

1 Introduction

1.1 Project Overview

The Corridor extends 30 miles between the Village of Suffern in Rockland County and the Village of Port Chester in Westchester County. The counties are linked by the Tappan Zee Bridge (TZB) over the Hudson River. The Purpose and Need of the Tappan Zee Bridge/I-287 Corridor Project is to:

- Improve the mobility of people, goods and services for travel markets served by the Tappan Zee Bridge
- Maximize the flexibility and adaptability of new transportation infrastructure to accommodate changing long term demand
- Maintain and preserve vital elements of the transportation infrastructure
- Improve the safety and security of the transportation system
- Avoid, minimize or mitigate any significant adverse environmental impacts caused by feasible and prudent improvements to mobility in the corridor.

The scoping stage of this study included a comprehensive three-level screening process. The purpose of the screening process has been to reduce the initial 150 project elements identified during the Level 1 screening into a short list of alternative elements to be carried forward into the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). Six alternatives, described in the Alternatives Analysis Report (January 2006), were selected as a result of Level 1 and Level 2 Screening and a further three options were subsequently developed. These six alternatives and three options currently under evaluation as part of Level 3 Screening are:

- Alternative 1** No Build
- Alternative 2** Bridge Rehabilitation with Transportation Demand Management and Transportation System Management (TDM & TSM) Measures
- Alternative 3** Full Corridor Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)
 - Option 3A Enhanced Full Corridor Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)
 - Option 3B Full Corridor Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)-Busway in Westchester
- Alternative 4A** Full Corridor and Manhattan Bound Commuter Rail Transit (CRT)
- Alternative 4B** Manhattan Bound CRT with Light Rail Transit (LRT) in Westchester
- Alternative 4C** Manhattan Bound CRT with BRT in Westchester
 - Option 4D Manhattan Bound CRT with Full Corridor BRT

With respect to the Tappan Zee Bridge itself, these alternatives and options result in two transportation modal requirements:

- 8 general purpose lanes with 2 BRT/HOV lanes to support BRT
- 8 general purpose lanes with 2 BRT/HOV lanes to support BRT and 2 tracks to support CRT

BRT/HOV lanes are special limited use traffic lanes open to buses and to passenger vehicles that elect to pay a toll to use the lane.

The conclusion of the Level 3 Screening may result in elimination, combination, or modification of one or more of the alternatives/options considered to date. Key questions of the Level 3 Screening process that must be resolved include:

- What Tappan Zee Bridge options should be progressed into the DEIS?
- Which transit mode or modes should form part of the Project?
- What assessment methodologies should be used in the DEIS?

The findings of the analysis into the above questions will be documented in the Project's Scoping Summary Report.

1.2 Purpose of Report

As part of Level 3 Screening the purpose of this report is to determine what Rehabilitation or Replacement Tappan Zee Bridge options are reasonable alternatives to be further evaluated in the DEIS. This report evaluates seven Tappan Zee Bridge Rehabilitation and Replacement Options that would accommodate the two Hudson crossing transit modes that passed the Level 2 screening process, CRT and BRT. These options are evaluated using the same criteria as used in the earlier screening stages – Engineering, Environmental, Transportation and Cost.

The scope of this report encompasses the area between South Broadway, near Interchange 10 in South Nyack, Rockland County, and Broadway Bridge (Route 9), near Interchange 9 in Tarrytown, Westchester County (the area where differences between bridge options occur).

The analysis was done in accordance with 23 CFR §771.12. See Footnote 1, page S1 of Executive Summary

Recognizing the Tappan Zee Bridge's eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (National Register), a Preliminary assessment was prepared in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA), as amended (implementing regulations at 36 CFR Part 800), and Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966, as amended (implementing regulations at 23 CFR Part 774). The assessment is included in Appendix D of this report.

1.3 Evaluation Process

Evaluation criteria (Table 1-1) and bridge options to be considered were established and presented to the bridge Stakeholders Advisory Working Group (SAWG) at a regular meeting in November 2007, and to the public at the Scoping Update Meetings held during February 2008. The criteria and options were also included in the Scoping Update Packet transmitted to all participating and cooperating agencies as well as all other stakeholders. No objections to the proposed criteria were received.

Engineering	Environmental	Transportation	Cost
Structural Integrity	Land Use	Travel Time	Capital Cost
Vulnerability	Displacements & Acquisitions	Roadway Congestion	Operating & Maintenance Cost
Seismic	Historic & Archaeological Resources	Alternative Modes in Mixed Traffic	Life Cycle Cost
Redundancy	Parklands & Section 4(f)/6(f)	Mode Split	
Emergency Response	Ecosystems & Water Resources	Transit Ridership	
Navigation	Visual Resources & Aesthetics	Non-Vehicular Travel	
Construction Impacts		Reserve Capacity	
Life Span		Rail Freight	
		Transportation System Integration	

Table 1-1
Evaluation Criteria

The results in this report will be presented to agencies and stakeholders at individual meetings and to the public at further Public Information Meetings and will be open to comment for a period of 30 days. Comments received will be reported in the Scoping Summary Report prepared at the end of Scoping or this report may be revised based on the comments received.