GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Transportation Goal

**GOAL:** For all modes of transportation, improve mobility, safety and access and reduce congestion within the study area.

- Improve traffic operations in the corridor, reducing delays and increasing efficiency and reliability.
- Reduce the frequency and severity of traffic accidents in the corridor by eliminating non-standard elements on the bridge and associated highway sections and ramps.
- Minimize diversion of highway auto and truck traffic to local streets, both during construction and long-term.
- Substantially conform to established design criteria to ensure safe operation and a smooth flow of traffic.
- Be consistent with regional transportation plans in the I-278 corridor and any related highway, transit or freight plans potentially affected by decisions in the project corridor.
- Provide cost-effective solutions to problems in the corridor related to both capital construction costs and operation and maintenance expenses.
- Eliminate infrastructure deficiencies.
- Provide a secure transportation infrastructure.
- Improve opportunities for pedestrian/bicycle travel in the corridor.
- Increase the effectiveness of mass transit in the corridor.
- Address the needs of emergency response personnel and vehicles.
- Enhance opportunities for the efficient movement of freight.

Public Participation Goal

**GOAL:** Provide an open, inclusive, transparent and responsive Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process that includes a proactive, comprehensive and ongoing public participation program.

- Create a process that embraces the principles of context sensitive design, fosters innovation and considers all ideas.
- Create a process that meets or exceeds federal and state requirements.
- Ensure that important but tangential issues that cannot be addressed by the EIS process are directed to the appropriate entity for action.
- Create a process in which data are accessible and in which any models used are understandable and the assumptions are clearly defined. (This could include conducting modeling workshops.)
- Provide a variety of forums to solicit broad public participation from a wide range of perspectives.
- Ensure that opportunities for public input are widely communicated.
- Facilitate cross-communication between agencies, groups and individuals.
- Develop written and graphic project materials that can be understood by the broadest possible audience.
Social, Economic & Environmental Goals

**GOAL:** Protect and/or enhance the environment, including natural resources and open space.
- Protect and enhance existing open space and parkland.
- Look for opportunities to create parks and open space in order to mitigate project consequences.
- Minimize adverse noise impacts and meet federal and state air quality standards.
- Protect existing wetlands and waterways.
- Avoid impacts to federal and state rare, threatened, and endangered species and other animal life.
- Protect public recreational facilities and minimize adverse impacts on their operation during construction.
- Protect against adverse visual and light impacts.

**GOAL:** Protect and/or enhance the integrity of residential neighborhoods.
- Protect residences and minimize adverse impacts on residential properties during construction.
- Improve pedestrian safety.
- Ensure that project impacts do not disproportionately affect one neighborhood over another.
- Preserve the integrity of neighborhoods.
- Protect and preserve community character.

**GOAL:** Maintain the viability of institutional and business communities.
- Protect commercial and industrial establishments and minimize adverse impacts on their operation during construction.
- Protect institutional facilities (religious, educational, etc.) and minimize adverse impacts on their operation during construction.
- Ensure safe pedestrian and vehicular access to institutions and businesses during construction.

**GOAL:** Protect and/or enhance cultural, historic and archeological resources.
- Protect and/or mitigate adverse impacts on cultural and historic resources that have been locally designated; identified as eligible for the State or Federal Register; or listed on the State or Federal Register.
- Avoid disturbances to archeological resources.

**GOAL:** Recognize the interrelationships between land use and transportation.
- Consider the impact on land use created by any transportation improvement.
- Be consistent with existing and committed transportation, community development, and land use plans and projects.
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PURPOSE/FUNCTIONS
The Kosciuszko Bridge Project’s Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC) is composed of community partners from the public and private sectors, including elected officials, community board representatives, local business interests, community-based organizations, residents and key agencies. Its purpose is to assist the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) with the Alternatives Analysis/Environmental Impact Statement process for the Kosciuszko Bridge Project by providing guidance and input on transportation, environmental, economic, community cohesion and other pertinent issues; and outreach to groups and individuals throughout the area.

The Kosciuszko Bridge Project is a multi-year effort designed to develop and evaluate possible solutions for the rehabilitation or replacement of the Kosciuszko Bridge, which spans Newtown Creek between Brooklyn and Queens.

The SAC will be an essential component of the Project’s Public Involvement Program and will play a central role in advising NYSDOT. It is being specifically established to:

• represent a variety of interests throughout project planning and implementation;
• assist with refinement of the Study’s problem statement and project goals and objectives;
• assist in developing a process by which strategies/alternatives to address the problems will be evaluated, including clear and understandable screening criteria;
• achieve consensus among SAC members on the information/analyses needed to support screening decisions;
• review project data and findings;
• review and provide input on preliminary recommendations, including interim and long-term solutions to be evaluated in the Draft EIS;
• serve as a community liaison and communications channel between local residents, business and civic organizations and NYSDOT, in order to promote ongoing dialogue on project goals and objectives, screening criteria, screening of alternatives, and related community issues and concerns;
• advise the project team with regard to planning an ongoing program of community outreach activities; and,
• assist in vetting candidates for the Community Advisor Team/Community Engineer.

MEMBERSHIP
An effective SAC is a group that represents a broad range of community interests. The SAC for the Kosciuszko Bridge Project will consist of approximately 40 members representing Brooklyn, Queens and regional transportation interests. It is anticipated that SAC membership may change
over the duration of the project to accommodate emerging circumstances and needs. Membership issues will be considered either by the full SAC or by a membership subcommittee. This will include developing criteria for adding and removing members, making recommendations on specific membership changes, and providing orientation for new members.

**Membership Responsibilities.** SAC members will generally be appointed because they represent a constituency or organization in the project area. Organizational representatives must be able to speak on behalf of their group and voice its perspective by actively soliciting its members’ concerns, views, and recommendations. It is important that SAC members attend meetings regularly and share their views with the entire group in order to work towards building consensus on critical project issues.

**Designation of Alternates.** Members are encouraged to designate one or more alternates to represent them when they are unable to attend a SAC meeting. Alternates will be subject to all of the membership responsibilities outlined above. In order for the SAC process to work effectively, all members and alternates must remain informed and up-to-date on issues pertaining to the project. Alternates will therefore receive all information and materials related to the SAC and are strongly encouraged to attend all meetings.

**Subcommittees.** The SAC will be a working committee. As such, it is anticipated that issue-specific subcommittees will be established as needed, at the discretion of the SAC. Subcommittee membership will be determined by the SAC.

**GOVERNANCE**

**Facilitation and Scheduling.** SAC meetings will be facilitated by the project team. The Committee will meet on a monthly basis, unless otherwise determined in advance. The agenda, date, time, and location of meetings will be determined jointly by the SAC and project team but meetings shall generally be held on the third Thursday of each month and shall alternate between Brooklyn and Queens.

**Process by Consensus.** The SAC will operate by consensus. No formal voting will take place; however, “straw polls” may be taken by the facilitator as needed in order to gauge progress toward consensus on a given issue. Consensus will be defined as “agreement that a particular course of action is one that most members of the SAC can live with.” Minority views will be reflected in the Minutes.

**Public Access.** All SAC meetings will be open to the public, including the media. Members of the public will be allowed to speak for a period of 15 minutes at the end of each meeting.

**Meeting Documentation.** All SAC meetings will be documented by means of Minutes drafted by project staff. Meetings will also be tape recorded for reference purposes only; tapes will not be transcribed. The Minutes will reflect any decisions reached by the group, as well as dissenting opinions. Minutes will be circulated to SAC members, alternates, and meeting attendees and made available to the public and press upon request. The agenda for the following meeting will be sent out with the Minutes.
Distribution of Materials by SAC Members. SAC members may prepare and distribute written materials for consideration by the full committee. All materials should be forwarded to the project team for distribution to the SAC within two weeks of the next meeting in order to provide adequate time for review by committee members. All information distributed by e-mail will be sent by regular mail as well.

Amendment of Operational Guidelines. The Operational Guidelines may be amended at any time deemed necessary by the SAC.
The first meeting of the New York State Department of Transportation’s (NYSDOT) Kosciuszko Bridge Project’s Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC) was held on Thursday, September 19, 2002 at Jennings Hall, Brooklyn. (See Attendance List, Attachment A) This initial meeting was scheduled to provide an overview of the project, discuss the community’s request for an independent community engineer, and establish operating and governance procedures for the Committee.

Helen Neuhaus, Helen Neuhaus & Associates Inc. (HNA), opened the meeting with welcoming remarks. Noting that the SAC will be a working committee, she thanked members for their commitment to an open, comprehensive process for determining the best alternative for the Kosciuszko Bridge. Ms. Neuhaus recommended that meetings be kept informal and interactive, with everyone working together and sharing ideas. Observing that the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process is complicated, she urged SAC members to ask questions along the way, stating that there are “no stupid questions.” After self introductions, Ms. Neuhaus turned the floor over to Douglas Currey, Regional Director, NYSDOT.

Mr. Currey expressed his pleasure at being present for the first meeting of the SAC, which he described as “a very important group.” Stating that he wants the Committee to develop the best solution for the bridge, he noted that NYSDOT will respect local concerns while meeting critical transportation needs. In response to several requests received during the scoping process, Mr. Currey announced that NYSDOT is recommending that the role of an independent community engineer be performed by a team of community advisors drawn from the University Transportation Research Center (UTRC). He indicated that Peter King, Planning and Development Supervisor, NYSDOT, would discuss this issue more fully later in the agenda.

Project Background/Update
Robert Adams, Project Manager, NYSDOT, described current conditions on the Kosciuszko Bridge, noting that the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway (BQE) is a heavily used interstate highway. Mr. Adams listed three primary reasons for the need for bridge improvements: traffic congestion, traffic safety and the deteriorated structural condition of the bridge. He added that due to a number of factors, including narrow lanes, lack of shoulders and steep grades on both sides of the bridge, the accident rate on the bridge is four times greater than the average accident rate for a similar highway facility in New York State. While stressing that the bridge is not unsafe, he noted that NYSDOT has spent more than $50 million over the past twelve years to keep the bridge in a good state of repair and will need to continue this aggressive maintenance schedule to ensure that the bridge is in safe, working order. He stated that the SAC will play an important role by providing input and helping to develop solutions to these problems throughout all stages of the project.

