to the proposed parking lot on South Franklin and Clinton Avenue and I am affirmatively against the proposal of the Thruway Authority removing the path and trees and instead build a parking lot. I am against the traffic and congestion it will bring to our village. In addition to how it will negatively impact the surrounding environment.

I request and support the recently developed plan F, the Proposal of Plan F keeps traffic away from Broadway and the village of South Nyack. I respectfully request Concept F which utilizes DOT owned land at Exit 10.

Thank you for considering our communities interests and honoring our request to preserve our village.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Lang

--
COMMENT CARD

You are invited to comment on the Proposed Action (parking and facilities for the shared-use path for the New NY Bridge) in the space below. If you need additional space, please feel free to use the back or additional sheets of paper.

Comments: The design of the maintenance facility leaves much to be desired. The fact that the blue strips really highlight the blue bridge span doesn’t save it. Tarrytown has wonderful stone architecture which should be used as a model to tie the facility into the community.

How about shuttles from the train to the bridge for out-of-town visitors.

Name: Joyce Hannert

Interest Represented:

Address: 141 West Main, Tarrytown

Email: Hannert@optonline.net

Here are the ways your written comments can be received and recorded:

- **SUBMIT** comment tonight. LEAVE COMPLETED COMMENT CARDS AT THE REGISTRATION TABLE
- **EMAIL** us at info@NewNYBridge.com;
- **FAX** comments to (914.524.5455); OR
- **WRITE** to any of the following agencies:

  Jamey Barbas, P.E.
  Project Director, New NY Bridge
  New York State Thruway Authority
  303 South Broadway, 4th Floor
  Tarrytown, NY 10591

  Peter Osborn
  Division Administrator
  Federal Highway Administration
  Leo W. O'Brien Federal Building
  11A Clinton Avenue, Room 715
  Albany, New York 12207

  Daniel D'Angelo, P.E.
  Deputy Chief Engineer
  New York State Department of Transportation
  50 Wolf Road
  Albany, NY 12232

Written comments may be submitted through **5:00 p.m. April 1, 2016.**
NYS Thruway Authority and NYS Department of Transportation,

We support Concept F in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path.

Thank you!

Stephen

Robert

Stephen J. Larson, PhD, CFP®
Associate Professor of Finance
Ramapo College of New Jersey

Robert B. Larson, ESQ.
Dental Practice Attorney
I favor the F plan for the Tappan Zee Bridge shared use. I have been a South Nyack resident for 12 years.

Lynn Lauber
19 White Ave., Nyack NY 10960
Dear NYS Thruway Authority/ New York State DOT,

I am a resident of South Nyack, New York. I live on Clinton Ave at the corner of Clinton and Franklin Ave. We LOVE our South Nyack Community. We have 3 young children and love all that South Nyack has to offer them. Currently our children can enjoy playing outside in our yard, taking neighborhood walks and walking to their friends/neighbors houses.

WE SUPPORT "CONCEPT F" IN SOUTH NYACK FOR THE SHARED USE PATH

We feel that "Concept F" will allow our family to continue to enjoy the wonderful quality of life that we have in South Nyack. We have grave concerns about some of the other options and how they will impact our home, our residential neighborhood and our children's lives.

Thank you for your attention to this critical matter.

Sincerely,

Kristy Leader
90 Clinton Ave.
South Nyack, NY 10960
914-907-5268
Kristy.Leader@yahoo.com
You are invited to comment on the Proposed Action (parking and facilities for the shared-use path for the New NY Bridge) in the space below. If you need additional space, please feel free to use the back or additional sheets of paper.

**Comments:**
As residents of Clinton Ave in So, Nyack we feel strongly that concept E is best for our community. The other options are simply unacceptable. We have grave concerns about E placing a parking lot + bathroom close to where our children play + live. The traffic, sewage + congregating of strangers close to where our children live, play + wait for the school bus is a huge concern.

**Name:** Krisly Leader

**Address:** 90 Clinton Ave, So, Nyack

**Email:** kristy.leader@yahoo.com

Here are the ways your written comments can be received and recorded:

- **SUBMIT** comment tonight. LEAVE COMPLETED COMMENT CARDS AT THE REGISTRATION TABLE
- **EMAIL** us at info@NewNYBridge.com;
- **FAX** comments to (914.524.5455); OR
- **WRITE** to any of the following agencies:

  - Jamey Barbas, P.E.,
    Project Director, New NY Bridge
    New York State Thruway Authority
    303 South Broadway, 4th Floor
    Tarrytown, NY 10591
  
  - Peter Osborn
    Division Administrator
    Federal Highway Administration
    Leo W. O'Brien Federal Building
    11A Clinton Avenue, Room 715
    Albany, New York 12207

  - Daniel D'Angelo, P.E.,
    Deputy Chief Engineer
    New York State Department of Transportation
    50 Wolf Road
    Albany, NY 12232

Written comments may be submitted through 5:00 p.m. April 1, 2016.
would be devastating to our wonderful community.
I am a resident of South Nyack and have been watching the construction of the new bridge with a great deal of apprehension.

The various meetings concerning the bridge have been greatly appreciated. They have provided much needed information concerning your plans.

I, and all of my neighbors, am strongly in support of Concept F for the following reasons.

It will provide visitor parking and bathroom facilities that are on NYS Thruway property and which is much more convenient to the users of the shared use path.

It will discourage visitor parking on our village streets.

It provides the opportunity to increase the number of parking facilities. There is no way to know accurately how many visitors will want to take advantage of the shared use path. The pedestrian bridge in Poughkeepsie attracts hundreds of visitors daily. The actual usage is greatly in excess of the number of visitors anticipated in Poughkeepsie.

If the new bridge attracts a large number of visitors daily it will interfere with the traffic flow on the bridge as well as destroy the peaceful residential neighborhood of South Nyack.

Concept F will save wear and tear on our village roads thereby saving us tax dollars for resurfacing.

Moving the local entrance to the bridge from South Broadway to route 9W will greatly reduce traffic on local roads and provide a better traffic flow.

It will provide a much needed new pedestrian crossing at the south end of the Village connecting the west side of the Village to the east side.

Please adopt Concept F in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path.
To Whom it May Concern at the NYS Thruway Authority/NYS Department of Transportation:

I am a South Nyack resident, and I am writing to express my support of Concept E. I support this concept because I do NOT want the exit closed. I am of working age and use this exit to get to and from my job in Yonkers every day. My son and I also use it on weekends to cross over to participate in a variety of leisure activities across the Hudson. I am greatly appreciative that both these new plans include a parking area that will discourage parking on our local streets. I live within a few blocks of the bridge, so this directly affects me. Thank you for considering our wishes.

Sincerely,
Katherine Leinart
128 Piernmont Avenue
South Nyack
As a long-time South Nyack resident and elected official, I feel that it is important to make clear my position on the South Nyack SUP Terminus design.

Having grown up in South Nyack and married into a third generation South Nyack family, I have always been aware of the damage done to the village sixty years ago by the Thruway Authority and the lingering sentiment among its residents. It is exciting to me to see that the leaders of the New NY Bridge project have acted in a manner so different than their predecessors. While it clear that the New NY Bridge project will significantly impact South Nyack and other communities, it is also clear to me that the project management has a real desire to mitigate the negative impacts and help these communities exploit the potential opportunities this project brings. While the state has a long way to go to repair the damage done, I am optimistic that there is a real desire within the leadership to try for a different outcome this time.

This is why it is particularly important that the SUP Terminus on the Rockland side NOT be implemented as described in Concept E.

Concept F is an opportunity to move some of the exit 10 traffic from a municipal road to a state road. This is critically important since the village cannot allow the increasing traffic congestion and wear-and-tear on its roads to continue. Steps will have to be taken to mitigate these problems if the entrance is left on South Broadway. Implementing Concept F solves these issues with a relatively small marginal cost to the state.

Alain Leinbach
Trustee
Village of South Nyack
Please support Concept F to save the character of the quaint Village if Nyack, New York.
Sincerely,
Nicki Levine
Sent from my iPad
We are South Nyack residents and we support Concept F in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path.

Sue Lindsey
James Lindsey
COMMENT CARD

You are invited to comment on the Proposed Action (parking and facilities for the shared-use path for the New NY Bridge) in the space below. If you need additional space, please feel free to use the back or additional sheets of paper.

Comments: As a cyclist, I prefer alternative F because it avoids the need for the ramp. I understand that the ramp is designed to pedestrian (not cycling) design standards. This means a pedestrian facility in the middle of a bicycle route! At the least, the ramp should be designed to allow cycling up/down. The main need is sufficient turning radius at the ends of the ramp.

Name: Mark H. Greene

Interest Represented: Cycling & Walking, Westchester Cyclist Group

Address: 1190 Park Lane, Yorktown, NY 10598

Email: rml@muenihan.us

Here are the ways your written comments can be received and recorded:

- SUBMIT comment tonight. LEAVE COMPLETED COMMENT CARDS AT THE REGISTRATION TABLE
- EMAIL us at info@NewNYBridge.com;
- FAX comments to (914.524.5455); OR
- WRITE to any of the following agencies:

  Jamey Barbas, P.E.
  Project Director, New NY Bridge
  New York State Thruway Authority
  303 South Broadway, 4th Floor
  Tarrytown, NY 10591

  Peter Osborn
  Division Administrator
  Federal Highway Administration
  Leo W. O'Brien Federal Building
  11A Clinton Avenue, Room 715
  Albany, New York 12207

  Daniel D'Angelo, P.E.
  Deputy Chief Engineer
  New York State Department of Transportation
  50 Wolf Road
  Albany, NY 12232

Written comments may be submitted through 5:00 p.m. April 1, 2016.
To NYS Thruway Authority/NYS Dept of Transportation:

I reside in South Nyack at 216 S Broadway. I support Concept F in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path.

Thank you.

Meghan Lockwood
My wife and I are residents of South Nyack, and we support “Concept F” for the South Nyack Shared Use Path (SUP).

Sincerely,

Scott & Nina Louis
Ms. Maria Lehman, Interim Executive Director  
New York State Thruway Authority - Administrative Headquarters  
200 Southern Boulevard  
P.O. Box 189  
Albany, New York 12201-0189

Re: South Nyack Shared-Use Path Concept

Dear Ms. Lehman:

I am writing to support the Village of South Nyack Board of Trustees’ resolution on January 12, 2016 endorsing the South Nyack Tappan Zee Task Force (Task Force) recommendation for Concept F for the proposed Shared-Use Path (SUP). Concept F provides adequate parking for SUP users while substantially reducing the traffic load on local Village streets and keeping options open for future economic development.

Before making its recommendation, the Task Force reviewed more than a dozen concepts for the SUP and evaluated the advantages and disadvantages of each concept. The Task Force and the Village Board of Trustees favor Concept F because it has room to expand parking capacity, has the parking lot adjacent to SUP’s first point of access, and adds a pedestrian crossing from Shadyside Avenue to the SUP parking area. Concept F also removes the majority of morning commuter traffic from the Village, while adding more distance between Route 9W and the homes on the corner of Shadyside Avenue. Although Concept F does not provide a direct connection from the SUP parking lot to the Esposito Trail, requiring a “spur,” and may increase traffic on Route 9W between Franklin Street and Shadyside Avenue, the Task Force concluded that its advantages far outweigh any downside.

