



THE ASSEMBLY
STATE OF NEW YORK
ALBANY

COMMITTEES:
Environmental Conservation
Governmental Operations
Insurance
Labor
Local Governments
Transportation

GEORGE S. LATIMER
91ST Assembly District

RECEIVED
2/27/08

TZB-181E

March 27, 2008

Michael P. Anderson, P.E., Project Director
New York State Department of Transportation
Tappan Zee Bridge/I-287 Environmental Review
660 White Plains Road, #340
Tarrytown, NY 10591

Re: Tappan Zee Bridge/I-287 Corridor Scoping Update Packet, February 2008

Dear Mr. Anderson:

We are writing to express our grave concern regarding the current structure for the Tappan Zee Bridge/I-287 Corridor Project (the "Project") Environmental Review process and its potential environmental, economic and social implications for the communities of Rockland and Westchester Counties, and the Hudson River. In particular, we are concerned that the planning process for this enormous and expensive Project, which has been redesigned to include multiple "tiers" of analyses of major decisions and evaluations, in conjunction with the shortened Statute of Limitations period has the practical and possibly illegal effects of hindering full public review and participation, and precluding a properly informed decision by the agencies, as required under the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA") and the State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQRA").

Although the Scoping Document ostensibly indicates that the tiered analysis will be conducted in two phases, a careful review of the Scoping Document reveals that, in fact, a subsequent NEPA action, i.e., an additional, third Tier, will be performed after the initial Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS") and Records of Decision ("RODs") are issued for the Tier 1 and Tier 2 decisions in 2010. This subsequent Tier 3 analysis, which will address **station locations, vehicle types, storage facilities, site specific impacts and mitigation measures**, is the very one which will most directly affect the communities and physical environment along the Project Corridor.

Contrary to the mandates of NEPA and SEQRA, this Tier 3 analysis of direct impacts will not be used in the Tier 1 and Tier 2 EIS decisions, resulting in illegal segmentation. Moreover, because of a shortened 180-day deadline to appeal (previously 6-years), the time period for appealing the Tier 1 and Tier 2 decisions will expire well before the actual Tier 3 analysis of direct impacts to the communities and appropriate mitigation measures is completed, or perhaps even begun. This segmentation, in conjunction with the shortened Statute of Limitations period, will result in the public being precluded from having the right to appeal the completed, final

S-06

Page.1



decision (encompassing Tiers 1, 2, and 3) at the conclusion of the Environmental Review Process.

We urge you to revise the environmental review process so that it will allow concerned individuals and entities the right to challenge all aspects of this important decision at one time rather than set up a process which would apparently preclude that from happening.

Respectfully submitted,



GEORGE LATIMER
Assemblyman, 91st A. D.

6