Steve Bennett, Consultant Team Project Manager, Parsons, outlined the EIS process and described the technical work currently being performed. He explained that last November, the project began with
the scoping stage of the EIS. Scoping is designed to identify the purpose and need, the range of alternatives, and the significant issues to be addressed in the EIS. Mr. Bennett noted that the project team is looking at a preliminary long list of alternatives, which was developed after numerous meetings with the community. These included 21 meetings with elected officials, Community Board representatives and civic organizations; 3 informational open houses; 3 bus tours with local residents; and 2 formal scoping meetings.

Mr. Bennett reported that a field survey to facilitate future mapping of the area has been completed. Work now underway includes traffic and marine data collection, and the initial stages of the alternatives analysis. He explained that the long list of alternatives will be reviewed by the SAC for further input. The list will then go through an initial screening process, during which the project’s goals and objectives will be used as a measure to screen the alternatives. Alternatives not eliminated during this process will be subjected to secondary screening, which will identify the most promising alternatives to be studied in detail in the Draft EIS.

Stakeholders Advisory Committee

Purpose and Functions

Ms. Neuhaus opened the discussion by introducing herself and her firm’s credentials in performing community outreach and consensus-building assignments. She noted that she has worked with advisory committees on transportation and environmental projects for the past thirty-five years and has successfully shepherded dozens of projects through the EIS process. While informing SAC members that the schedule will be vigorous and their work frustrating at times, Ms. Neuhaus assured the group that the project will be far superior in meeting the needs of the constituencies and stakeholders it is designed to serve after going through a public review process.

After reviewing the purpose and responsibilities of the SAC as outlined in the draft Operational Guidelines, Ms. Neuhaus asked for comments or questions. In response to a question from Cathryn Keeshan, United Forties Civic Association, she indicated that the process will be lengthy because NYSDOT wants to ensure that every voice is heard. Responding to further questions from Ms. Keeshan, Ms. Neuhaus replied that community fears can be allayed by providing people with information and listening to their concerns at every step of the process. She added that community meetings will be held in the future, at a time determined with the SAC’s input. In response to an inquiry from MaryAnna Zero, Maspeth Chamber of Commerce, Ms. Neuhaus stated that project information will be available to the public in English, Spanish, Italian and Polish.

Community Engineer

Mr. King reiterated that one of the common themes heard during the scoping process was the need for an independent community engineer who would help members of the public clearly understand the complex technical issues raised during the EIS process. In response to these requests, NYSDOT is proposing the formation of a Community Advisor Team (CAT). The CAT would be an advisory panel composed of top-level experts in a number of fields, including traffic planning and engineering, structural design and analysis, and environmental issues and would be drawn from the UTRC. (See Attachment B.) Stressing that selection of the CAT is not a “done deal”, Mr. King explained that the CAT would take the community engineer concept one step further by providing a team of experts with a range of expertise. After describing the role of the CAT, Mr. King stated that resumes of potential
CAT members are being collected for SAC review, if the Committee wishes to proceed with this approach.

In response to questions from Jon Orcutt, Tri-State Transportation Campaign, Mr. King explained that the contract for the CAT, which would be between NYSDOT and the UTRC, would allow the CAT to function independently of the Department. He noted that NYSDOT has worked with the academic community many times and has found it to be capable of tackling a broad range of diverse issues. Mr. Bennett added that as a consultant, a community engineer might rely on the state for business, thereby possibly compromising his or her independence, whereas a team of academics would not have such a vested interest. In response to Ms. Keeshan’s inquiry about the state’s experience with the UTRC, particularly the consortium’s success rate on projects, Mr. King noted that he thought highly of their thoroughness and expertise. He added that he is currently managing a project being done by the UTRC.

Responding to questions from Angelica Kofin, Assemblyman Joseph Lentol’s office, regarding how the CAT would function and the availability of CAT members for consultation, Mr. King stated that the work program could specify that the CAT must respond to requests from the SAC in a timely manner. In response to further discussion about the role of the CAT, Mr. King said that the SAC will determine how the CAT will function, which could include attending SAC meetings, making presentations, and other involvement.

Concerns were raised about the ability of the CAT to interpret data and discuss technical issues on a level that the SAC and members of the public could understand. Mr. King explained that because CAT members are teachers, they are extremely skilled at explaining complex issues to a general audience. Ms. Neuhaus added that although SAC members are not engineers, they are the project’s experts on local issues and will need to educate the project team and the CAT on community concerns.

The discussion turned to how an independent engineer or team of advisors would be selected. Theresa Cianciotta, Assemblyman Lentol’s office, noted that the Assemblyman had requested a community engineer, which had worked well on a previous BQE project. Annette LaMatto, resident, expressed her view that the consultant should be one person, chosen by the SAC, in order to truly represent the community. In response, Mr. Bennett explained that NYSDOT’s concept is for the SAC to select members of the CAT, including a project manager who would be a liaison to the SAC. Mr. Bennett further explained that the SAC would be able to review resumes and interview candidates, adding that approximately twelve resumes have been received from the UTRC with more expected. Christine Holowacz, resident, requested that independent consultants, as well as UTRC members, be invited to meet with the SAC.

In response to questions regarding the CAT budget, Mr. King noted that, similar to any project, the resources are not unlimited. After Ms. Kofin and Ms. Holowacz asked what that limit would be, Mr. King stated that the budget will depend on the work tasks determined by the SAC. He explained that NYSDOT has a pre-existing contract with the UTRC, but that it does not include specifics about the CAT. Michael Rossmy, Brooklyn Borough President Marty Markowitz’s office, pointed out that a consultant would have higher overhead costs than a team of academics, which should be a consideration when thinking about the budget.
Ms. LaMatto observed that the SAC has not yet come together as a cohesive group and needs time to
discuss the CAT among themselves before making a decision. Mr. King and Ms. Neuhaus concurred,
with Mr. King urging the group to take the matter under advisement. Ms. Neuhaus suggested that the
SAC may want to form a subcommittee to address the issue. She also stated that the SAC might wish
to review resumes and interview candidates to determine if the UTRC members appear to meet the
community’s need for independent review and advocacy.

After a brief break, Ms. Neuhaus returned to discussion of the Operational Guidelines, focusing on
SAC membership and governance.

SAC Organization and Management

• Membership
Ms. Neuhaus noted that the SAC had been formed with the goal of creating a broad, diverse committee
that is representative of the communities affected by Kosciuszko Bridge traffic and construction. In
response to a question from Ms. LaMatto, Ms. Neuhaus stated that the membership list was developed
after speaking with local residents, elected officials and representatives of civic organizations at
community meetings and public forums. In response to a question from Ms. Neuhaus to the SAC
regarding overall membership of the group, Mr. Rossmy observed that the SAC would need to see the
list of invited members before determining if there were any omissions, but noted that the Queens
Borough President’s office was not in attendance. Ms. Neuhaus explained that the Borough Engineer’s
department of that office was being disbanded but that the project team would follow-up to see if
anyone else could represent the Borough President.

• Decision-Making
Ms. Neuhaus observed that in her experience, reaching consensus is generally more effective than
governing by majority vote. She added that straw votes could be taken during a discussion to
determine the sense of the group on a particular issue and that the Minutes would reflect minority
views. Teresa Toro, Brooklyn Community Board #1, recommended, and Mr. Rossmy concurred, that
it would be preferable to leave the decision-making process loose until the group is fully up-to-speed.
Both supported the use of consensus for the present time. In response to a comment from Gary
Giordano, Queens Community Board #5, Ms. Neuhaus agreed that it won’t always be easy to reach
consensus but that the group should work toward that goal. She added that there may be times when a
vote will have to be taken, but that the SAC might choose to form a subcommittee to examine complex
issues in an attempt to reach consensus prior to reaching a point where voting is necessary.

• Facilitation
Ms. Neuhaus explained that a facilitator is not a chairperson, but more of a “drill sergeant” who keeps
the agenda moving and ensures that all of the issues are covered. Tina Filiato, OUTRAGE, suggested
that the facilitator be a “neutral” person, while Mr. Giordano asked if Ms. Neuhaus could continue to
facilitate SAC meetings. Ms. Neuhaus responded that she could, adding that the SAC could change
the arrangement at any time. The SAC agreed that Ms. Neuhaus would serve as its facilitator.

• Public Access
Ms. Neuhaus noted that by law, SAC meetings must be open to the public. After a brief discussion, it
was decided that members of the public would be given fifteen minutes at the end of each meeting to
provide their comments or questions. The media, if in attendance, will be allowed the same access as members of the public.

- Documentation
Various suggestions were made for documenting SAC meetings, including tape recording and transcription and tape recording without transcription but in conjunction with a written synopsis of the meeting. After Ms. Neuhaus noted that tape recording sometimes discourages people from speaking as openly or honestly as they would like, Mr. Giordano observed that SAC meetings are semi-public and that people expect their comments to be “on the record.” After a brief discussion, it was agreed that SAC meetings will be taped, but that the tapes will not be transcribed. Minutes summarizing the meeting will be distributed to SAC members for review prior to the next meeting.

- Other Issues
SAC members raised several issues, including the responsibilities of members; limiting the number of absences; the time and location of future meetings; and the naming of alternates. In response to Ms. Neuhaus’s suggestion that meetings alternate between Brooklyn and Queens, the group agreed that this is a fair solution; the idea of meeting in Manhattan was strongly opposed. The NYSDOT office in Long Island City was raised as a possible Queens meeting site, and it was agreed that the third Thursday of the month is a good time to meet. Ms. Neuhaus agreed with Ms. LaMatto’s comment that 47 (the number of people invited to serve on the SAC) is a large Committee, and suggested that the SAC may want to form subcommittees to address specific issues. Ms. Keeshan asked that the naming of alternates be tabled until SAC representatives have the chance to discuss this issue with their organizations. The final Operational Guidelines issue concerned distribution of materials to the SAC. Ms. Neuhaus suggested that any materials distributed by SAC members be distributed to the entire group in advance of the meeting.