Concept F was also selected because it does not close the northbound entrance to the Thruway, which several other concepts would require. Nor does it require the construction of overhead switchback ramps above South Broadway at Cornelison or the construction of an overpass at Franklin Street.

For all these reasons, I support the Village Board’s resolution endorsing the Task Force recommendation for Concept F for the proposed SUP. If you have any questions or would like
additional information, please contact my District Representative Sara Levine in my Rockland District Office at 845-639-3485.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Nita M. Lowey
Member of Congress
Hello.....I live on Clinton Avenue in S. Nyack and I support Plan F to keep the 52 parking lot off Clinton Avenue. Sincerely,
Marcia T. Lynch

Sent from my iPhone
To whom it may concern,

The new bridge offers new opportunities for cyclists who have been unable to cross the Tappan Zee bridge. Cyclist cannot even commute to the train station in Tarrytown because bicycles are not allowed on cross-bridge mass transit buses. Recreational riders from Westchester County communities have to ride all the way up to the Bear Mt. bridge to cross the river. The new bridge has the potential to be a great link for commuters traveling from Rockland County to New York City and a wonderful recreational route for cyclists and pedestrians on both sides of the river.

The objection that cyclists will park their cars in the South Nyack neighborhood, taking spaces and bringing undesirable traffic into the area is weak. Currently there are no parking problems in South Nyack, and there is relatively little traffic. Studies performed by the Environmental Assessment project the need for 54 parking spaces on the Rockland side. The George Washington Bridge accommodates approximately 1,500 cyclists a day on weekends and there are NO parking set-asides in Fort Lee, NJ, for cyclists, and no parking spaces at all on the New York City side. So, while projected numbers of cyclists are much lower for the new bridge, there will not be parking problems because most cyclists actually ride their bikes from other places to the bridge crossings.

In response to objections by residents of South Nyack, there have been some plans that make cycling across the bridge difficult, if not impossible to access, (such as a flight of stairs over which cyclists would have to carry their bicycles). Some of the parking locations suggested are remote and potentially dangerously unattended, instead of being located in a well-trafficked, public use areas. These solutions seem to be a way to hinder, if not halt, the use of this resource that we share.

The truth is, the new bridge is certain to bring a greater amount of motorist traffic, resulting in more noise for South Nyack residents. However increased bicycle use could actually mean fewer cars, which would be a good thing for everyone.

Please move forward with a fair and reasonable plan that will allow access to bicycle commuters and recreational cyclists.

Kate Marshall
"We support "ConceptF" in South Nyack for Shared Use Path."

GeraldinemcBrearty
125 Depot Place
Nyack, NY 10960
We are South Nyack residents and support "Concept F" in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path. Thank you.

Anthony & Lucinda McClarty
mcclarty2@verizon.net
From: Catherine McCue <catherinemccue@verizon.net>
Sent: Tuesday, March 15, 2016 7:47 PM
To: NNYB Info; Bonnie Christian
Subject: The south Nyack SUP

Categories: handled

Please register my vote for plan F for the location of the parking lot for the SUP for the new path linked to the north span of the bridge and South Nyack. Plan E is unacceptable due to the proximity to residential neighborhood who want no part of the extra traffic congestion and parking issues visitors would impose on the residents. Listen to the voice of the people!

Catherine McCue
Village Trustee
South Nyack, N Y

Sent from my iPhone
I am a South Nyack resident.
I support "Concept F" in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path.

Thank you.
Julie McDonald
7 Elizabeth Place
South Nyack
I am a resident of South Nyack and I support the “Concept F” in South Nyack Shared Use Path. The Shared Use Path has a negative impact on South Nyack. “Concept E” is the least objectionable.

Thomas McManamon
"We support "Concept F" in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path."
Thanks!!
The McNulty Family
We sincerely request that you support our quality of life. It’s a burden right now to contend with the noise, dust and closed roads. We’ll have to live with this for the next few years. But the shared use path would be a permanent barrier to the peace and safety of our neighborhoods. These bicyclists are all out-of-towners who refuse to treat us with respect. They often cycle in large packs – blocking the road and intimidating and cursing us – very thug-like behavior. Please help us. We’re paying a high enough price already. And BTW, my family NEVER uses the TZB. So we are carrying the burden of making travel easier for people from all over the state and indeed all over the country. And we derive no value at all. Please make the additional investment to preserve our neighborhoods and property values.

Sincerely, Gigi McPartland Salisbury Point, South Nyack
As a resident of South Nyack, New York, I am writing to strongly endorse and support "Concept F" in South Nyack for the Shared Path. This will be so helpful in maintaining the quality of life in our village.

Lois Mergentine
272 Piermont Avenue
South Nyack, NY 10960
Being able to safely ride across the new Tappan-Z is critically important.

Concept B on the Westchester side seems ok. Are there plans to connect the path to the trailway?

On the Nyack side, Concept F is the only solution that is viable for cyclists. *Please* go with Concept F.

Thomas Merwin, Cyclist

NYC
We support "Concept F" in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE smartphone
We are south Nyack residents and "We support "Concept F" in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path."
Absolutely no to Plan E but YES to Plan F. Joan E. Moffett, Salisbury Point - Bldg. 4, Apt. 6A.
I'll be at the meeting tomorrow night and will vote for Concept F.

------- Forwarded Message -------

Subject: Salisbury Point residents and The Thruway Plan for the SUP Please Attend this Meeting
Date: Tue, 15 Mar 2016 18:00:28 -0400
From: Bryant Holmes <Behmay@aol.com>
To: Bryant Holmes <Behmay@aol.com>

Mayor’s Update – March 16, 2016

**STEP ONE:** Mark Your Calendar – Attend this Meeting

“Make your voices heard South Nyack residents”

**Date:**
**Location:**
**Open House:** 5:00 pm – 8:00 pm
**Public Hearing:** 6:30 pm

The NYS Thruway Authority and the NYS Department of Transportation will be gathering all comments on Wednesday, March 16 about the two remaining concepts for the Shared Use Path. This pathway across the new bridge will bring many tourists to our area and now is our opportunity to save the character of our Village and our way of life.

**Support Concept F:**

It will provide visitor parking, bathroom facilities and walkways while keeping them away from our homes and within the interchange on NYS Thruway property.
It will discourage visitor parking on our Village streets.
It will greatly reduce traffic on our Village roads by moving the South Broadway entrance of the interchange to Route 9W.
It will ultimately save the wear and tear on our Village roads, which will save us money on resurfacing and save on taxes.
It will build a new pedestrian crossing at the south end of the Village; connecting the west side of the Village to the east side of Route 9W.
“The 1955 bridge destroyed our commercial center”

Don’t let the new bridge destroy our neighborhood” – A South Nyack resident

**STEP TWO:** Today – Don’t Wait Until the March 16th Meeting

Send the following email (and please state that you are a South Nyack resident) to:
The NYS Thruway Authority/NYS Department of Transportation and be sure to copy South Nyack Mayor, Bonnie Christian:

Email: info@newNYbridge.com
cc: bonnie.christian@southnyack.ny.gov

“We support “Concept F” in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path.”

Thank you for your continued support,

Bonnie Christian
Hello,

I am a long-time resident of Piermont, NY and an avid cyclist. I often commute to and from NYC by bicycle as well as do my training on the roads in and around Rockland county. Building this new bridge without a bicycle friendly path is a huge mistake. I know hundreds of cyclists in Westchester county who would love to visit new roads and towns on this side of the river if they had easy access (often the GWB or Bear Mtn Bridge are too far). I'm sure that a solution to any concerns regarding the path can be resolved with input from both sides of the issue. Providing easy bike access to the train in Tarry Town will also reduce car traffic and pollution in the area. Commuting by bike has been on the rise for many years now and this will continue if city planners further encourage this practice. Thank you for your time.

Shane Moran
Co-Founder/Owner
Goji Fitness, LLC
USA Cycling Coach
shane@gojifitness.com
Facebook

From: shane@gojifitness.com
Sent: Monday, March 21, 2016 12:57 PM
To: NNYB Info
Subject: Bike path

Categories: handled
Dear Sir or Madam:

Please allow me to add these suggestions for the subject plan in anticipation of tomorrow night's presentation.

- The **path needs to be open 24/7**, just like the car lanes. Those who are serious about reducing our carbon footprint may well choose to ride their bikes to work across the river, and the bike path will have to be open for them. Bike riding should be encouraged to replace car driving.

- The **intersection of Route 9 and the Shared Use Path on the Westchester side** will need a **traffic light** so folks can safely cross Route 9 to reach the path. Also consider having a median half way across Route 9 for slower elderly and very young walkers. Everyone should have access to and be able to enjoy the pedestrian walk on the bridge, no matter what age they are - with safety.

My husband and I are among thousands of Sleepy Hollow and Tarrytown residents whom the State bitterly disappointed by excluding bikers and pedestrians when the bridge opened in 1955. Please do the right thing by us this time.

I look forward to tomorrow's presentation and hope that you will include these 2 suggestions in the final plan.

With kind regards,
Sonya Munroe
63 New Broadway
Sleepy Hollow NY 10591
Hello,

As a resident of South Nyack and a Nyack business owner "We support "Concept F" in the Shared Use Path."

Rosemary Narcisi
Salisbury Point
It is terrific that there will be pedestrian and cycle access to the bridge, enhancing business for restaurants and small ships on both sides of the river.

HOWEVER, PLEASE
- Add an access point at the River Road/Piermont Avenue by Bike Route 9. Cycling and walking will only displace automobiles when it is made convenient to community businesses and resources.
- Keep it open 24/7. This is important for people who evening and night shifts (typically lower income residents who can really benefit financially from being able to bike or walk to work), as well as for casual and recreational users.

Thank you
Margaret Neuer

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android
To whom it may concern,

I am writing to voice my strong support for plan F, specifically the provision to provide SUP parking as far away from South Nyack residential areas as possible. As a South Nyack resident myself, I am keenly aware of the residents' concerns, and it seems like the compromises worked out in proposal F are amply sufficient and fair.

It is a treat for us, one we bought into when we moved here and have grown accustomed to, to walk out our doors and up the street and enjoy a quiet residential atmosphere free of parking lots and the like. We see no reason to let that change when there is a perfectly viable alternative.

Sincerely,

Joel Newton
Clinton Ave

Sent from my iPhone
To whom it may concern.

After a careful review and as a resident of Rockland County, I am in favor of "Concept F" for the shared use path in South Nyack. I hope the Thruway Authority will give strong consideration to the desires of their neighbors in South Nyack. Thank you.

Peter Noonan
11 Atlantic Ave.
Nanuet, N.Y. 10954
"We support "Concept F" in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path."

Richard and MJ O’Connor
4 Balsam Court
New City, NY
I am a South Nyack resident and I am definitely not in favor of the "E" Concept for the Shared Use Path.