In response to Mr. Orcutt’s request for a membership list with contact information, Ms. Neuhaus asked members to note their preferred method of receiving information (fax, e-mail, regular mail) on the sign-in sheet.

The next SAC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 17th at 6:30 P.M. The meeting will be held at the New York State Department of Transportation, Hunters Point Plaza, Room 820, 47-40 21st Street, Long Island City. (Meeting Agenda attached.)
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New York State Department of Transportation  
Kosciuszko Bridge Project  

Community Advisor Team  

Background  
During the scoping process, elected officials and community groups requested that the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) provide an independent “community engineer” to help the public understand the complex technical issues raised during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process. In response to these requests, NYSDOT has taken the community engineer suggestion one step further and is recommending the formation of a Community Advisor Team (CAT), which will work closely with the Project’s Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC).  

What is the CAT?  
The CAT will be an advisory team composed of top-level experts in the areas of traffic planning and engineering; structural design and analysis; socio-economic analysis; and environmental issues, including, but not limited to, air and water quality, noise and vibrations.  

CAT members will be drawn from the University Transportation Research Center (UTRC), a consortium of twelve universities located throughout the region, including New York University, Polytechnic University, City University of New York and Cornell University. The UTRC includes experienced faculty members and researchers who collectively have expertise in all technical fields relevant to the Kosciuszko Bridge Project. Because the EIS will cover a wide range of issues, it was determined that this broad range of expertise would best serve the needs of the community.  

As an academically based institution, the UTRC is aware of (and often on the cutting edge of) engineering advancements and procedures, and would present issues and findings in an unbiased manner.  

What is the Role of the CAT?  
The role of the CAT will become more fully developed as the EIS and the work of the SAC proceed. However, the following are expected to be key tasks that will be performed by the CAT:  

- Provide an independent review of key project documents developed in the course of the Alternatives Analysis and EIS processes, as requested by the SAC.  

- Meet with NYSDOT and its consultant team to become familiar with the project’s history, purpose and need, goals and objectives, EIS scope and schedule.
• Participate, as needed, in the SAC, including presenting the results of the CAT’s project reviews to the Committee or special sub-committees.

Overall, the CAT will provide an independent voice to ensure that the SAC and public-at-large fully understand the complex issues associated with the EIS analyses and recommendations.

**How Will the CAT be Formed?**

The UTRC will provide resumes of candidates for the CAT. Using criteria developed by the SAC and the project team, the SAC will review the resumes of potential candidates, interview candidates (if needed) and select members of the CAT. In addition to the CAT, the UTRC will provide the SAC with a list of specialists in other fields, to be called on as needed.

**How Will the CAT Function?**

The CAT will be available on an “on call” basis. Its role will be to review, advise, explain and interpret rather than to perform separate, parallel studies. In order to ensure the most effective use of budgetary resources, work performed by the CAT will be assigned by NYSDOT in consultation with the SAC. All reasonable SAC requests for independent consultation and review will be honored.

The SAC will also select a CAT Project Manager to be the main point of contact with NYSDOT and the SAC. The SAC will select one of its members to be its liaison with the CAT’s Project Manager.
The second meeting of the New York State Department of Transportation’s (NYSDOT) Kosciuszko Bridge Project’s Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC) was held on Thursday, October 17, 2002 at NYSDOT Region 11, Long Island City. (See Attendance List, Attachment A.) This meeting was scheduled to provide a project update, establish operating and governance procedures for the Committee, discuss the community’s request for an independent community advisor, and begin discussion of the project’s Goals and Objectives.

Subi Chakraborti, Deputy Regional Director, NYSDOT, and Jennifer Nelson, Director of Public Affairs, NYSDOT, opened the meeting with welcoming remarks. After self introductions, Helen Neuhaus, Helen Neuhaus & Associates Inc (HNA), reminded everyone that each group represented on the Committee should have one person sitting at the table. Guests and alternates will be seated in the public area and, pursuant to the draft Operational Guidelines discussed at the previous meeting, will be allowed 15 minutes speaking time at the end of the meeting. Ms. Neuhaus also noted that, as per the Guidelines, the meeting would be tape-recorded for reference purposes.

Old Business
In response to Ms. Neuhaus’ request for comments on the Minutes of the September 19, 2002 meeting, Christine Holowacz, resident, stated that the Minutes did not reflect all of her remarks concerning the issue of a community engineer. She noted that she had asked that independent consultants, as well as University Transportation Research Center (UTRC) members, be invited to attend a SAC meeting. Ms. Neuhaus replied that this item was included on a follow-up list that was distributed to the project team. She indicated that, in the future, the follow-up list would be attached to the Minutes.

Referring to the project update provided at the September meeting, Mary Gottlieb, Meeker Avenue/Apollo Street Association, inquired about the source of information regarding conditions and accident rates on the Kosciuszko Bridge. Robert Adams, Project Manager, NYSDOT, and Peter King, Planning Supervisor, NYSDOT, explained that this information came from the Department’s 1995 Traffic Study. In response to a question from Michael Rossmy, Brooklyn Borough President’s Office, Ms. Neuhaus stated that the September meeting Minutes would be revised and circulated to the SAC prior to reconsideration for adoption at the November meeting.

Ms. Neuhaus turned to the list of possible repositories, asking whether the list adequately meets the need for public access to project documents. She noted that the sites have not been contacted, pending SAC approval of the list. Mr. Rossmy stated that his Office has served as a repository site in the past and would be happy to do so again. Ms. Holowacz observed that including the Community Board Offices was a good idea and suggested the Leonard Street branch of the Brooklyn Public Library as another possible location. Ira Greenberg, Assemblywoman Catherine Nolan’s Office, suggested the Sunnyside Branch of the Queens Public Library. Ms. Neuhaus
agreed to explore these possibilities, adding that Parsons’ Manhattan Office has been included to provide an opportunity for people who work downtown to review documents on their lunch hour. Once the sites have been confirmed, project materials will be delivered. Documents will also be available for review on the project web site.

Operational Guidelines
In response to the SAC’s comments regarding the draft Operational Guidelines presented at the previous meeting, Ms. Neuhaus presented revised guidelines for the Committee’s review. After noting that the membership section has been expanded, she opened the floor for discussion.

Mr. Greenberg questioned the section of the Guidelines that restricted subcommittee membership to SAC members. In response to Mr. Rossmy’s observation that only a small number of SAC members were present at tonight’s meeting, Ms. Holowacz stated that it might be beneficial to supplement subcommittee membership with interested community residents. She added that this would further open up the process. Mr. Greenberg noted that removing the restriction would not necessarily require the inclusion of non-SAC members, but would allow for flexibility. In response to questions from Cathryn Keeshan, United Forties Civic Association, Ms. Neuhaus stated that the SAC will decide when a subcommittee is needed to address a specific issue and will select its members. She added that subcommittee members will be encouraged to attend both subcommittee meetings and full SAC meetings. Mr. King described another NYSDOT study where working groups have been formed that involve outside people with relevant areas of expertise. In response, Tina Filiato, OUTRAGE, spoke in favor of such an idea, stating that her organization includes several people with expertise in environmental and traffic issues who might become involved in a SAC subcommittee. Following this discussion, it was decided that the Operational Guidelines would read “Subcommittee membership will be determined by the SAC.”

Christopher McBride, Automobile Association of America, requested that the phrase “and regional transportation interests” be added to the sentence of the membership section reading “The SAC for the Kosciuszko Bridge Project will consist of approximately 40 members from Brooklyn and Queens.” In response, Anthony Parra, EWVIDCO, stated that the inclusion of regional groups would throw off the balance of membership, if it were based on the idea of equal representation from Brooklyn and Queens. Ms. Neuhaus and Ms. Holowacz noted that use of consensus for decision-making eliminates the need for equal representation from each borough, with Ms. Holowacz adding that working toward consensus will “bring us together.” The SAC agreed that the requested phrase would be added.

In response to Ms. Holowacz’ question regarding the protocol for amending the Operational Guidelines, Ms. Neuhaus answered that they could be changed at any time. The Guidelines will be amended, as requested by the SAC, to include this statement. After a brief discussion regarding the length of speaking time allotted to members of the public, it was agreed to leave the time at a total of 15 minutes, to be provided at the end of each meeting.

Ms. Neuhaus indicated that changes to the Operational Guidelines will be shown in bold italics or strikethrough. The revised Guidelines and Minutes will be sent to SAC members shortly; all future Minutes will be sent within two weeks of the following meeting. There were no further comments or questions about the Operational Guidelines.
Project Update

Mr. Adams reported that the project team’s recent public outreach efforts included a tour of Acme Steel’s facilities (September 27th); a presentation to the Brooklyn Borough Board (October 1st); and attendance at the Greenpoint Waterfront Association for Parks and Planning’s (GWAAP) annual meeting (October 2nd). He indicated that technical work is moving ahead. On September 24th, aerial photographs were taken to assist in the visualization of different bridge alternatives. The Joint Traffic Operations Center, located in Long Island City, is using cameras mounted at strategic points on highways and ramps to tape traffic patterns. This will help with traffic classifications (i.e. the types of vehicles using the bridge and highways). He further explained that later this month, traffic volume data (including pedestrian counts, turning movements and travel times and speeds) will be collected using automated traffic recorders and manual counts. This work, which will take place on the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway, the Kosciuszko Bridge, and local streets in the study area, is expected to be completed by Thanksgiving. Mr. Adams stated that the new data is needed to establish existing conditions in the project’s study area. It will update data collected in 1999 and shortly after September 11, 2001 (which does not reflect normal conditions). Mr. King added that the data is being collected in accordance with strict state standards.

In response to a question from Mr. Rossmy, Mr. Adams explained that counts will be performed 24 hours/day during typical mid-week and weekend traffic times (Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and Saturday). Michael Hofmann, GWAAP, observed that significant waterfront development is expected within the next four to five years and asked if the traffic studies will take this into account. Steve Bennett, Parsons, explained that the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will consider all projects proposed between now and the design year, which is 30 years after the completion of the project. Mr. King added that the “No Build” alternative being studied as part of the EIS will examine all currently committed projects and plans. He noted that, in many ways, trying to determine what conditions will look like in the future without the bridge project is one of the most important and challenging pieces of the EIS.

Project Goals and Objectives

Ms. Neuhaus stated that the development of Goals and Objectives is one of the early steps in preparing an EIS and allows the SAC, as a group, to raise important community concerns. Prior to discussing specific Goals and Objectives, she provided a brief overview of the EIS process and its importance in protecting both the built and natural environment. Ms. Neuhaus explained that the EIS is part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), legislation passed in 1969 in response to the impact of major road building on communities. NEPA requires any project using federal funds to study the environmental, social, cultural, historic and economic impacts of a project. While NEPA only requires public notification and hearings, public participation efforts since 1969 have expanded the community’s role and now routinely include Citizens Advisory Committees. Ms. Neuhaus emphasized that although the Kosciuszko Bridge Project’s public involvement program includes many different ways to share information and hear local concerns, the SAC will play an extremely important role in the process.

She further explained that the Goals and Objectives, which will be included in the EIS, are used to evaluate project alternatives. She described a goal as a broad policy statement and an objective as the means or strategy used to achieve the goal. Referring to a handout, Ms. Neuhaus noted that
preliminary Transportation Goals and Objectives have been developed based on comments received from the public during the scoping process; these were contained in the Draft Scoping Memorandum, but are open for discussion. Ms. Neuhaus also referred to a list of possible categories around which the SAC could develop additional Goals and Objectives. Pat Monte, Project Manager, Vollmer Associates, noted that Goals and Objectives could be very detailed and that the SAC may wish to form a subcommittee to draft them.

In response to Mr. Rossmy’s question, Ms. Neuhaus indicated that the listed categories cover the scope of the EIS. Steve Martin, Acme Steel, expressed concern about the uncertainty of trying to run a business until the estimated time of construction without concrete information about bridge design and construction and how these will affect the operation of his company. Mr. King acknowledged these concerns and noted that the Goals and Objectives could address neighborhood character and quality of life; Ms. Neuhaus added that one objective could express the need to minimize impacts on businesses and residences. When Mr. Martin questioned the length of time the EIS will take, Mr. King asked that he “stay with the process” and noted that as the project moves forward, the SAC will see how many pieces are involved. However, he added that NYSDOT will look at every opportunity to accelerate the schedule. Mr. Adams added that information will be shared with the SAC as soon as it is developed.

Noting that many neighborhoods in the project study area have unique characteristics, Ms. Keeshan stated that it is important to understand the environmental impacts on each before moving forward. Ms. Neuhaus pointed out that the technical studies are just starting, and this information will not be ready for several months. She reiterated the importance of developing the Goals and Objectives first and suggested that one objective could reflect the importance of protecting and preserving community character.

In the discussion that followed, SAC members expressed their concern about developing Goals and Objectives without a clear understanding of the issues involved in the EIS and without the assistance of a community engineer. After Ms. Neuhaus noted that Goals and Objectives do not need to be technical but should reflect the community’s priorities and concerns, Mr. Parra suggested that the project team prepare draft Goals and Objectives for the SAC’s review. Teresa Toro, Brooklyn Community Board #1, objected to the team drafting the list but indicated that she did not feel she had enough information to proceed. Mr. Adams offered to provide Ms. Toro and Community Board #1’s Transportation Committee with a briefing. Ms. Neuhaus then asked for a straw poll to determine if the SAC had reached consensus on having the team draft Goals and Objectives for the Committee’s review. There was general agreement, with the exception of Ms. Toro, who assented to the group’s wishes.

Community Advisor
Mr. Monte introduced the subject of a community advisor for the SAC by inviting the Committee to discuss the qualifications they are seeking in such a person or persons. He noted that criteria raised at the previous meeting included availability and the ability to speak to the group in a non-technical manner. Ms. Holowacz and Ms. Filiato added the following qualifications: experience working with grassroots community groups and/or advisory committees; experience with the EIS process; expertise/knowledge of issues that will be studied in the EIS, including environmental, traffic and structural issues; and ability to serve as a strong advocate for the community. In addition, SAC
members stressed that relevant experience is more important than educational background or publications. Mr. Martin added that the selected person or firm should have consistently available resources.

In response to Mr. Martin’s question about the means of finding possible candidates, Mr. Monte replied that the project team will report back on the course to be selected but will look for people who meet the SAC’s criteria. Responding to a question from Ms. Filiato, Mr. Monte indicated that the candidates will be drawn from the UTRC and other sources. Referring to the community engineer working with the Newtown Creek Sewage Treatment Plant Monitoring Committee, Ms. Holowacz and Ms. Filiato described the process by which that person was hired. They noted that a Request for Proposals (RFP) was issued and candidates interviewed. The consulting firm EnviroSciences was chosen, and a single individual from the company was selected to work with the Committee.

In response to questions about the budget for the community advisor, Mr. Adams stated that $300,000 will be allocated to cover the EIS period (approximately three years.). He stressed that this amount is just a starting point that can be adjusted depending on the SAC’s needs. Mr. Monte added that the budget is based on the number of reports to be reviewed and analyzed, among other factors. Ms. Holowacz remarked that $300,000 might not be sufficient and stated that the Newtown Creek Committee’s community advisor is funded at $100,000 a year. In the discussion that followed, it was noted that the Newtown Creek project is in the construction phase which, Ms. Neuhaus noted, would require a different level of commitment from a community advisor than the EIS phase. Ms. Holowacz agreed that this may be true, adding that it would be important to have a paid liaison between the SAC, the community advisor and NYSDOT. In response, Ms. Neuhaus stated that her firm could fill that role by addressing SAC requests and helping with some of the day-to-day logistics.

Other Business
In response to Mr. Martin’s inquiry regarding survey and traffic count work that he recently witnessed in the project area, it was indicated that NYSDOT had not yet begun its work. However, the project team agreed to investigate who was working in the area and why.

Mr. Martin asked if an online bulletin board could be created for SAC members to communicate with each other. Ms. Neuhaus noted that, in an e-mail to HNA, Ms. Toro had suggested that the Minutes be posted on the project website. However, due to agency logistics, NYSDOT may not be able to post information in a timely manner. In response, Mr. Martin explained that the bulletin board could be established through a Yahoo group, rather than through the website. The project team will look into this idea.

Public Comment Period
Laura Hofmann, Barge Park Pals and an alternate for GWAPP, requested that the redevelopment of the Brooklyn waterfront and the resulting population increases be reflected in the Goals and Objectives. Noah Arnow, Councilman Eric Gioia’s office, added that population increases in Long Island City are also a concern and noted that the bridge must be completed before the 2012 Olympics.
Upcoming Events
In light of the proximity of the third Thursday to Thanksgiving and Christmas, it was decided to change the next two SAC meeting dates to Tuesday, November 19th (Brooklyn location) and Tuesday, December 17th (Queens location). Both meetings will begin at 6:30 p.m. The location of the November 19th meeting was subsequently confirmed as Jennings Hall, 260 Powers Street, Brooklyn. The December 17th meeting will be held at NYSDOT, Region 11.

Follow-Up Items

1. Prepare and circulate list of meeting follow-up items to SAC. Responsibility: HNA.
2. Revise minutes of September 19th SAC meeting to reflect comments received. (Additions/changes to be noted in bold italics.) Circulate revised minutes to SAC for adoption at November meeting. Responsibility: HNA.
4. Contact proposed repository sites to assess willingness to serve as repository location. Investigate possibility of adding Sunnyside Branch of the Queens Borough Public Library and the Leonard Street Branch of the Brooklyn Public Library as repository locations. Responsibility: HNA.
5. Revise discussion draft of Operational Guidelines and distribute to SAC. (Additions/changes to be noted in bold italics.) Responsibility: HNA.
6. Provide copy of Draft Scoping Memorandum to Teresa Toro. Responsibility: HNA.
7. Identify other agencies that have been collecting traffic data in the study area and obtain information, if appropriate. Contact New York City Department of Transportation’s SAC representative to assist with identification of related data collection efforts in area. Responsibility: R. Adams, NYSDOT.
8. Prepare preliminary draft of project goals and objectives for review by SAC. Responsibility: Project Team.
9. Develop list of technical studies to be conducted as part of the project, along with projected timeframes. Responsibility: Project Team.
11. Notify Mary Gottlieb when minutes will be available via email. Responsibility: HNA.
12. Identify Brooklyn location for November SAC meeting. Responsibility: HNA.
13. Follow-up with non-attendees to SAC meetings. Responsibility: HNA.
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The third meeting of the New York State Department of Transportation’s (NYSDOT) Kosciuszko Bridge Project’s Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC) was held on Tuesday, November 19, 2002 at Jennings Hall, Brooklyn. (See Attachment A for Attendance List.) This meeting was scheduled to provide a project update and overview of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, finalize operating and governance procedures for the Committee, and discuss the community’s request for an independent advisor.

Old Business
Helen Neuhaus, Helen Neuhaus & Associates Inc (HNA), reminded everyone that each group represented on the Committee should have one person sitting at the table. Guests and alternates should be seated in the public area and, pursuant to the draft Operational Guidelines, will be allowed 15 minutes speaking time at the end of the meeting.

Following self introductions, Ms. Neuhaus asked for comments on the revised Operational Guidelines and September 19th SAC meeting minutes, which were distributed prior to the meeting. There were no comments, and both documents were adopted as revised. Ms. Neuhaus then asked for comments on the Minutes of the October 17th meeting. Referring to the Project Update, Richard Beers, Federal Highway Administration, requested that the term “horizon year” be replaced with “design year” and that the Minutes reflect that the design year is thirty years after completion of the project. Ira Greenberg, Assemblywoman Catherine Nolan’s Office noted that he had not received the October Minutes. A copy was provided, and Ms. Neuhaus assured Mr. Greenberg that the SAC Membership List would be checked to ensure that all addresses are correct. As there were no further comments, the Minutes of the October 17, 2002 meeting were adopted with the suggested changes.