The 1955 bridge destroyed our commercial center. Please don't let this bridge destroy our neighborhood. We, in South Nyack are in favor of the "F" Concept.

Sincerely.

Therese O'Dowd
I'd like to register my support for a bike/ped path on the new Tappan zee bridge. I'm astounded that it isn't an automatic feature of the design in this day and age. The age old GW bridge has ped/cycling access and it is a boon to both NJ and NY communities on either side of the bridge. Of course it will bring a lower carbon footprint and more business to both sides of the bridge. It is truly a no brainer. I live in Westchester and hope my support helps this important issue.

Steven Odrich
From: Bill Orme
Subject: Bike and pedestrian path parking concepts

Message is regarding: Bike and pedestrian path parking concepts

Contact Information
First Name: Bill
Last Name: Orme
Email Address: bill.orme@gmail.com
Join Mailing List?: Subscribe to New NY Bridge Project Updates
Telephone: 9176071026
Organization:

Address
Street: 18 Cranberry Street
City: Brooklyn
State: New York
Zipcode: 11201

Message Body:
As a regular user of the current T-Zee bridge as a motorist, and as a New York cyclist who very much looks forward to being able to bike across the new bridge, I join those who have called for 24/7 bike lane access and improved access and exit bike lanes on the western (Nyack) end of the new bridge.

--
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on New NY Bridge (http://www.newnybridge.com)
We support "Concept F" in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path.

I am a South Nyack resident.

Sincerely,

Brent Osborne
73 Depot Place
South Nyack, NY 10960
bwosborne80@gmail.com
We support "Concept F" in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path.

I am a South Nyack resident.

Sincerely,

Carmel Osborne
73 Depot Place
South Nyack, NY 10960

cosborne8016@gmail.com
We are residents of South Nyack. We support plan F for the shared use of path Bonnie J Ossman

Sent from my iPhone
Hello,
I’m writing in favor of “concept F” in South Nyack for the shared path.

Thank you,
Marla Pasquale
52 River Rd
Grandview, NY 10960
My family lives in South Nyack and we strongly support Concept F and urge that that plan be selected and implemented.
My husband and I are south Nyack residents and we support "Concept F" in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path.

The 1955 bridge destroyed our commercial center.
Please don't let the new bridge destroy our neighborhood.

D

Sent from my teleportation remote.
I strongly support "Concept F" in South Nyack for the shared use path.

Sincerely,
Lee S. Prisament
Resident South Nyack
36 Clinton Ave.
South Nyack, NY 10960
"We support "Concept F" in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path."

Thank you,

- Dr. Phil -
To whom it may concern,

I am a physician assistant at Weill Cornell Medical Center, on the Liver Transplant Surgery service. My fiance is a PhD candidate and professor at NYU. Last year we considered buying a home in Nyack. The house was perfect for us, we loved it. But, we realized that without a bike path accross the Tappan Zee to the train station, living on the West side of the river was not a viable option for us. Commuting accross a toll bridge by car and paying for parking at a train station is both a daunting, unpleasant and expensive endeour that we did not wish to undertake. We now live in Westchester instead of Rockland County, although I still sometimes think about that perfect home that was so close to all of the local Nyack shops that we love.

I am shocked that the residents of Nyack are heavily opposed to bicycle traffic in their town. Nyack is already a bicycle destination and there are many local businesses that I'm confident could not have reached their current level of success without NYC bicycle traffic. Westchester bicycle traffic can surely only strengthen the local economy by bringing more consumers to local restaurants and shops.

The new bridge offers new opportunities for cyclists who have been unable to cross the Tappan Zee bridge. Cyclist cannot even commute to the train station in Tarrytown because bicycles are not allowed on cross-bridge mass transit buses. Recreational riders from Westchester County communities have to ride all the way up to the Bear Mt. bridge to cross the river. The new bridge has the potential to be a great link for commuters traveling from Rockland County to New York City and a wonderful recreational route for cyclists and pedestrians on both sides of the river.

The objection that cyclists will park their cars in the South Nyack neighborhood, taking spaces and bringing undesirable traffic into the area is weak. Currently there are no parking problems in South Nyack, and there is relatively little traffic. Studies performed by the Environmental Assessment project the need for 54 parking spaces on the Rockland side. The George Washington Bridge accommodates approximately 1,500 cyclists a day on weekends and there are NO parking set-asides in Fort Lee, NJ, for cyclists, and no parking spaces at all on the New York City side. So, while projected numbers of cyclists are much lower for the new bridge, there will not be parking problems because most cyclists actually ride their bikes from other places to the bridge crossings.

In response to objections by residents of South Nyack, there have been some plans that make cycling across the bridge difficult, if not impossible to access, (such as a flight of stairs over which cyclists would have to carry their bicycles). Some of the parking locations suggested are remote and potentially dangerously unattended, instead of being located in a well-trafficked, public use areas. These solutions seem to be a way to hinder, if not halt, the use of this resource that we share.
The truth is, the new bridge is certain to bring a greater amount of motorist traffic, resulting in more noise for South Nyack residents. However increased bicycle use could actually mean fewer cars, which would be a good thing for everyone.

Please move forward with a fair and reasonable plan that will allow access to bicycle commuters and recreational cyclists.

Thank you,

Travis Rabbit, MPH, MSc. PA-C
35 Coachlight Square
Montrose NY 10548

--
"Do the kind thing, and do it first" - Sir William Osler
Dear NYSTA/NYSDOT,

I am a South Nyack resident who supports Concept F in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path.

This way of connecting the path will mean a lot to the integrity of our community.

Thanks,
Marcia Rappaport
S. Nyack
Dear Reader:
As a South Nyack resident, I strongly believe that ONLY Plan F is acceptable for the exit to the shared use path.

Sincerely,
Marcia Rappaport
36 Clinton Avenue
S. Nyack, NY
From: Larry Reilly <larrybike@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 14, 2016 12:27 PM
To: NNYB Info
Subject: Tappan Zee Bridge Bike/Ped comments

Categories: handled

24 Hour Access
---------------
* The path needs to be open 24/7. It's a transportation resource, just like the roadway. Would the Thruway Authority close down the road overnight? No! Similarly, around the clock access is required for people cycling and walking. For example, this opens up job opportunities for low income individuals and those who don't drive or don't have access to a car.

Westchester County Side
------------------------
* A signalized crosswalk with a median refuge area is necessary at the intersection of Route 9 and the Shared Use Path. The Environmental Assessment explicitly says no changes will be made here. That opinion is dangerously mistaken.

Route 9 has significant vehicle counts and is over 50' wide at this location.

Across the street from the path entrance is an apartment complex with 380 residents. There's also a shopping center and a bank. All of them will draw pedestrians across Route 9 at this intersection. The nearest crosswalk adds up to 1,300 feet to a journey and requires traversing a two lane wide free flowing right hand turn lane. The crosswalk in the other direction adds up to 1,500 feet to a trip.

Without a signal, cyclists coming off the bridge who are heading north on Route 9 will have a very hard time finding a safe gap in traffic between through traffic on Route 9, north bound turning movements from Route 119, plus vehicles exiting the gas station, bank, shopping center and apartment building.

Similarly, people riding bikes north on Route 9 heading onto the bridge will have a difficult time navigating that left turn.

Rockland County Side
---------------------
* Alternative E should be rejected because the narrow switchback ramps and stairs significantly reduce the attractiveness of cycling or walking the bridge.

* An access point needs to be added at River Road (State Bicycle Route 9) in Grand View on Hudson. The area is presently being used for bridge construction. Entering the bridge here is 1.3 miles shorter and has 80 feet less climbing for people walking and cycling from points south. The emergency access point can be here as well, instead of Smith Ave.

Between the new parking lot being discussed in the Environmental Assessment, signage of that lot existing and proper parking regulations will dissuade people from parking cars at this path entrance.
Similarly, if Alternatives E or F are chosen, there is value to having the initially proposed bicycle/pedestrian ramp at South Broadway / Cornelison Ave as an additional access point for people traveling to/from the south on Route 9 and those living in neighborhoods south and southwest of the bridge.

Larry Reilly
As South Nyack residents, I and my wife support Concept F for the Shared Use Path (SUP) in South Nyack.

Frank Richards
To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to you with support FOR a cycling and pedestrian path for the new Tappan Zee Bridge. I recently moved to Cold Spring, NY from NYC with my family and I am an avid cyclist. I commute at least 1x a week to the city on my bike when weather permits. Having the Tappan Zee as another option for Hudson River crossing would do the following:

- help promote cycling in the Hudson Valley
- allow for more and better safe travel to/from the city
- promote green commuting to a large amount of people on the West side of the river
- promote the Hudson River landscape in itself
- too many other reason to list…. 

If NYS was to build such a significant and expensive bridge project and not extend the investments in GREEN travel which were so successfully implemented in NYC, this would be such a stain on the future of NY’s commitment to the environment but also her commitment to the people within it as well.

A modern bridge without a bike path is simply short sighted, wrong and would be an immense lost opportunity.

Mark Robohm
mark@juicyorange.com
You are invited to comment on the Proposed Action (parking and facilities for the shared-use path for the New NY Bridge) in the space below. If you need additional space, please feel free to use the back or additional sheets of paper.

Comments: I have no issues with your shared use path concept but I want to know if the names of the rest areas/boulevards are permanent? I would suggest naming one after Pete Seeger. As for the name, I would not name it after a politician or individual. Call the new bridge the Tappan Zee Veterans Memorial Bridge takes one of everyone who served our country!

Name: James Rocco

Interest Represented:

Address: Yacktan Heights, NY

Email: coyoteacat@gmail.com

Here are the ways your written comments can be received and recorded:

- SUBMIT comment tonight. LEAVE COMPLETED COMMENT CARDS AT THE REGISTRATION TABLE

- EMAIL us at info@NewNYBridge.com;

- FAX comments to (914.524.5455); OR

- WRITE to any of the following agencies:

  Jamey Barbas, P.E.
  Project Director, New NY Bridge
  New York State Thruway Authority
  303 South Broadway, 4th Floor
  Tarrytown, NY 10591

  Peter Osborn
  Division Administrator
  Federal Highway Administration
  Lec W. O'Brien Federal Building
  11A Clinton Avenue, Room 715
  Albany, New York 12207

  Daniel D'Angelo, P.E.
  Deputy Chief Engineer
  New York State Department of Transportation
  50 Wolf Road
  Albany, NY 12232

Written comments may be submitted through 5:00 p.m. April 1, 2016.
Comments: ALTERNATE IF AS IN FRANKLY IS A BAD IDEA, BESIDES THAT WHY WOULD YOU PAY 3.1 MILLION TO CHANGE THIS IF IT DOES NOT CHANGE THE VOLUME OF CARS GOING ACROSS THE BRIDGE OR MAYBE IT WILL BY CNS TAKING THE GIDGE WADINTON BRIDGE? I SO NO TO ALTERNATE F, THANK YOU FOR HEARING ME!