Ms. Neuhaus then facilitated a discussion of responses to issues and concerns raised at that meeting. These included the following:

- In response to a request from Steve Martin, Acme Steel, to identify agencies that have been collecting traffic data in the study area, Robert Adams, Project Manager, NYSDOT, reported that two transportation projects are currently in the data collection phase: long-range planning for the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway (BQE) Park Avenue Viaduct (NYSDOT) and rehabilitation of the Grand Street Bridge (New York City Department of Transportation/United States Coast Guard). In addition, there are three other projects in the study area that may currently involve traffic counting: the Cross Harbor Freight Tunnel (New York City Economic Development Corporation); Newtown Creek street ends in Queens (New York City Department of City Planning); and remediation of the Phelps-Dodge site in Maspeth (New York State Department of Environmental Conservation/New York State Department of Health). Mr. Adams added that he and Steve Bennett, Project Manager, Parsons, attended a public hearing the previous week.
regarding the Phelps-Dodge remediation plan. He encouraged SAC members to inform the project team of any similar meetings in the Kosciuszko Bridge Project study area.

In response to a question from Barbara Mihelic, Noble Street Block Association, Mr. Adams stated that the proposed addition of tolls on East River bridges will be taken into account during the project’s traffic studies. Mr. Bennett noted that tolls are not proposed for the BQE and that current technology allows drivers to pass through toll facilities without stopping, thereby maintaining the flow of traffic. Michael Rossmy, Brooklyn Borough President’s Office, observed that traffic is likely to be redistributed along the I-278 Corridor even if new toll collection technologies are installed. Peter King, Planning Supervisor, NYSDOT, added that the implementation of tolls on the East River bridges would probably require an EIS.

Ms. Mihelic asked if the SAC would have access to data gathered through state and city projects. In response, Mr. King and Mr. Adams answered that NYSDOT would share all data relating to the Kosciuszko Bridge and Park Avenue Viaduct projects, when the information is available. However, they could not guarantee that other agencies would make their data available to the public.

In response to the SAC’s previous request to add the Leonard Street Branch of the Brooklyn Public Library and the Sunnyside Branch of the Queens Public Library to the list of repository sites, Ms. Neuhaus indicated that these locations have been added. Representatives of all the sites were contacted and have agreed to accept documents. The project team is in the process of distributing documents to each of the sites.

In response to the SAC’s interest in establishing an internet group to facilitate communication between SAC members, Mr. Bennett explained that the easiest way to do so would be through a Yahoo group. He indicated that he had established a site on behalf of the SAC but emphasized that the SAC is free to set up its own site. Mr. Bennett then distributed a handout (see Attachment B) about Yahoo groups, described how they work, and noted that while members of the Yahoo group must subscribe to Yahoo, the service is free. Mr. King and Mr. Bennett added that the project team could hold a training session and send written instructions to the SAC. In response to a related question, Mr. Bennett indicated that unlike the project web site (http://www.dot.state.ny.us/reg/r11/kosciuszko/kosciuszkohome.html), which is available to everyone, the Yahoo site could only be accessed by SAC members. As a follow-up to concerns about members of the public who do not have internet access, Ms. Neuhaus assured the group that project updates and other documents will be sent to the offices of elected officials, community boards and the local media, as well as the repository sites.

In response to a request for a list of technical studies to be performed as part of the EIS, Ms. Neuhaus stated that the list is available at the sign-in table. (See Attachment C.)

Following up on a question regarding the Cross Harbor Tunnel project and its impact on the Kosciuszko Bridge Project study area, Mr. King explained that the EIS process requires that all activities proposed for or underway within the study area be considered.
EIS: The First Steps
Pat Monte, Project Manager, Vollmer Associates, began a discussion of the EIS process by observing that the EIS is simply a report that is issued in draft, and then final, form. Mr. Monte identified the elements of an EIS by distributing a sample Table of Contents (see Attachment D), which was based on the EIS for the Route 9A (Manhattan) Project. After briefly reviewing the chapter headings, Mr. Monte encouraged SAC members to study the details later. Referring to the Project Milestone chart (see Attachment E), he noted that the process is lengthy, with the Draft EIS scheduled for completion in late 2004, final design and contract award anticipated at the end of 2007 and construction scheduled to start in 2008. Mr. Monte explained that because alternatives for the replacement or rehabilitation of the Kosciuszko Bridge will be analyzed in the context of the Goals and Objectives, it is important to develop these early in the process.

Ms. Mihelic raised the issue of a community advisor, noting that the community engineer for the Newtown Creek Monitoring Committee has helped that committee understand technical issues. Mr. Monte stated that the reason for reviewing an EIS Table of Contents is for the SAC to see the types of issues that a community advisor will have to address. He also urged Committee members to avoid selling themselves short, adding, “you’re the real expert on community issues.” Ms. Neuhaus indicated that the community advisor issue would be discussed later in the agenda.

In response to a question from Gus Amato, United Forties Neighborhood Association, Mr. Monte clarified that a short list of alternatives will be studied in the Draft EIS and presented to the public for comments at a Public Hearing. Mr. Beers added that all comments on the Draft EIS will be reviewed before a Final EIS is prepared. Following completion of the Final EIS, a Record of Decision (ROD), which describes the selected alternative, will be prepared. The ROD is expected in 2005. Ms. Mihelic asked if the EIS would be updated periodically to reflect changing traffic conditions. Mr. Bennett replied that all activities proposed for the next 30 years will be studied in the EIS. In response to a question from Vincent Arcuri, Queens Community Board #5, regarding the updating of baseline conditions, Mr. King stated that the purpose of a baseline study is to ‘freeze’ data at a specific point in time in order to measure future conditions against current conditions. Annette LaMatto, resident, expressed concern about establishing an accurate, comprehensive baseline report. Ms. Neuhaus replied that the SAC will be able to review all data and data sources.

Community Advisor
Mr. Monte opened the discussion by stating that an avenue exists to retain a community advisor through the University Transportation Research Center (UTRC). He explained that the project team has collected resumes from the UTRC and other universities for the SAC’s review, adding that individual candidates for the community advisor team may also be recommended by the SAC. However, firms may not be added to the list of potential candidates.

Ms. LaMatto remarked that the discussion has not progressed since the September meeting in that the SAC is still considering NYSDOT’s suggestions for a community advisor, rather than the Committee’s recommendations. After noting that the community advisor should be selected by the SAC, Ms. LaMatto added that the advisor, if hired by NYSDOT, would work for NYSDOT, not the community. She urged the SAC to make this decision together, as a group. Mr. Monte responded by indicating that the five individuals whose resumes were included in the
EnviroSciences packet (submitted by Ms. LaMatto on behalf of Christine Holowacz, who was unable to attend the meeting) could be considered individually. However, NYSDOT’s contractual arrangements are designed to retain individuals, not firms, through the UTRC. Mr. Monte emphasized that the SAC could still choose whichever individuals it prefers.

Ms. Neuhaus reviewed the criteria identified by the SAC at its October meeting: availability; ability to speak to community groups in a non-technical manner; experience working on similar projects; experience working with grassroots community groups and/or advisory committees; experience with the EIS process and expertise/knowledge of issues to be addressed in the EIS, including environmental, traffic and structural issues; ability to serve as a strong advocate for the community; and consistently available resources.

A lengthy discussion ensued concerning the community advisor issue. A summary of comments, questions and responses is provided below:

- In response to Mr. Arcuri’s comment that no consultant would leave a secure job with a firm to work as a community advisor, Mr. Bennett explained that the Kosciuszko Bridge Project would not be a full-time job. The selected person would work as an independent consultant and be paid through the UTRC.
- Ms. LaMatto expressed concern that academics would be unfamiliar with the community and unable to talk to members of the public on an understandable level.
- In response to a comment from Evelyn Cruz, Congresswoman Nydia Velazquez’s Office, regarding the community engineer on the Meeker Avenue project, Ms. Neuhaus drew a distinction between the construction phase of a project, which is more defined, and the EIS phase, which will require advisors with a broad range of expertise.
- In response to a request from Anthony Parra, EWVIDCO, for clarification of the community advisor’s relationship with the UTRC, it was explained that although the UTRC would be the funding mechanism, it would not play a role in evaluating the community advisor’s job performance. The SAC would have that responsibility.
- Ms. LaMatto asked why a firm could not be retained. Mr. Bennett reiterated that a firm could be significantly more expensive due to overhead costs. He also noted that the UTRC would have a broader range of expertise and be capable of serving as an advisor independent of NYSDOT. Mr. Arcuri added that although an individual would not have the available resources of a firm, cost is an issue; he advocated that a compromise be found. Mr. King indicated that questions regarding resources could be directly addressed to the candidates.
- Ms. LaMatto remarked that Greenpoint and Williamsburg are burdened with many environmental hazards, which will only increase during bridge reconstruction and that the health concerns of the community are more important than the state’s financial considerations. She urged SAC members to “make wise choices” and suggested that NYSDOT create a budget line for the community advisor.
- Mr. Greenberg expressed interest in reviewing the resumes of potential candidates in order to determine the level of resources behind each. He added that he is familiar with the UTRC which, because of its affiliation with several universities, may have readily available resources.
- In response to a question from Mr. Arcuri, Ms. Neuhaus replied that the community advisor would research any issue requested by the SAC.
A brief discussion ensued regarding the formation of a subcommittee to review resumes and interview candidates, if necessary. Ms. Neuhaus noted that the subcommittee should reflect the diversity of the SAC. Mr. Parra suggested that the subcommittee be composed of three members from Brooklyn and three from Queens. The following SAC members expressed interest in serving: Dolores Rizzotto, Queens Community Board #2; Vincent Arcuri; Anthony Parra; Mary Gottlieb, Meeker Avenue/Apollo Street Block Association; Annette LaMatto; Barbara Mihelic; Michael Hofmann, GWAPP; and Anthony Nunziato, Queens resident. Ms. LaMatto also nominated Christine Holowacz, Brooklyn resident, who was not present at the meeting. Ms. Neuhaus asked the Brooklyn group to narrow its choices to three during the 10-minute break. (Following a discussion among the Brooklyn representatives, Ms. LaMatto reported that she, Ms. Holowacz, and Ms. Gottlieb would represent Brooklyn on the subcommittee.) Ms. LaMatto stated that the subcommittee meeting, which was tentatively scheduled for Monday, December 9th at the Office of Queens Community Board #2, did not require project team attendance. The subcommittee asked for a written statement describing how the UTRC would function.

A packet of resumes of potential community advisor candidates was distributed to SAC members. In addition, they received information on EnviroSciences, including team qualifications and resumes. (Copies of both sets of materials are attached for SAC members not present at the meeting.) In response to Ms. LaMatto’s inquiry regarding the designation of project manager on the cover sheet of the packet of resumes, Mr. Bennett explained that the project manager would be the main contact person between the Community Advisor Team and the SAC. In response to Ms. LaMatto’s question concerning whether selecting a firm is a possibility, Mr. King and Mr. Bennett encouraged the SAC to review the resumes of potential candidates before passing judgment. Mr. Bennett specifically noted that the project team worked hard to identify qualified candidates and that several have experience in the study area.

Other Business
- In response to Ms. Neuhaus’ inquiry regarding possible meeting locations in Queens, it was suggested that the Sunnyside Community Center be investigated for the December meeting. It was agreed that the team would try to secure Jennings Hall for the January meeting.
- There was a brief discussion regarding remediation, ownership and future use of the Phelps-Dodge site. Mr. Arcuri observed that the property is a potential landing site for a new Kosciuszko Bridge, adding that Queens Community Board #5 has asked Queens Borough President Helen Marshall for a two-year moratorium on any development of the site. He added that the Board supports remediation of the site. Mr. Nunziato noted that a trucking business is interested in obtaining the property. He stated that the site should be completely cleaned so that there will not be any problems if the new bridge is built at this location. Ms. Neuhaus indicated that the project team will keep the SAC apprised of this issue.
- Mr. Nunziato reported that the Transit Authority is preparing an EIS for its proposed all-borough bus depot on Grand Avenue, one block from the Grand Avenue Bridge. This facility will serve as a repair site for all New York City buses and will operate 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. It will include a 700-car employee parking lot.

Public Comment Period
- Laura Hofmann, Barge Park Pals, expressed her discomfort with the idea of projecting baseline information forward thirty years, given the re-zoning and development projects.
proposed for the study area. She stated that the community needs assurance that the baseline data will be re-evaluated periodically.

- Steve Gottlieb, resident, suggested that the existing Kosciuszko Bridge be torn down and replaced with a lower, more level bridge of the same size to avoid the demolition of houses. Ms. Neuhaus answered that this would be one of the alternatives reviewed. Mr. King added that a great deal of engineering and analysis needs to be done before NYSDOT decides on any property takings. Mr. Gottlieb also questioned the project timeline, stating that the project began five or six years ago, but was stopped due to financial problems. He asked if it would be stopped again given the current budget situation. In response, Mr. King explained that although a preliminary bridge rehabilitation investigation was conducted several years ago, the EIS process did not start at that time. He added that the earlier project was stopped when NYSDOT realized that rehabilitation would not address several project issues. Mr. Beers noted that the EIS process began in April 2002 when the Notice of Intent was published in the Federal Register. In response to further questions, Mr. King and Mr. Adams stated that the EIS is fully funded and that the possibility of holding the 2012 Olympics in New York City will not impact the project.

Subsequent to the meeting, it was discovered that the December 17th SAC meeting conflicted with another important community meeting. In light of this conflict, and the upcoming holidays, the next SAC meeting will be held on Thursday, January 16th at 6:30 p.m., in the Sunnyside Community Services Cafeteria, 43-31 39th Street, Sunnyside.

Follow-up Items
1. Coordinate with Mayor’s Office and appropriate agencies regarding status of Phelps-Dodge site. Responsibility: Project Team.
2. Obtain information and remain informed of work related to EIS being prepared for all-borough bus depot proposed for Grand Avenue. Responsibility: Steve Bennett, Parsons.
3. Suggestion to invite representative of trucking company (potential buyer of Phelps-Dodge site) to future SAC meeting. Responsibility: Project Team.
4. Schedule work session with SAC to “walk through” use of Yahoo site. Responsibility: Steve Bennett, Parsons.
5. Distribute Yahoo address to all SAC members with email addresses. Responsibility: Steve Bennett, Parsons.
7. Request for background information on UTRC. Responsibility: Robert Adams, NYSDOT.
8. Request for written clarification of relationship between UTRC and community advisor, along with explanation of funding mechanism. Responsibility: Steve Bennett, Parsons.
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At the October 17, 2002 Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC) meeting, the committee asked if an electronic bulletin board system (BBS) could be established. The purpose of the BBS would be to encourage discussion of project issues amongst SAC members outside of the group’s limited meeting time.

A BBS can be an effective means of communicating messages to and facilitating discussion amongst large groups of individuals. Anyone with access to a computer can post messages to the bulletin board for others in the group to read and reply to. Thus a virtual “discussion” can be carried out among members of the group. The BBS can also be used to disseminate information from the Project Team, such as meeting reminders, to members of the SAC. The system can also include a calendar with meeting times/locations for the SAC and individual subcommittees and is capable of handling electronic files up to 5 MB. Finally the system can be used to take a poll of all the members, such as when/where to hold the next meeting or what kind of food the group wants.

Prior to establishment of the BBS however, the SAC needs to address several issues about the goals and scope of the BBS. A BBS can be set up with a number of different parameters controlling who is permitted to read and post messages on the BBS. The two primary areas of control are:

- **Access:** The BBS can be set up so that only identified individuals (such as SAC members and their alternates) can access the BBS. The alternative is that the BBS is open to anyone with any interest in the project.

- **Moderation:** The BBS can be set up as an “open” or a “moderated” forum. In an “open” format, anyone with access to the BBS (see above) can post messages freely without any control over content. Under a “moderated” system, a single user must approve any messages that are to be posted on the BBS.

- **Receiving Messages:** Members of the group can choose several different methods of receiving messages from the group to meet their individual needs: (1) individual emails, (2) a daily batch of messages, or (3) web-based viewing (no emails).

The choices that are made in these areas of control depend on the group’s goals for the BBS. If the system is intended to facilitate discussion amongst members of the SAC only, then a restricted membership should be considered. However, if the goal were for the SAC to gather input from the broader community, an open membership would be appropriate. Likewise, if the purpose of the BBS is the free and open sharing of ideas and comments, an un-moderated system would be appropriate, whereas if the purpose is primarily the dissemination of information from the project team or members of the group a moderated format may be more appropriate. Of course, a moderated BBS...
requires a certain amount of dedication on the part of the designated moderator to read and approve messages in a timely manner.

A primary consideration in establishing a BBS for the SAC is the provision for those who do not have Internet access and therefore would not be able to participate in the forum. One of the primary functions of the BBS is to quickly share information and ideas amongst a group. The exclusion of a portion of the group would significantly diminish the effectiveness of the BBS. If in order to include those that don’t have Internet access, printed copies of posts must be mailed or faxed periodically, the effectiveness of the system would also be reduced.
**KOSCIUSZKO BRIDGE TECHNICAL STUDIES**

Below is a list of the key technical memos that will be completed during the Kosciuszko Bridge Project and the section of the Draft EIS that each supports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Memo #</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>EIS Section Supported</th>
<th>Scheduled Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T-1</td>
<td>Existing Conditions</td>
<td>Goals and methods of data collection effort and description of database created</td>
<td>Existing Conditions</td>
<td>March 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-2</td>
<td>Baseline Traffic &amp; Transportation Data Summary</td>
<td>Current traffic and transportation conditions</td>
<td>Existing Conditions</td>
<td>March 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-3</td>
<td>Traffic Forecasting Methods &amp; Results</td>
<td>Method of traffic modeling process and manner that the results of Design Year traffic forecasts will be presented</td>
<td>Project Alternatives</td>
<td>October 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>Initial Definition of Alternatives Screening Process</td>
<td>How initial alternatives are selected, screening criteria, long list of alternatives, method of analyzing alternatives</td>
<td>Project Alternatives Draft</td>
<td>May 2003 Final February 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-2</td>
<td>Purpose &amp; Need, Rationale for Alternatives &amp; Fatal Flaw Analysis</td>
<td>Purpose and need, goals and objectives, fatal flaw screening process and results, and outreach efforts associated with screening</td>
<td>Purpose &amp; Need, Project Alternatives</td>
<td>Draft March 2003 Final April 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-3</td>
<td>Fatal Flaw Analysis</td>
<td>Detail the results of the fatal flaw screening process</td>
<td>Project Alternatives</td>
<td>May 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-4</td>
<td>Rationale and Methods for Comparative Analysis</td>
<td>Selection criteria/Methods of Evaluation used to rank alternatives; public outreach activities</td>
<td>Project Alternatives</td>
<td>September 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-5</td>
<td>Comparative Analysis &amp; Conceptual Design Report</td>
<td>Rationale for the selection of alternatives for detailed consideration in the DR/DEIS</td>
<td>Project Alternatives</td>
<td>May 2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below are additional sections that will be completed the EIS:

**Additional Technical Studies**

- Land Use, Socioeconomic, Environmental Justice
- Noise Study
- Air Quality
- Ecology and Endangered Species
- Water Bodies and Wetlands
- Cultural Historic Resources
- Hazardous Waste/Contaminated Materials
- Visual Impact Assessment

The potential impacts of those alternatives that advance to the Draft EIS will be analyzed in each of these sections.
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Kosciuszko Bridge - Milestone Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Process</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Scoping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Existing Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Alternatives Review / Draft EIS / Alternative Selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Technical Environmental Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Final EIS / Record of Decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Final Design / Award                |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Construction                        |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Public Outreach                     |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |

October 17, 2012
The fourth meeting of the New York State Department of Transportation’s (NYSDOT) Kosciuszko Bridge Project’s Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC) was held on Thursday, January 16, 2003 at the Sunnyside Community Center (see Attachment A for Attendance List). This meeting was scheduled to continue the discussion related to the community’s request for an independent advisor and to finalize the project’s goals and objectives.