Name: HOWARD RODRIGUEZ

Interest Represented:

Address: 312 S. BROADWAY, NYACK NY

Email: HRODRIGUEZ10613@GMAIL.COM

Here are the ways your written comments can be received and recorded:

- SUBMIT comment tonight. LEAVE COMPLETED COMMENT CARDS AT THE REGISTRATION TABLE

- EMAIL us at info@NewNYBridge.com;

- FAX comments to (914.524.5455); OR

- WRITE to any of the following agencies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jamey Barbas, P.E.</td>
<td>Project Director, New NY Bridge</td>
<td>New York State Thruway Authority</td>
<td>303 South Broadway, 4th Floor, Tarrytown, NY 10591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Osborn</td>
<td>Division Administrator</td>
<td>Federal Highway Administration</td>
<td>11A Clinton Avenue, Room 715, Albany, New York 12207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel D'Angelo, P.E.</td>
<td>Deputy Chief Engineer</td>
<td>New York State Department of Transportation</td>
<td>50 Wolf Road, Albany, NY 12232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written comments may be submitted through 5:00 p.m. April 1, 2016.
COMMENTS:

I am opposed to closing the entrance ramp to the bridge in S. Nyack. I moved from Tarrytown to my home 6 years ago because of the entrance ramp so I commute to Westchester for my job. I will sell my house and move back to Westchester where my entire family and job is if the ramp is closed.

NAME: Karen Rodriguez

INTEREST REPRESENTED:

ADDRESS: 312 S. Broadway, S. Nyack

EMAIL: KCappuzzello@gmail.com

Here are the ways your written comments can be received and recorded:

- SUBMIT comment tonight. LEAVE COMPLETED COMMENT CARDS AT THE REGISTRATION TABLE
- EMAIL us at info@NewNYBridge.com;
- FAX comments to (914.524.5455); OR
- WRITE to any of the following agencies:

  Jamey Barbas, P.E.
  Project Director, New NY Bridge
  New York State Thruway Authority
  303 South Broadway, 4th Floor
  Tarrytown, NY 10591

  Peter Osborn
  Division Administrator
  Federal Highway Administration
  Leo W. O'Brien Federal Building
  11A Clinton Avenue, Room 715
  Albany, New York 12207

  Daniel D'Angelo, P.E.
  Deputy Chief Engineer
  New York State Department of Transportation
  50 Wolf Road
  Albany, NY 12232

Written comments may be submitted through 5:00 p.m. April 1, 2016.
Gentlemen and Ladies,

I am a resident and taxpayer in New York City, a member of New York Cycle Club and an avid recreational cyclist, having been riding in the New York/New Jersey metropolitan area for over 30 years. I write to urge you to adopt Carol Waaser’s recommendation that “Concept F” on the Rockland side of the new bridge and “Concept B” on the Westchester side are the best choices to permit cyclists to use the bridge safely and compatibly with pedestrians.

Ms. Waaser is one of the most knowledgeable people in our club and in New York generally about the needs of and problems faced by cyclists. She is a past president and lifetime member of New York Cycle Club and speaks for all of us on this subject.

You should know that New York Cycle club is one of the largest recreational cycling clubs in the New York/New Jersey metropolitan area, with approximately 2,000 members. We actively promote safe and courteous riding.

Another aspect of the new bridge project that deserves consideration is that a safe and accessible bike path across the new Tappan Zee bridge will take considerable pressure off the George Washington Bridge, which is seriously overcrowded. As Carol points out, with a Tappan Zee bike path riders can ride north on one side of the river and south on the other side, spreading bike traffic over a wider area, and bring more business to local shops and restaurants on both sides of the river.

Please incorporate “Concept F” and “Concept B” in your plans for completing the new bridge.

Gerald E. Ross
Fryer & Ross LLP
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 422
New York, New York 10176
(212) 286-0099; FAX (212) 286-0495; CELL (917)846-7769
E-MAIL: GERALDROSS@FRYERROSS.COM
I support "Concept F" in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path. I live in the immediate vicinity of this proposal.

Jennifer Rothschild
49 Washington Ave.
South Nyack, NY 10960
845 480 5567
jenniroth2@gmail.com
To Whom It May Concern,

I am a long time resident of South Nyack and have voiced my concerns regarding the shared use path publicly at various public meetings. Our community is small and the effects of the placement of the shared use path has disproportionate consequences to my neighbors and the community my family lives in. The thruway authority forever changed the Village of South Nyack with the construction of the Tappan Zee bridge and particularly the interchange at exit 10. It is because of this that it is important to weigh the proposed plans to favor the one that has the least negative impact on my neighbors and my community. I support concept F for the reasons below.

It will provide visitor parking, bathroom facilities and walkways while keeping them away from private homes and within the interchange on NYS Thruway property.

It will discourage visitor parking on our Village streets.

It will greatly reduce traffic on our Village roads by moving the South Broadway entrance of the interchange to Route 9W.

It will ultimately save the wear and tear on our Village roads, which will save us money on resurfacing and save on taxes.

It will build a new pedestrian crossing at the south end of the Village; connecting the west side of the Village to the east side of Route 9W.

Best Regards,
DeWitt Rulon
50 Voorhis Ave.
South Nyack, NY

This email has been sent from a virus-free computer protected by Avast.

www.avast.com
To Whom It May Concern,

I am a lifelong resident of the Nyacks and have resided in South Nyack for over 30 years. Our community is small and the effects of the placement of the shared use path has disproportionate consequences to my neighbors and the community my family lives in. The thruway authority forever changed the Village of South Nyack with the construction of the Tappan Zee bridge and particularly the interchange at exit 10. It is because of this that it is important to weigh the proposed plans to favor the one that has the least negative impact on my neighbors and my community. I support concept F for the reasons below.

It will provide visitor parking, bathroom facilities and walkways while keeping them away from private homes and within the interchange on NYS Thruway property.

It will discourage visitor parking on our Village streets.

It will greatly reduce traffic on our Village roads by moving the South Broadway entrance of the interchange to Route 9W.

It will ultimately save the wear and tear on our Village roads, which will save us money on resurfacing and save on taxes.

It will build a new pedestrian crossing at the south end of the Village; connecting the west side of the Village to the east side of Route 9W.

Best Regards,

Vera Rulon
50 Voorhis Ave.

South Nyack, NY
I am a 20 year resident of South Nyack and I support concept F in Nyack for the Shared Use Path.

Lisa Marie Ryan
To Members of The NYS Authority/NYS Department of Transportation,

I am a 54 year old life long resident of South Nyack and I along with my family support Concept F in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path.

Michael Ryan
47 Washington Ave
South Nyack, NY 10960
We support Concept F in South Nyack for the SHARED USE PATH.

Sincerely,
Stephen & Marsha Safran
6 Edgewater Ln.
S. Nyack, NY 10960
As co- Ride Librarian of the New York Cycle Club, with Carol Waaser, I support her comments.

This Shared Use Path is essential to current and future generations for recreation and health.

For cyclists it will open regions to users on both sides of the Hudson. To some members of our region, this has the potential to introduce those otherwise less fit to the process of the enjoyment of exercise.

What Carol alludes to is the importance that users have unimpeded access. Adjacent localities have concerns that need to be addressed, but the final form must not hinder the vision of living up to the potential that this path at its fullest will benefit users.

Hank Schiffman  
35 East 9th St, #5  
New York City, NY 10003

hank.schiffman@gmail.com
I am a South Nyack resident and I support concept F. The path should be part of the interchange Sandra Schmidt

Sent from my iPhone
To Whom it May Concern.

As a New York City resident who cycles both for transportation and recreation I often ride North into either Rockland or Westchester Counties.

A fully accessible bike lane on the new Tappan Zee bridge will provide significantly more route options than currently exist and I believe will encourage more recreational riding by the many cyclist in the New York City, Westchester County and Rockland County areas. With the safety of both pedestrians and cyclists in mind I strongly urge that the shared use path be as cyclist-friendly as possible, with no impediments to access, and provide sufficient safety accommodations for both cyclists and pedestrians in line with current space and egress recommendations by cycling safety authorities.

Regarding the Nyack side: I urge you to select Option F on the Nyack approach to the shared use path. Option F is the only solution that provides unencumbered access for cyclist without compromising the safety of cyclists or pedestrians.

On the Westchester side, Concept B is a very workable solution with some minor concerns regarding linkage to existing cycling routes (particularly safe access from the nearby North/South County Trailway, a major cycling path) and traffic controls at the base of the ramp.

I believe there is an historic opportunity for us to set a high standard for mixed use of a major transportation infra-structure that signals a profound awareness and sensitivity to changing transportation needs. I urge you to fully embrace this opportunity without compromise.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Rob Schoenbohm
515 East 13th Street #4
New York, NY
10009
212 533 1371
Member: New York Cycling Club, and League of American Cyclists.
An additional access point is needed at the River Road/Bike Route 9 crossing for the SUP, and keep it open 24/7. Consider easy access to town of Nyack.
March 29, 2016

Administrator Gregory G. Nadeau
Federal Highway Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE
Washington, DC 20590

Dear Administrator Nadeau:

I write today in regards to the proposed Shared-Use Path Parking Facilities and Bicycle/Pedestrian Connections as part of the Tappan Zee Bridge project. As part of the Environmental Assessment process for the project the Federal Highways Administration (FHWA) and the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) have conducted a number of public meetings where various alternatives for the terminus of the shared use path have been discussed. The overwhelming consensus at these meetings has been that Alternative F provides both the best facilities for users of the shared-use path, while also protecting the community of South Nyack. In light of the overwhelming local support, I urge you to not only approve alternative F, but also to issue the Shared-Use Path Parking Facilities and Bicycle/Pedestrian Connections project a Finding of No Significant Impacts (FONSI). By issuing a FONSI to this aspect of the project work can move forward immediately, saving both time and money for the overall project. Delays and lengthy reviews of this proposal, which is widely supported by the community, could be significantly detrimental to efforts to advance the shared-use path project.

South Nyack has had a long history with the Tappan Zee Bridge, and construction of the original bridge in 1955 had a number of negative impacts on the local community. Now, as significant progress is being made on a new Tappan Zee Bridge, it’s important that the mistakes of the past are not repeated. By approving Alternative F, and expediting all necessarily permits including issuing a FONSI, the FHWA can help play a role in shaping a far more positive legacy for the new Tappan Zee Bridge and South Nyack. Alternative F would provide off-street parking accommodations, connection(s) to parking from the shared-use path, access from existing bicycle and pedestrian routes to the shared-use path, and limited ancillary facilities. In addition, this alternative provides all of these benefits in a way that minimizes community and environmental impacts and does so in a far more successful way than other alternatives that were considered.

Because the Alternative F proposal is considered a new project element as part of the Tappan Zee Hudson River Crossing Project (TZHRCP), and it was not considered as part of the environmental review that was conducted in 2012, the proposed action is subject to both NEPA and SEQRA requirements. As you know, while important, those requirements can often be burdensome, time consuming, and costly. In this case, because the Record of Decision that was issued in September of 2012, contained project elements for the shared-use path parking facilities that were more intrusive than the new proposed Alternative F, issuing a FONSI that would waive the full NEPA process for this new project element is appropriate and warranted. South Nyack deserves a plan.
for the shared-use path parking facilities that is supported by the community, therefore I urge you to do everything you can to quickly advance Alternative F.

I appreciate your attention to this issue, should you need further information please do not hesitate to contact my office.

Sincerely,

Charles E. Schumer
United States Senator
NYS Department of Transportation and NYS Thruway,

As South Nyack residents we support "Concept F" in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path.

Best wishes,
Kelly Schunk+Elliot Berkowitz
85 Depot Place
South Nyack, NY 10960

--
Kelly Schunk, MPH
(845) 367-2451
kelly.schunk@gmail.com
I am in full SUPPORT of Concept F.

I live next to exit 10, and putting the parking lot close to Franklin and Clinton would be disastrous.

Let me ask you one simple question: Would you want a flow of hundreds of cars, strangers on your street? I don’t think so. I think it’s quite imaginable thinking of the consequences. Please DON’T do it, NO to concept E

If the newNYbridge and NYstate really cares of our concerns then going with Concept F is the concept South Nyack wants.

Thank you,

Vic
vschwaid@optonline.net
We support **Concept F** in South Nyack for the Shared-Use path.

Jill & Mark Schwarz  
12 Maple Street  
South Nyack, N.Y. 10960
You are invited to comment on the Proposed Action (parking and facilities for the shared-use path for the New NY Bridge) in the space below. If you need additional space, please feel free to use the back or additional sheets of paper.

Comments: Strongly recommend that the new parking lot at mid exit 10 be expanded. 54 spaces not enough for projected traffic. Better to use "Space for additional parking at outset."

Name: Roger Seiler
Interest Represented: South Nyack resident
Address: 5 Benachoh Ave, S. Nyack, NY 10960
Email: roger@leadraft.com

Here are the ways your written comments can be received and recorded:
- SUBMIT comment tonight. LEAVE COMPLETED COMMENT CARDS AT THE REGISTRATION TABLE
- EMAIL us at info@NewNYBridge.com;
- FAX comments to (914.524.5455); OR
- WRITE to any of the following agencies:

James Barbas, P.E.
Project Director, New NY Bridge
New York State Thruway Authority
303 South Broadway, 4th Floor
Tarrytown, NY 10591

Peter Osborn
Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration
Leo W. O'Brien Federal Building
11A Clinton Avenue, Room 715
Albany, New York 12207

Daniel D'Angelo, P.E.
Deputy Chief Engineer
New York State Department of Transportation
50 Wolf Road
Albany, NY 12232

Written comments may be submitted through 5:00 p.m. April 1, 2016.
To whom it may concern
As a resident of Upper Grand View I can't see any advantage to concept F over E which is much less invasive and looks much cheaper. The parking is exactly the same and in fact the parking access is much easier with E. If you take the benefits to the residents of south nyack of closing of the Broadway on ramp out of the equation there is really no reason to choose F over E.
The years of road construction required to transform the existing road will create massive traffic along rt 9W and the finished product will only make a smooth traffic pattern congested.
Please choose PLAN E

Thank you
Michael Shaw
1111 Rt 9 W

Sent from my iPad
OPTION "E" IS THE LOWEST IMPACT MOST COST EFFECTIVE OPTION. SAME PARKING SPACES — EASY ACCESS TO PARKING. MUCH LESS DISRUPTION TO EXISTING TRAFFIC FLOW. CLOSING THE ON RAMP OFF RAMP IS NOT A GOOD IDEA AND NOT ENOUGH REASON TO INACT OPTION "F".

Name: MICHAEL SHAW
Interest Represented: Homeowner
Address: 1111 RT 9W UPPRVR GRANVIEW
Email: mshaw@mac.com

Here are the ways your written comments can be received and recorded:
- SUBMIT comment tonight. LEAVE COMPLETED COMMENT CARDS AT THE REGISTRATION TABLE
- EMAIL us at info@NewNYBridge.com;
- FAX comments to (914.524.5455); OR
- WRITE to any of the following agencies:

  Jamey Barbas, P.E.
  Project Director, New NY Bridge
  New York State Thruway Authority
  303 South Broadway, 4th Floor
  Tarrytown, NY 10591

  Peter Osborn
  Division Administrator
  Federal Highway Administration
  Leo W. O'Brien Federal Building
  11A Clinton Avenue, Room 715
  Albany, New York 12207

  Daniel D'Angelo, P.E.
  Deputy Chief Engineer
  New York State Department of Transportation
  50 Wolf Road
  Albany, NY 12232

Written comments may be submitted through 5:00 p.m. April 1, 2016.
Dear Sir / Madam
I think it is critical that all efforts be made to accommodate both pedestrians and cyclists on the new Tappan Zee bridge. Anything that promotes alternative modes of transportation must be supported. The benefits to public health and safety are clear. When people walk or bike there is less traffic, less pollution and better positive outcomes as a benefit of physical exercise. Please support a segregated walk/ bike lane.
Sincerely
Richard Shea
Philipstown Supervisor

Sent from Windows Mail
March 29, 2016

To whom it may concern,

My name is Bahram Shirazi and I reside at 220 Piermont Avenue in South Nyack NY and I am writing to you regarding the proposal of the Shared Use Path Parking for South Nyack for the New Tappan Zee Bridge. I live one block away from the proposed parking lot on South Franklin and Clinton Avenue and I am affirmatively against the proposal of the Thruway Authority removing the path and trees and instead build a parking lot. I am against the traffic and congestion it will bring to our village. In addition to how it will negatively impact our village.

I request and support the recently developed plan F, the Proposal of Plan F keeps traffic away from Broadway and our Village. I respectfully request Concept F which utilizes DOT owned land at Exit 10.

Thank you for considering our communities interests and honoring our request to preserve our village.

Sincerely,

Bahram Shirazi
March 29, 2016

To Whom it May Concern,

My name is Bahram Shirazi and I reside at 220 Piermont Avenue in South Nyack NY and I am writing to you regarding the proposal of the Shared Use Path Parking for South Nyack for the New Tappan Zee Bridge. I live one block away from the proposed parking lot on South Franklin and Clinton Avenue and I am affirmatively against the proposal of the Thruway Authority removing the path and trees and instead build a parking lot. I am against the traffic and congestion it will bring to our village. In addition to how it will negatively impact our village.

I request and support the recently developed plan F, the Proposal of Plan F keeps traffic away from Broadway and our Village. I respectfully request Concept F which utilizes DOT owned land at Exit 10.

Thank you for considering our communities interests and honoring our request to preserve our village.

Sincerely,

Bahram Shirazi

917-992-9830
March 29, 2016

To whom it may concern,

My name Cyrus Shirazi and I reside at 220 Piermont Avenue in South Nyack NY and I am writing to you regarding the proposal of the Shared Use Path Parking for South Nyack for the New Tappan Zee Bridge. I live one block away from the proposed parking lot on South Franklin and Clinton Avenue and I am affirmatively against the proposal of the Thruway Authority removing the path and trees and instead build a parking lot. I am against the traffic and congestion it will bring to our village. In addition to how it will negatively impact our village.

I request and support the recently developed plan F, the Proposal of Plan F keeps traffic away from Broadway and our Village. I respectfully request Concept F which utilizes DOT owned land at Exit 10.

Thank you for considering our communities interests and honoring our request to preserve our village.

Sincerely,

Cyrus Shirazi
COMMENTS

You are invited to comment on the Proposed Action (parking and facilities for the shared-use path for the New NY Bridge) in the space below. If you need additional space, please feel free to use the back or additional sheets of paper.

Comments: Please Use Page 2

Name: 

Interest Represented: 

Address:  720 Armory Ave, South Windham 10960

Email: 

Here are the ways your written comments can be received and recorded:

- **Submit** comment tonight. LEAVE COMPLETED COMMENT CARDS AT THE REGISTRATION TABLE
- **Email** us at info@NewNYBridge.com;
- **Fax** comments to (914) 524-5455; OR
- **Write** to any of the following agencies:

  - Jamay Barbas, P.E.,
    Project Director, New NY Bridge
    New York State Thruway Authority
    303 South Broadway, 4th Floor
    Tarrytown, NY 10591

  - Peter Osborn
    Division Administrator
    Federal Highway Administration
    Leo W. O'Brien Federal Building
    11A Clinton Avenue, Room 715
    Albany, New York 12207

  - Daniel D'Angelo, P.E.,
    Deputy Chief Engineer
    New York State Department of Transportation
    50 Wolf Road
    Albany, NY 12223

Written comments may be submitted through 5:00 p.m. April 1, 2016.
I am a resident of South Nyack for the last 15 years--and a resident of Rockland County since 1960, when I was editor of a weekly/county newspaper in Rockland County. I have examined plans the NY Thruway has submitted for the new TZ bridge and I definitely do NOT want Plan E.

If I must choose a proposal, I vote FOR Plan F.

Thank you for your consideration.

Murray Shor
1 Salisbury Point, Apt. 6B
South Nyack, NY 10960
I am a recreational cyclist living in NYC and applaud the foresight of the designers to include a pedestrian/bicycle path across the bridge.

I wanted to make the point that on the Nyack approach to the shared use path, concept F is the only solution that is viable for cyclists. Please go with concept F.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully --
Marci Silverman
I am a resident of South Nyack and I support "Concept F" in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path.

Flavia Silvestri
285 Piermont Ave
S. Nyack
To whom it may concern,
I am a South Nyack resident with a house only one block from Cornelison and South Broadway. I have followed the efforts of our Major and the Task Force analyzing the best concepts for the Shared Used Path. I strongly support "Concept F" in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path."
I will attend the meeting on March 16th to express my support for our community.

Gino Silvestri
285 Piermont Ave
South Nyack, NY 10960
845-358-6692
To Whom It May Concern:

Subject: Shared Use Path

From: Elaine and Samuel Simon
2 Salisbury Point 6C
South Nyack, N.Y. 10960

We plan to attend the March 16 community meeting to voice our support for Concept F in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path.

Elaine and Sam Simon
I support plan F - Maryann Slattery South Nyack
We support Concept F in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path.

Thanks!
Jennifer Smith and Erik Simon
83 Depot Place
South Nyack NY 10960
I am a South Nyack resident and I support Concept F for the Shared Use Path.

Peter Smolin
110 Clinton Ave.
Dear Sir/Madam,

I am a New Yorker who bicycles daily for transportation as well as recreation. Being able to bike out of the city for a few hours or days is an emotional lifeline and also good for the state’s tourist economy. Points north, in Rockland, Westchester, and counties north, are frequent destinations for me and all of my cycling friends.

A fully accessible bike lane on the new Tappan Zee bridge will enable us to make longer and more frequent journeys, since it will also give us the option of taking Metro North from the city. I strongly urge that the shared use path be as cyclist-friendly as possible, with no impediments to access.

With this in mind, I urge you to select Option F on the Nyack approach to the shared use path. Concept F is the only solution that is viable for cyclists. Without it, our travel will be impeded.