Old Business
Helen Neuhaus, Helen Neuhaus & Associates Inc. (HNA), opened the meeting by welcoming Douglas A. Currey, Regional Director, NYSDOT Region 11 and other NYSDOT staff in attendance. She reminded everyone that each group represented on the committee should have one person at the table and that alternates and members of the public would be allowed to speak during the Public Session at the end of the meeting. Ms. Neuhaus then made two announcements: 1) Denise Woodin, HNA, is not present at tonight’s meeting because she has recently returned from China where she adopted a baby and 2) Mary Gottlieb, Meeker Avenue/Apollo Street Block Association and SAC member, suffered a serious injury in a fall shortly before Christmas and is currently undergoing rehabilitation.

In response to Ms. Neuhaus’ request for comments on the Minutes of the November 19, 2002 SAC meeting, Michael Rossmy, Brooklyn Borough President’s office, clarified a point he made regarding proposed East River tolls and the redistribution of traffic. He stated that he was referring to traffic along the I-278 corridor, not in the local communities. As there were no further comments, the Minutes of the November 19, 2002 meeting were adopted with the suggested change.

Ms. Neuhaus then facilitated a discussion of responses to issues and concerns raised at previous meetings. These included the following:

- In response to a request for further information regarding the citywide bus depot proposed for Grand Street, Steve Bennett, Parsons, noted that the subconsultant performing traffic studies for that project is the same firm conducting traffic studies for the Kosciuszko Bridge project. The subconsultant informed Mr. Bennett that the bus depot is currently on hold; however, potential traffic generated by that project will be taken into consideration by NYSDOT when evaluating alternatives for the bridge.

- Referring to the SAC attendance chart, Ms. Neuhaus observed that forty-two people were originally invited to serve on the committee. Thirteen people have never attended a meeting, while a few others have attended only one of the three meetings held to date. During the discussion that followed, concerns were raised about removing elected officials from the SAC. Michael Den Dekker, Assemblywoman Margaret Markey’s office, stated that some elected officials may not realize that they are not being represented at SAC meetings. As a partial response, Ms. Neuhaus reiterated that the SAC
is a working committee; members who do not attend regularly are not up-to-date on the committee’s work and place an unfair burden on regular attendees.

In response to a remark by Gus Amato, United Forties Civic Association, that certain people may have attended the first meeting for the sole purpose of seeking information about property takings, Ms. Neuhaus repeated that this information will not be available for a very long time. She explained that one of the committee’s primary roles is to help shape the alternative selection process, thereby protecting the community’s interests.

It was again noted that committee members should be encouraged to attend meetings in order to fully participate in the decision-making process. Ms. Neuhaus observed that on another project that she is facilitating, the advisory committee requested that letters be sent to non-attendees. Those who did not respond (in writing, by telephone or by attending the following meeting) were removed from the committee.

After further discussion, the SAC asked the project team to draft two different letters: one to individuals and representatives of organizations or businesses who have never attended a meeting, reminding them of their absences and allowing them an additional opportunity to participate; and one to elected officials, alerting them to their non-attendance status and encouraging them to participate. Ms. Neuhaus emphasized that anyone removed from the committee would remain on the overall mailing list and would continue to receive information about the project.

- In response to a question from Annette LaMatto, Brooklyn resident, Ms. Neuhaus indicated that it is not necessary to replace members who are dropped from the committee. In a related comment, she noted that Mr. Bennett recently spoke with Philip Galasso, who plans to purchase the Phelps-Dodge property. During that conversation, Mr. Galasso expressed interest in participating in the SAC. Ms. Neuhaus reminded the group that adding new members is a SAC decision. After a brief discussion, the SAC agreed to invite Mr. Galasso to join the committee.

- Ms. Neuhaus reported that the information repositories are up and running at all sites. Project materials generated thus far have been forwarded to the repositories, and new materials will be sent as they are produced.

Community Advisor
Dolores Rizzotto, Queens Community Board #2, reported on the December 9, 2002 meeting of the subcommittee that was formed to review resumes for a community advisor. In addition to Ms. Rizzotto, subcommittee members who attended the meeting were: Anthony Nunziato, Queens resident; Vincent Arcuri, Queens Community Board #5; Ms. LaMatto; Ms. Gottlieb; and Christine Holowacz, Brooklyn resident. Ms. Rizzotto stated that based on the community’s experience in Brooklyn with the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway (BQE) project, and the current use of a community engineer on the Gowanus project, the subcommittee recommends that NYSDOT issue a Request for Proposals (RFP) for an independent community advisor. This recommendation was forwarded to Robert Adams, NYSDOT, in a letter dated December 31st.

Mr. Currey responded that one of the reasons he attended tonight’s meeting was to address the community advisor issue. Referring to the request to issue an RFP, he stated that this is not a
feasible option. Mr. Currey explained that the state budget includes funds for capital projects as well as a separate budget for engineering services (which is used to hire consultants). After emphasizing that both funding streams will be severely limited in the future, he explained that the Department will not allow state monies to be used to hire an additional engineering firm to act as a community consultant. Mr. Currey further explained that the University Transportation Research Center (UTRC) was made available to the SAC as the result of a special request he made to officials in Albany. He added that any UTRC monies used by the SAC would take away from other planning studies throughout New York State. Mr. Currey concluded by stating that the Department does not have the flexibility or the funding to go beyond the UTRC offer that is on the table.

A lengthy discussion followed, during which the following issues and concerns were raised:

- Referring to the $300,000 budgeted for the UTRC to perform community consultant services, Mr. Arcuri and Ms. Holowacz questioned why this money could not be used to hire an independent engineer or firm outside of the UTRC. Mr. Currey explained that the $300,000 would come from an existing contract between the State and the UTRC and is not available for other purposes. Mr. Adams added that the Department knew last spring that there were no available funds for a community engineer. NYSDOT therefore approached the UTRC and asked it to assemble a team of experts that the community could consider in lieu of a community engineer.

- Mr. Arcuri and Evelyn Cruz, Congresswoman Nydia Velazquez’s office, expressed concern that the UTRC has already been hired without the SAC’s input. Theresa Cianciotta, Assemblyman Joseph Lentol’s office, read a letter from the Assemblyman to NYSDOT Commissioner Joseph Boardman in which he supported the community’s request for a single, independent community advisor. Ms. Cianciotta stated that it was disheartening to hear that the UTRC had already been retained. Mr. Currey reiterated that although the state has an ongoing contract with the UTRC to conduct planning studies across the state, the consortium has not yet been hired for the Kosciuszko Bridge project. He explained that there are eleven NYSDOT regions and that he has been trying to direct money to downstate projects. Mr. Currey added that offering the UTRC as an independent advisor represents a unique opportunity for the SAC.

- Ms. LaMatto and Mr. Arcuri questioned the independence of the UTRC, in light of its contract with NYSDOT. Ms. LaMatto expressed her opinion that use of the UTRC would represent a conflict of interest because the group would work for the state not the community. In response to Mr. Arcuri’s comment that “you’re using your people and we want to use our people,” Ms. Neuhaus pointed out that the resumes distributed to the SAC included potential candidates who are not part of the UTRC. In addition, it was noted that the project team asked the SAC for its recommendations at two previous meetings. (Non-UTRC individuals would be hired using the UTRC as a funding mechanism.) In response to a further comment about the impartiality of the UTRC, Ms. Neuhaus reiterated that four to six people would be chosen by the SAC to serve as community advisors.

- Several persons raised questions and concerns about the availability and responsiveness of the UTRC. Noting that the UTRC works all over New York State, Ms. LaMatto
expressed her view that the community would not receive the kind of personal, detailed attention required. Ms. Cruz stated that given the size and impact of the project, the community should have an independent consultant who could immediately respond to its needs. Mr. Bennett explained that the SAC could designate one individual as project manager. This person would attend every SAC meeting and serve as the primary point of contact between the SAC and the community advisor team. Other individuals with specific expertise could be called upon, as needed. In response to a question about the number of hours expected of the project manager, Mr. Currey explained that there would be times when the project manager would work intensively for a week or two; at other times, the workload would be lighter. He added that no member of the advisor team would be available 24/7. Mr. Rossmy observed that consultants generally work on several projects at a time and would not be available to work full-time on this project.

In response to many of the above concerns, Mr. Currey encouraged the SAC to review the candidates’ resumes and select those that best meet the community’s needs. He noted that working directly with the SAC, as well as with engineers from the Borough Presidents’ offices, these individuals would provide expertise on a broad range of issues. Mr. Currey also called for a change in the dynamic of the project and expressed his hope that the project team and the SAC could work together productively as the process moves forward. Asserting that “we’re not trying to ram the project down anyone’s throat,” Mr. Currey stressed that the only clear plan at the moment is to maintain the highway for the long term and solve several problems on the bridge.

Ms. Neuhaus observed that she has worked on several projects in recent years in which independent review panels were created to assist community advisory groups. In every instance, the panels were paid for with public funds. She noted that while the community was almost always skeptical at first, the projects generally turned out extremely well with the public satisfied with the results. Ms. Neuhaus further observed that members of independent review panels often question the agency’s position and suggest other ways of looking at an issue. She added that after re-examining an issue, the agency often changes its approach. Ms. Neuhaus urged SAC members to take a “leap of faith” and interview some of the suggested candidates.

Ms. LaMatto stated that if funding could be obtained from the elected officials, the community would hire its own consultant but would still use the UTRC. She noted that she lived around the corner from the BQE project and was affected by the noise and pollution every day. She added that living in Greenpoint/Williamsburg led her to mistrust agencies and press for her own consultant. Mr. Arcuri added that while the SAC is not questioning the qualifications of the UTRC and would still probably use it as needed, the committee must seek its own funding for an independent consultant. In response, Mr. Currey indicated that although he would take such a scenario under advisement, he could not guarantee that the UTRC option would be available in the future.

The SAC then decided that the Resume Subcommittee would draft a letter to elected officials requesting funding for an independent community advisor. A subcommittee meeting was scheduled for Monday, January 27th at 6:30 p.m. at the Queens Community Board #2 Office.
Goals and Objectives

NYSDOT Presentation

As an introduction to his PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Currey indicated that viewing other NYSDOT projects might give the SAC ideas for the Kosciuszko Bridge Project’s goals and objectives. Ms. Neuhaus reminded SAC members that they had asked the project team to draft goals and objectives for their review. These were distributed with the October 2002 Minutes.