On the Westchester side, Concept B looks like a very viable solution. I have two concerns, however. 1) Are there provisions for cyclists traveling to and from the nearby North/South County Trailway? The most direct route is on NY-119 -- a busy, high-speed 4-lane roadway with mostly no shoulders. This would be extremely dangerous.

2) Are there any plans available for controlling the interaction between bikes and cars at the end of the access ramp? A signalized crosswalk with a median refuge area is necessary at the intersection of Route 9 and the Shared Use Path. The Environmental Assessment explicitly says no changes will be made here. That opinion is dangerously mistaken.

Route 9 has significant vehicle counts and is over 50' wide at this location. Across the street from the path entrance is an apartment complex with 380 residents. There's also a shopping center and a bank. All of them will draw pedestrians across Route 9 at this intersection. The nearest crosswalk adds up to 1,300 feet to a journey and requires traversing a two lane wide free flowing right hand turn lane. The crosswalk in the other direction adds up to 1,500 feet to a trip. Without a signal, cyclists coming off the bridge who are heading north on Route 9 will have a very hard time finding a safe gap in traffic between through traffic on Route 9, north bound turning movements from Route 119, plus vehicles exiting the gas station, bank, shopping center and apartment building.
Similarly, people riding bikes north on Route 9 heading onto the bridge will have a difficult time navigating that left turn.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Matthias Stadtfeld
1161 York Avenue, New York

This email message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain information that is proprietary, confidential, and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure, or distribution is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender by return email and delete the original message. Please note, the recipient should check this email and any attachments for the presence of viruses. The organization accepts no liability for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this email.

=================================
03/02/2016

To the NYS Thruway Authority/NYS Department of Transportation:

Finally -- we get to Concept F for the Shared Use Path. Here's a concept I can unconditionally support. It will certainly give us a way to welcome visitors while enhancing the amenities that make our residential village so special to us.

So my vote is a "yes" for Concept F, and a thank you to your agencies for working with the Village of South Nyack to make it possible.

Myra Starr
South Nyack Village Historian
COMMENT CARD

You are invited to comment on the Proposed Action (parking and facilities for the shared-use path for the New NY Bridge) in the space below. If you need additional space, please feel free to use the back or additional sheets of paper.

Comments: Alternate E Usualization - ramp behind Police station; (1) sound wall needs to be raised to increase sound abatement as well as hide walkers on walkway. Residents do not wish to watch Isla walkers on path.

(2) Trees need to be replaced around police station, along ramps etc. Net shrubs + vines.

Name: Merry Street

Interest Represented: 45 Washington St. South Nyack, NY

Address: 45 Washington St. South Nyack, NY

Email: 

Here are the ways your written comments can be received and recorded:

- SUBMIT comment tonight. LEAVE COMPLETED COMMENT CARDS AT THE REGISTRATION TABLE
- EMAIL us at info@NewNYBridge.com;
- FAX comments to (914.524.5455); OR
- WRITE to any of the following agencies:

  Jamey Earbas, P.E., Peter Osborn, Daniel D'Angelo, P.E.
  Project Director, New NY Bridge
  New York State Thruway Authority
  New York State Thruway Authority
  303 South Broadway, 4th Floor
  Tarrytown, NY 10591

  Leo W. O'Brien Federal Building
  Federal Highway Administration
  11A Clinton Avenue, Room 715
  Albany, New York 12207

  Albany, NY 12232

Written comments may be submitted through 5:00 p.m. April 1, 2016.
Hello -
I am a recreational cyclist who frequently rides in Rockland and Westchester Counties, and I would like to comment on the proposed routing the shared use path on the New Bridge. On the Nyack approach to the shared use path, Concept F is the only solution that is viable for cyclists. Please go with Concept F.
Thanks for your consideration.
best regards,
Brian Sullivan
Jersey City, NJ
I am a south nysaok resident and support a Concept F. It will provide the best be fit to the village and its residents. Joan Sullivan

Sent from my iPhone
COMMENT CARD

You are invited to comment on the Proposed Action (parking and facilities for the shared-use path for the New NY Bridge) in the space below. If you need additional space, please feel free to use the back or additional sheets of paper.

Comments:
Both plans are poorly conceived and obviously planned by someone who does not live in the area and has absolutely no idea about traffic conditions in the area. Since I live in South Nyack and have commuted over the T&B since 1982, I believe plan "F" serves the needs of the community the best.

Name: JOHN SULLIVAN

Interest Represented: SALISBURY POINT CO-OP

Address: 4 SALISBURY POINT S. NYACK NY 10960

Email: jshandson@aol.com

Here are the ways your written comments can be received and recorded:

- SUBMIT comment tonight, LEAVE COMPLETED COMMENT CARDS AT THE REGISTRATION TABLE
- EMAIL us at info@NewNYBridge.com;
- FAX comments to (914.524.5455); OR
- WRITE to any of the following agencies:

  Jamey Barbas, P.E.
  Project Director, New NY Bridge
  New York State Thruway Authority
  303 South Broadway, 4th Floor
  Tarrytown, NY 10591

  Peter Osborn
  Division Administrator
  Federal Highway Administration
  Leo W. O'Brien Federal Building
  1101 Constitution Avenue, Room 715
  Albany, New York 12207

  Daniel D'Angelo, P.E.
  Deputy Chief Engineer
  New York State Department of Transportation
  50 Wolf Road
  Albany, NY 12232

Written comments may be submitted through 5:00 p.m. April 1, 2016.
To whom it may concern - I am writing to urge the state to support Concept F for the Shared Use Path.

Yesterday the Tappan Zee Bridge backed up traffic in South Nyack almost up to Cedar Hill as it often does. Anger and frustration caused chaos. Commuter busses gave up and went down Prall Place, a small one car width side street. Cars turned right from Clinton onto South Broadway regardless of the 'no turn on red' signs. Cars on South Broadway before Clinton zoomed into the oncoming lane to turn down Clinton and onto Piermont in the hopes of gaining a few seconds by turning back up to Broadway on Cornelious. Let's not even begin to discuss the horror waiting to happen with the cars rushing down Piermont while the children are running to catch the school busses. If you don't understand the details of this statement... you should, to understand the impact of your options. Where else in the state does a major highway feed off and onto small village streets?

Sincerely, Janey Tannenbaum (South Nyack resident)
As a long time South Nyack resident and enthusiast of the village, I support "Concept F" in South Nyack for the shared use Path."

Please keep our village safe and quiet.

Any Taylor
My name is Nora Tegni. I am a South Nyack resident. My husband and I support "Concept F" in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path.

Thank you.
Statement of Bardyl R. Tirana, Resident of South Nyack, NY

To: NYS Thruway Authority and NYS Department of Transportation

SUBJECT: New NY Bridge – Shared Use Path
Public Hearing March 16, 2016

I reside at 3 Washington Ave., South Nyack, on the west bank of the Hudson River. I support Concept "F" for the western terminus of the Shared Use Path (the "SUP") of the New NY Bridge.

Under Concept "F", westbound SUP pedestrians, runners and bike riders will be discharged within Exit 10 of the Thruway. Also, visitor parking, bathroom facilities and walkways will be available within Exit 10.

The Esposito Trail crosses the Thruway within the boundaries of Exit 10. Under Concept "F", SUP pedestrians, runners and bike riders will have safe access over the Esposito Trail to the Franklin Street Park, the Village of Nyack and other destinations to the north of Exit 10, and to the Elizabeth Place Park and other destinations south of the Thruway.

Under Concept "F", the location of the western terminus of the SUP within Exit 10 will minimize the impact of having to discharge pedestrians, runners and bikers into South Nyack’s residential areas. Furthermore, Concept "F" provides for parking for 54 vehicles within Exit 10, and for the construction of additional parking in the future. This will reduce the need for visitor parking on South Nyack’s roads, and the risk of death or injuries resulting from vehicular and bike collisions.

On December 10, 2015, South Nyack prepared and filed an application for funding under the New NY Bridge Waterfront Revitalization Projects 2015. The Application reflects several improvements which South Nyack has planned in large part for the benefit of visitors arriving either from the end of the SUP or from the terminus of the New NY Bridge at Exit 10.

Please let me know if you have any questions. Sincerely,

Bardyl R. Tirana

Bardyl R. Tirana
3 Washington Ave.
South Nyack, NY 10960-4713
845-358-0007
btirana@aol.com
Please be advised as a South Nyack resident,

"WE SUPPORT "CONCEPT F" in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path."

Thank-You
Sincerely,
Roanne Torrens

Sent from my iPhone
March 10, 2016

Good afternoon! I'm Susan Truss, a 35+ year resident of South Nyack, and I'm writing to let you know that I strongly support Concept F for the Shared Use Path configuration.

This option will greatly reduce bridge traffic on our local roads by closing the entrance by Village Hall and reducing the frequent traffic tie-ups (like this morning’s) for people “taking the shortcut” onto the bridge right through the middle of South Nyack. (This ties up school buses, people getting to work locally and adds to the noxious gasses spewed onto local neighborhoods.)

Concept F uses space which was formally a part of South Nyack to provide visitor parking, bathroom facilities and walkways while keeping them away from residential areas.

Concept F builds the new pedestrian crossing outside of residential areas by connecting the west side of the Village to the east side of Route 9W.

For these reasons, I believe it in some small way atones for the massive land grab which destroyed central South Nyack during the building of the 1955 bridge building.

My husband and I will be at the March 16th meeting at the Nyack Middle School, but wanted you to have our decision in writing prior to the meeting.

Very truly yours,

Susan Truss
From: Jeff Vogel <jeffvgl@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 17, 2016 6:18 AM
To: NNYB Info
Subject: NNY Bridge connections to Shared Use Path

Categories: handled

I agree with Carol Wasser’s comments (copied and attached below) and support Concept F as the only viable solution to bicycle access on the bridge.
Respectfully submitted,
Jeffrey H Vogel
Forest Hills, NY

Comments on NNY Bridge connections to Shared Use Path
Submitted by Carol Waaser
January 12, 2016

I am a recreational cyclist living in New York City. I often lead group rides, many of which go through Nyack or Tarrytown. I applaud the foresight of the New Bridge designers to include a pedestrian/bicycle path across the bridge. It will make it possible to do a 50-60 mile loop ride from Manhattan that takes in both Rockland and Westchester Counties. It will also make it possible to do a ride farther north in Rockland, then circle back across the bridge to Tarrytown to take a train home. (Thus, for example, slower riders like myself, with less stamina, will be able to enjoy Rockland Lake State Park without having to cycle all the way back to Manhattan.)

My desire is for the shared use path to be as cyclist-friendly as possible, with no impediments to access. Thank you for considering the following comments as to access to the path.

1. Rockland Side.
   a. Concept E. This is the most troubling of the access concepts. The drawing shows hairpin switchbacks on the access ramp for cyclists. The caption states: “Ramps and stairs lead to a pedestrian bridge over on-ramp.” It’s difficult to tell from the drawing whether cyclists would be required to carry their bikes up or down stairs. Both the stairs and the switchbacks are serious impediments to cyclists wishing to use the SUP. The switchbacks are extremely dangerous, especially in a path shared by bikes and pedestrians. UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES SHOULD “CONCEPT E” BE CHOSEN if you truly want the SUP to be used by cyclists.
   b. Concept F. This concept looks very cyclist-friendly. I do have a question as to whether it’s possible for a cyclist approaching the access point from the Rockland side to reach the comfort station directly from the Esposito Trail, without having to enter the bridge ramp, go to the junction of the two paths and turn back to go to the parking area & comfort station. However, without question, if Concepts E and F are the two remaining options, then Concept F is the only viable one for cyclists.

2. Westchester Side.
   a. Concept B looks like a very viable solution. My main concerns from the original drawings seem to have been addressed quite successfully. The SUP no longer has a chicane on the access ramp. There seems to be adequate open space at the bottom for cyclists to gather. And there seems to be direct access to the comfort station.
b. One remaining concern now is with the interaction between cyclists using the SUP and vehicles on US-9. The Rockland side concepts include notes about traffic lights and pedestrian-activated signals; there are no such notes on Concept B. I was told at one point that this would be handled by the DOT (I assume that’s the State DOT). Is that still the case? Are there any plans available for controlling the interaction between bikes and cars at the end of the access ramp?

c. The “Purpose and Need” document includes the statement: “Provide routing between the shared use path public access and existing bicycle and pedestrian routes.” On the Rockland side, the existing Esposito Trail is incorporated into the planning. On the Westchester side, there is no indication of incorporating the nearby North/South County Trailway. The Trailway is a major north-south route for cyclists. However, the most direct route between the break in the trail at Elmsford and the NNY Bridge is NY-119, a busy, high-speed 4-lane roadway with mostly no shoulders. Are there any plans to create access from the Trailway to the bridge?

Respectfully submitted,
Carol Waaser
I am a member and former President of the New York Cycle Club, representing over 2,000 recreational cyclists from the New York City area. This letter represents the sentiments of the membership of our club. Many of our group rides go through Nyack or Tarrytown. We applaud the foresight of the New New York (NNY) Bridge designers to include a pedestrian/bicycle path across the bridge. It will make it possible to do a 50-60 mile loop ride from Manhattan that takes in both Rockland and Westchester Counties. It will also make it possible to do a ride farther north in Rockland, then circle back across the bridge to Tarrytown to take a train home. (Thus, for example, slower riders with less stamina will be able to enjoy Rockland Lake State Park without having to cycle all the way back to Manhattan.)

Our desire is for the shared use path (SUP) to be as cyclist-friendly as possible, with no impediments to access. Thank you for considering the following comments as to access to the path.

1. Rockland Side.
   a. **Concept E.** This is the most troubling of the access concepts. The drawing shows hairpin switchbacks on the access ramp for cyclists. The caption states: “Ramps and stairs lead to a pedestrian bridge over on- ramp.” It’s difficult to tell from the drawing whether cyclists would be required to carry their bikes up or down stairs. Both the stairs and the switchbacks are serious impediments to cyclists wishing to use the SUP. The switchbacks are extremely dangerous, especially in a path shared by bikes and pedestrians. **UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES SHOULD “CONCEPT E” BE CHOSEN** if you truly want the SUP to be used by cyclists.
   b. **Concept F.** This concept looks very cyclist-friendly. We do have a question as to whether it’s possible for a cyclist approaching the access point from the Rockland side to reach the comfort station directly from the Esposito Trail, without having to enter the bridge ramp, go to the junction of the two paths and turn back to go to the parking area & comfort station. However, without question, if Concepts E and F are the two remaining options, then Concept F is the only viable one for cyclists.
   c. **Access from Bike Route 9/Piermont Ave.** In order to be truly viable, Concept F needs a ramped access point from Piermont Ave. (aka Bike Route 9). A great many cyclists who would potentially use the SUP will not arrive by car. They will have cycled north from NYC or northern NJ and approach the bridge on Piermont Ave. either from the south, having come through Piermont, or from the north, having arrived in Nyack via Bradley Pkwy and Highland Ave., or having cycled up through West Nyack to Rockland Lake and come down either 9W and Old Mountain Rd. or the Hook Mountain/Nyack Beach Bikeway. Since Piermont Ave. is a designated NY State bicycle route, it **must** have a viable access point to the NNY Bridge shared use path.

2. Westchester Side.
   a. **The current Concept** looks like a very viable solution. Our main concerns from the original drawings seem to have been addressed quite successfully. The SUP no longer has a chicane on the access ramp. There seems to be adequate open space at the bottom for cyclists to gather. And there seems to be direct access to the comfort station.
b. One major concern now is with the interaction between cyclists using the SUP and vehicles on US-9. The Rockland side concepts include notes about traffic lights and pedestrian-activated signals; there are no such notes on the Westchester side. We were told at one point that this would be handled by the State DOT. Is that still the case? There must be provisions for controlling the interaction between bikes and cars at the end of the access ramp.

c. The “Purpose and Need” document includes the statement: “Provide routing between the shared use path public access and existing bicycle and pedestrian routes.” On the Rockland side, the existing Esposito Trail is incorporated into the planning. On the Westchester side, many cyclists use the South and North County Trailways, but there is no viable connection between the Trailways and the bridge. The “Alternatives E & F (Westchester)” illustration labels NY-119 as one of the “On Road Bicycle Routes.” In its current state, NY-119 is absolutely NOT a viable bicycle route. It is a fast four-lane car and truck route that, for the most part, has no shoulders between the South County Trailway access in Elmsford and the access ramp to the NNY Bridge. In order for cyclists to access the NNY Bridge from the Trailways, NY-119 must have a dedicated bicycle lane in both directions, preferably with a physical separation from the traffic lanes.

Thank you for your careful consideration of these comments.

Respectfully submitted,
Carol Waaser
bikerc@verizon.net
Hello,

We bought our house in South Nyack in 1978 and I’m very worried about the impact of the new bridge on our village. I’m especially concerned about the volume of cars that will be coming to our village for the new walkway on the bridge. I’ve talked with many of my neighbors and they share these concerns.

This week the backup for eastbound traffic onto the bridge was so gridlocked that buses were going down Prall Place (between Broadway & Piermont Ave.) to bypass Broadway which was at a complete standstill. It’s reached a point where it’s critical to get the bridge traffic off our local streets and onto 9W. The wear and tear to our local streets from bridge traffic is paid for by our village. 9W is a state road so the expenses of maintaining the road(s) that feed the bridge would then be paid for by the state rather than just village residents.

The new walkway over the bridge will bring potentially hundreds of cars needing parking spots in our village on the weekends. Concept F may not fully address the parking required for the new walkway but is the best of the plans submitted.

Please support Concept F.

Thankyou.

Mark Walter
First I want to thank everyone involved with removing the idea of having the Shared Use Path (SUP) placed at South Broadway in South Nyack. Since I live on South Broadway I would have had to consider living some place else. The thought of South Nyack becoming a tourist attraction didn’t work for me.

Honesty I wish Concept H was still being considered. Granted it was the most ambitious choice, but it would have resolved a great deal of issues that were created when the original Tappan Zee Bridge was built.

Of the two choices being considered Concept F is the best choice. Concept E isn’t much better than the original idea of putting the SUP at South Broadway. My neighbors on Franklin Street and Clinton Avenue would get the brunt of the tourist issues and problems.

Concept F will keep the SUP separate from the village as much a possible. In addition it will close off the entrance to the bridge at South Broadway. I will be so glad to not have to see a parade of vehicles crawling down South Broadway in order to get to Westchester.

The only change for Concept F I would like to see is the removal of the stairway next to the Village Hall that connects South Broadway to the Esposito Trail. Leaving that stairway intact will encourage tourist to park on South Broadway to gain entrance to the SUP.

Please do the most to make this right and keep South Nyack from having a major Tourist Distractions.

Sincerely,
Keith Walters
224 South Broadway, South Nyack, NY
I am a recreational cyclist living in New York State. I support Alternative F for the SUP on the Nyack approach. Thank you.

Charles Wang
35 W 92nd St Apt 7B
NY, NY 10025
To Whom It May Concern,

It is extremely important to make the bike lane access as user-friendly as possible for cyclists. Ease of use for cyclists, both recreational and commuter, will cut down on the number of vehicles using the bridge, thereby limiting traffic and carbon emissions.

This is not the time to be small-minded!

Thank you,

Mark Wasserman
Westchester Resident
To: info@NewNYBridge.com

I am a New Yorker who bicycles daily for transportation as well as recreation. Being able to bike out of the city for a few hours or days is an emotional lifeline and also good for the state’s tourist economy. Points north, in Rockland, Westchester, and counties north, are frequent destinations for me and all of my cycling friends.

A fully accessible bike lane on the new Tappan Zee bridge will enable us to make longer and more frequent journeys, since it will also give us the option of taking Metro North from the city. I strongly urge that the shared use path be as cyclist-friendly as possible, with no impediments to access.

With this in mind, I urge you to select Option F on the Nyack approach to the shared use path. Concept F is the only solution that is viable for cyclists. Without it, our travel will be impeded.

On the Westchester side, Concept B looks like a very viable solution. I have two concerns, however.

1) Are there provisions for cyclists traveling to and from the nearby North/South County Trailway? The most direct route is on NY-119 -- a busy, high-speed 4-lane roadway with mostly no shoulders. This would be extremely dangerous.

2) Are there any plans available for controlling the interaction between bikes and cars at the end of the access ramp?

A signalized crosswalk with a median refuge area is necessary at the intersection of Route 9 and the Shared Use Path. The Environmental Assessment explicitly says no changes will be made here. That opinion is dangerously mistaken.

Route 9 has significant vehicle counts and is over 50' wide at this location. Across the street from the path entrance is an apartment complex with 380 residents. There's also a shopping center and a bank. All of them will draw pedestrians across Route 9 at this intersection. The nearest crosswalk adds up to 1,300 feet to a journey and requires traversing a two lane wide free flowing right hand turn lane. The crosswalk in the other direction adds up to 1,500 feet to a trip.

Without a signal, cyclists coming off the bridge who are heading north on Route 9 will have a very hard time finding a safe gap in traffic between through traffic on Route 9,
north bound turning movements from Route 119, plus vehicles exiting the gas station, bank, shopping center and apartment building.
Similarly, people riding bikes north on Route 9 heading onto the bridge will have a difficult time navigating that left turn.
Thank you for your time and consideration.
Sincerely,
Neile Weissman
309 East 5th Street #19
New York City, NY 10003
Hello-

I am a South Nyack resident and I strongly support Concept F for the New NY Bridge shared use path.

- Anne R Welles

Sent from my iPhone
I support "Concept F" in South Nyack for the shared use path. Thank you!

Colleen Wertheiser
125 Depot Place
Nyack, NY 10960
as residents of south Nyack. we support plan F. Daniel & Lila White
Greetings, I am a government employee, a husband and father of three, a bike commuter, and a longtime resident of NY state in places from Manhattan to Cornwall on Hudson. My family owns two cars and we cross the Tappan Zee bridge regularly to visit friends, go to physicians appointments, and for my work. As a bike commuter, I value protected biking and walking paths away from automobile traffic. In addition, as a bike commuter, if I park my vehicle at a designated lot or location at the head of a trail or path, I am very likely to spend money in that community by going to convenience stores or purchasing food or gasoline. I sincerely wish that the planners of the village in which I reside had the foresight and creativity to construct protected biking paths and to encourage alternate forms of travel that would help enrich the surrounding communities, not only financially, but socially as well. I admire and applaud the efforts to expand protected biking paths and wish the engineers, managers, and supporters of the new bridge project all the best in their efforts to make a world-class bridge across our great river.

Regards, J. Kenneth Wickiser
As a 54-year resident of South Nyack, I support "Concept F. I pray that the new bridge will not destroy our village."
I support "concept f" in South Nyack for the shared use path.

Thank you.

Barbara Willen
Rockland County
We support CONCEPT F for the Shared Use Path in South Nyack/Rockland County.

Thank you,

Nancy Willen
43 Cedar Hill Avenue
South Nyack, NY 10960
845 353 3321
We support "Concept F" in South Nyack for the Shared Use Path.
Earl and Margaret Williams
Salisbury Point
South Nyack, NY 10960
My husband and I are longtime residents of South Nyack. We strenuously oppose a Parking lot in our neighborhood. We support Plan F.

Sincerely

Sally and Michael Witte
South Nyack, NY

Sent from my iPhone
As a lifelong recreational and commuting cyclist I urge you to include bike access in bridge plans.

I know many cyclists from around the tri-state area who are looking forward to using the bridge.

Sincerely,

Aaron Wolfe
Cold Spring, NY
Putnam County.
The Legislature of Rockland County

ALDEN H. WOLFE
Chairman

March 22, 2016

New NY Bridge Outreach Team
303 South Broadway, Suite 413
Tarrytown, New York 10591

Dear Members of the Outreach Team:

I would like to voice my support for the Alternative F plan of the Shared Use Path in the Village of South Nyack. This option would close the South Broadway on-ramp and redirect motorists to a new I-87/287 access ramp from Hillside Avenue.

Over sixty years ago, the construction of the Tappan Zee Bridge had a devastating effect on the Village of South Nyack. Back then, there was no real partnership between the State, County and the Village. Now, with the construction of the New NY Bridge, it's heartening that the State has worked collaboratively with the residents to explore alternatives that would divert traffic from residential roads and safeguard the community.

The New NY Bridge brings new opportunities and it's our chance to help market the Village of South Nyack and neighboring communities; highlighting the area's rich history which dates back to the early 1800s and promoting it as a destination to fabulous eateries, store fronts, sight seeing and various recreational activities - including biking, hiking and trail exploration. It also provides for entrepreneurship and economic development.

The Bridge is a gateway to Rockland County, its Towns and Villages, and we need to direct the incoming traffic in the right direction, one that will lead to tourism and prosperity for the Village of Upper Nyack and all of Rockland. I encourage you to chose Alternative F as it's clearly the one that would benefit the entire community.

Yours Truly,

ALDEN H. WOLFE
Chairman of the Legislature
Hello,

I am a New Yorker who bicycles daily for transportation as well as recreation. Being able to bike out of the city for a few hours or days is an emotional lifeline and also good for the state’s tourist economy. Points north, in Rockland, Westchester, and counties north, are frequent destinations for me and all of my cycling friends.

A fully accessible bike lane on the new Tappan Zee bridge will enable us to make longer and more frequent journeys, since it will also give us the option of taking Metro North from the city. I strongly urge that the shared use path be as cyclist-friendly as possible, with no impediments to access.

With this in mind, I urge you to select Option F on the Nyack approach to the shared use path. Concept F is the only solution that is viable for cyclists. Without it, our travel will be impeded.

On the Westchester side, Concept B looks like a very viable solution. I have two concerns, however.

1) Are there provisions for cyclists traveling to and from the nearby North/South County Trailway? The most direct route is on NY-119 -- a busy, high-speed 4-lane roadway with mostly no shoulders. This would be extremely dangerous.

2) Are there any plans available for controlling the interaction between bikes and cars at the end of the access ramp? A signalized crosswalk with a median refuge area is necessary at the intersection of Route 9 and the Shared Use Path. The Environmental Assessment explicitly says no changes will be made here. That opinion is dangerously mistaken.

Route 9 has significant vehicle counts and is over 50' wide at this location.

Across the street from the path entrance is an apartment complex with 380 residents. There's also a shopping center and a bank. All of them will draw pedestrians across Route 9 at this intersection. The nearest crosswalk adds up to 1,300 feet to a journey and requires traversing a two lane wide free flowing right hand turn lane. The crosswalk in the other direction adds up to 1,500 feet to a trip.

Without a signal, cyclists coming off the bridge who are heading north on Route 9 will have a very hard time finding a safe gap in traffic between through traffic on Route 9, north bound turning
movements from Route 119, plus vehicles exiting the gas station, bank, shopping center and apartment building.

Similarly, people riding bikes north on Route 9 heading onto the bridge will have a difficult time navigating that left turn.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Carol A. Wood

--

Carol A. Wood
Hi

We support Concept F in South Nyack for shared use path. We are residents of south Nyack.
Amy & Richard Yee
119 S. Highland Ave
S. Nyack, NY 10960

amy yue
amy.rph729@gmail.com
I am a recreational cyclist living in New York City. I often lead group rides, many of which go through Nyack or Tarrytown. I applaud the foresight of the New Bridge designers to include a pedestrian/bicycle path across the bridge. It will make it possible to do a 50-60 mile loop ride from Manhattan that takes in both Rockland and Westchester Counties. It will also make it possible to do a ride farther north in Rockland, then circle back across the bridge to Tarrytown to take a train home. (Thus, for example, slower riders like myself, with less stamina, will be able to enjoy Rockland Lake State Park without having to cycle all the way back to Manhattan.)

My desire is for the shared use path to be as cyclist-friendly as possible, with no impediments to access. Thank you for considering the following comments as to access to the path.

1. Rockland Side.

a. Concept E. This is the most troubling of the access concepts. The drawing shows hairpin switchbacks on the access ramp for cyclists. The caption states: “Ramps and stairs lead to a pedestrian bridge over on-ramp.” It’s difficult to tell from the drawing whether cyclists would be required to carry their bikes up or down stairs. Both the stairs and the switchbacks are serious impediments to cyclists wishing to use the SUP. The switchbacks are extremely dangerous, especially in a path shared by bikes and pedestrians. UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES SHOULD “CONCEPT E” BE CHOSEN if you truly want the SUP to be used by cyclists.

b. Concept F. This concept looks very cyclist-friendly. I do have a question as to whether it’s possible for a cyclist approaching the access point from the Rockland side to reach the comfort station directly from the
Esposito Trail, without having to enter the bridge ramp, go to the junction of the two paths and turn back to go to the parking area & comfort station. However, without question, if Concepts E and F are the two remaining options, then Concept F is the only viable one for cyclists.

2. Westchester Side.

a. Concept B looks like a very viable solution. My main concerns from the original drawings seem to have been addressed quite successfully. The SUP no longer has a chicane on the access ramp. There seems to be adequate open space at the bottom for cyclists to gather. And there seems to be direct access to the comfort station.

b. One remaining concern now is with the interaction between cyclists using the SUP and vehicles on US-9. The Rockland side concepts include notes about traffic lights and pedestrian-activated signals; there are no such notes on Concept B. I was told at one point that this would be handled by the DOT (I assume that’s the State DOT). Is that still the case? Are there any plans available for controlling the interaction between bikes and cars at the end of the access ramp?

c. The “Purpose and Need” document includes the statement: “Provide routing between the shared use path public access and existing bicycle and pedestrian routes.” On the Rockland side, the existing Esposito Trail is incorporated into the planning. On the Westchester side, there is no indication of incorporating the nearby North/South County Trailway. The Trailway is a major north-south route for cyclists. However, the most direct route between the break in the trail at Elmsford and the NNY Bridge is NY-119, a busy, high-speed 4-lane roadway with mostly no shoulders. Are there any plans to create access from the Trailway to the bridge?

Respectfully submitted,

Tracy Young

--
www.tracyyoung.info
I live in Manhattan and often bicycle on either side of the river in Rockland and Westchester Counties, especially on the Old Erie Path, the Esposito Trail, and the N/S County Trailways. I am looking forward to being able to cycle across the river on the new shared use path.

Reviewing the options in the environmental assessment, I note that alternatives E and F are being considered on the Rockland side. **If your intent is to promote cycling you must choose alternative F.** Alternative E with its switchbacks and stairs would make cycling access to the shared use path far more difficult and potentially dangerous.

Jim Zisfein  
305 West 98th Street, Apt 3DS  
New York, NY 10025  
jzisfein@gmail.com
COMMENTS CARD

You are invited to comment on the Proposed Action (parking and facilities for the shared-use path for the New NY Bridge) in the space below. If you need additional space, please feel free to use the back or additional sheets of paper.

Comments: My husband and I feel very strongly that option F is the only option. We cannot have a public restroom and parking lot in our backyard. It will make our block significant more dirty and dangerous. Keeps the parking and traffic off of our streets! We vote F; option E is unacceptable.

Name: Lynda Zittel (my husband is Nick Zittel)
Interest Represented: I live on Clinton Ave in South Nyack
Address: 44 Clinton Ave, S Nyack, NY 10960
Email: lyndazittel@verizon.net

Here are the ways your written comments can be received and recorded:

- SUBMIT comment tonight. LEAVE COMPLETED COMMENT CARDS AT THE REGISTRATION TABLE
- EMAIL us at info@NewNYBridge.com;
- FAX comments to (914.524.5455); OR
- WRITE to any of the following agencies:

Jamey Barbas, P.E.,
Project Director, New NY Bridge
New York State Thruway Authority
303 South Broadway, 4th Floor
Tarrytown, NY 10591

Peter Osborn
Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration
Leo W. O'Brien Federal Building
11A Clinton Avenue, Room 715
Albany, New York 12207

Daniel D'Angelo, P.E.,
Deputy Chief Engineer
New York State Department of Transportation
50 Wolf Road
Albany, NY 12232

Written comments may be submitted through 5:00 p.m. April 1, 2016.
To whom it may concern:

With regard to the Proposed Action on parking and facilities for the shared-use path for the new Tappan Zee bridge, I am supporting option F.

Thank you.

Very best regards, Nicholas Zittell

Nicholas Zittell
44 Clinton Avenue
South Nyack, NY 10960
Hello,

I am very excited about the new SUP.

Please make sure that the path is open 24/7 and that there is a good exit at River Road/Piermont Avenue/Bike Route 9 crossing.

These are essential to making the path successful.

Opponents in Nyack are being shortsighted in their concern about too many cyclists in their town. It will be much more positive than negative.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Laurence Zuckerman
441 West End Avenue Apt 15B
New York, NY 10024