The following is a summary of Mr. Currey’s presentation:

- NYSDOT is responsible for $300 million in contracts a year. The money is mostly spent on bridge projects and highway safety. There are many miles of expressway in New York City, including long stretches that cross bridges.

- NYSDOT works in partnership with local, state and federal agencies. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) is a partner on the Kosciuszko Bridge Project.

- NYSDOT Commissioner Boardman’s goal is to pull together different transportation modes and create “quality communities.”

- Mr. Currey provided several examples of complex and sensitive NYSDOT projects that were completed without a community engineer:
  - Rebuilding a ramp that had long been closed on the FDR Drive near the United Nations.
  - Rebuilding a ramp from the Williamsburg Bridge to the BQE, using special techniques to minimize impacts. This project was completed in ten months, in order to meet the City’s schedule for work on the bridge.
  - Developing innovative solutions for traffic and pedestrian problems at complicated intersections on the BQE.
  - Working with the community to develop a plan to avoid traffic impacts during reconstruction of the FDR Drive by placing a temporary structure outboard of the bulkhead.
  - Coordinating with the New York City Department of Parks and Recreation to minimize the impact of a ramp from the George Washington Bridge that funneled traffic through a city park.

- Mr. Currey also provided several examples of projects that have included amenities designed to enhance the environment:
  - Creating a new pond at the Long Island Expressway and Cross Island Parkway interchange to improve water flow and water quality. This work also included recreating trails, removing ramps and developing new park space.
  - Using state-of-the-art engineering technology, including hydraulic pile driving, which is quieter than traditional pile driving.
  - Designing bikeways, pedestrian walkways, parks and other special features for projects on the west side of Manhattan.

- Mr. Currey explained that the Department moved quickly after September 11th to re-establish the West Street/Route 9A corridor. Work included installing a temporary pedestrian bridge to allow residents access to/from Battery Park City. He added that
NYSDOT is currently working on some of the design plans for Lower Manhattan, particularly those related to West Street.

In response to a question from Ms. Cruz, Mr. Currey noted that the consultants for these projects were many of the same people working on the Kosciuszko Bridge project. Ms. Cruz commended the State on the Williamsburg Bridge project, stating that she lives across the street and was impressed with the efficient manner in which the work was done and with the pedestrian walkway that recently opened. Barbara Mihelic, Noble Street Block Association, echoed Ms. Cruz, saying in particular that traffic continued to flow during reconstruction, which she described as a very well formulated project.

**SAC Discussion**

The SAC then turned to a detailed discussion of the draft goals and objectives, a significant step in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process. Ms. Neuhaus noted that she had not received any comments on the draft goals and objectives prior to tonight’s meeting. She reiterated that the goals and objectives represent the community’s vision of what it wants this project to achieve and would serve as an important tool against which to measure project alternatives.

Ms. LaMatto questioned the use of the word “minimize” in the objective relating to the displacement of residences, stating that the objective should reflect the need to “protect” residences. Ms. Rizzotto added that the same change should apply to the objective relating to commercial establishments. Noting that the word “minimize” appears in several places, Ms. Neuhaus stated that the optimal goal is to eliminate the need to displace anyone. However, she acknowledged that there is usually not an alternative that meets every goal or objective. The idea is to evaluate the alternatives against the goals and objectives and see which alternative most closely matches the community’s vision.

Mr. Nunziato recommended that the goals and objectives go beyond “protecting” green space to provide for the addition of green space. Ms. Neuhaus agreed to change the objective to reflect the SAC’s interest in adding and developing green space in Brooklyn and Queens. She encouraged the SAC to work with the project team to identify potential sites.

Mr. Rossmy suggested the addition of the following objective under the transportation goal: “Enhance opportunities for the efficient movement of freight.” He noted that this could apply to the movement of rail freight, trucks or garbage.

Referring to the objective that reads “create a process in which data are accessible and in which any models used are understandable and the assumptions are clearly defined,” Ms. LaMatto asked how the data is generated and who decides which studies are performed. She specifically noted that different testing parameters can sway modeling results. Mr. Bennett replied that the topics covered in an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) are mandated by federal law. They include examination of air quality, noise, and environmental justice issues, among others. Ms. Neuhaus explained that the purpose of the objective is to ensure that data is presented in a way that is understandable to the SAC and the public at large. As an example, she added that the team will consider holding “modeling workshops” so that the SAC can understand how
modeling is performed. It was agreed that the objective would be amended to reflect the desire for a modeling workshop.

Ms. Holowacz asked if the State has a program similar to the City’s “Percent for Art” program. Mr. Currey answered that although there is no set budget for art or landscaping, these elements can be considered part of the Department’s environmental initiative. He stated that typically “a couple percent” of the total construction cost is spent on landscaping or other enhancements. In response to a question regarding the maximum permissible distance of an enhancement from the project site, Mr. Currey replied that federal rules dictate that the amenity be related to, and seen as mitigating the impacts of, the project. However, he noted that the Department tries to be as liberal as possible. Ms. Cianciotta requested a list of state-owned sites within approximately one mile of the bridge corridor that could potentially be developed as parkland. While agreeing to provide such a list, Mr. Currey cautioned that any work performed by the state, even if funded by another entity, must be related to the project.

Responding to Mr. Arcuri’s observation that SAC members from Brooklyn and Queens share concerns about truck traffic on residential streets, Ms. Neuhaus and Mr. Currey indicated that the objective “minimize diversion of highway auto and truck traffic...” appears under the transportation goal and, indirectly, in the goal related to the protection of residential neighborhoods. Ms. Mihelic asked if NYSDOT would be working with the New York City Police Department (NYPD) to ensure traffic enforcement. Mr. Adams explained that NYSDOT will soon form an Inter-agency Advisory Committee (IAAC), which will bring together the NYPD, the New York City Fire Department, the New York City Department of Sanitation and other agencies in order to share information and coordinate activities with other projects in the area. Mr. Adams added that the IAAC will also enable NYSDOT to share the SAC’s input regarding trucks in residential neighborhoods. Mr. Arcuri recommended that the Queens Traffic Safety Council, convened by the Queens Borough President, be invited to participate in the IAAC.

Concluding the discussion on goals and objectives, the committee agreed with Ms. Neuhaus’ suggestion to incorporate the SAC’s comments and send the document out as Working Goals and Objectives.

Other Business

- Mr. Nunziato urged the team to be more forthcoming about project issues, especially as they relate to funding. If the SAC is informed that funds are unavailable, its members can approach their elected officials for assistance. In response, Jennifer Nelson, NYSDOT, noted that the Governor has not yet unveiled this year’s budget and the Department does not yet know where the budget cuts will fall.

- Mr. Nunziato reported that representatives of the New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP) approached Queens Community Board #5 regarding a new committee that will address the clean-up of Newtown Creek. Mr. Nunziato joined the committee, which will begin meeting in May. Mr. Adams asked Mr. Nunziato to inform him of meeting dates so that project team members can attend.

- Ms. Cianciotta suggested that the project include a marker commemorating Thaddeus Kosciuszko on or near the bridge. Mr. Adams mentioned that a one-page biography of
Mr. Kosciuszko, which was distributed at the Open Houses and Scoping Meetings, can be found in the repositories.

Ms. Neuhaus reminded SAC members that instructions regarding the Yahoo Bulletin Board Service and copies of the Scoping Report are available at the sign-in table.

Public Session
Referring to the objective that reads “protect open space and parkland,” Laura Hofmann, Barge Park Pals, observed that Greenpoint/Williamsburg lacks open space. She recommended that the objective read “create open space and parkland.” In response, Mr. Currey suggested the following language in order to make the objective fundable by the FHWA: “look for opportunities to create parks and open space in order to mitigate project consequences.” Ms. Hofmann also protested use of the word “minimize” in the goals and objectives, especially in the objective relating to the displacement of residences. Ms. Neuhaus noted that, pursuant to the earlier discussion, the word minimize would be changed.

Ms. Hofmann questioned NYSDOT’s assertion that funds do not exist for hiring an independent community engineer outside of the UTRC. She referred to the assertion as “inappropriate,” adding that not hiring the person sought by the community creates distrust.

The next SAC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, February 20th at 6:30 P.M. at Jennings Hall, 260 Powers Street, Brooklyn.

Follow-up Items

1. Send letters to inactive SAC members requesting that they confirm interest in continuing membership. Responsibility: HNA.
2. Send letters to elected officials who have not attended, or sent representatives to, three or more SAC meetings requesting that each designate a representative who will attend the February 20th and future SAC meetings. Responsibility: HNA.
3. Send letter to Philip Galasso (anticipated buyer of the Phelps-Dodge site) inviting him to become a SAC member. Responsibility: HNA.
4. Provide the SAC with an inventory of New York State-owned properties within an approximate one-mile radius of the Kosciuszko Bridge corridor that the community could potentially develop as parkland. These sites would supplement any green space developed during the reconstruction or rehabilitation of the Bridge. Responsibility: Robert Adams, NYSDOT/Steve Bennett, Parsons.
5. Extend an invitation to SAC members to use the Yahoo site. Responsibility: Steve Bennett, Parsons.
6. Investigate report and take appropriate action concerning loose panels of corrugated sheet metal on the Kosciuszko Bridge that pose a potential safety hazard to motorists. Responsibility: Robert Adams/Subi Chakraborti, NYSDOT. [Report investigated and addressed on 01/17/03]
7. Consider including representation from the Queens Traffic Safety Council (convened by the Queens Borough President) on the Kosciuszko Bridge Project’s proposed Inter-

8. Schedule “modeling workshops” to facilitate the SAC’s ability to understand modeling data. Responsibility: Project Team.

9. Revise and finalize Minutes of the November 19th SAC meeting. Responsibility: HNA.

10. Revise Goals and Objectives to incorporate SAC comments. Responsibility: HNA.

11. Identify location for the February 20th SAC meeting. Responsibility: HNA. [Jennings Hall, Brooklyn confirmed on 1/17/03]
### SAC Members/Alternates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member/Alternate</th>
<th>Organization/Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad Afzal</td>
<td>New York City Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gus Amato</td>
<td>United Forties Civic Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Arcuri</td>
<td>Queens Community Board #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Campagna</td>
<td>Queens Borough President’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa Cianciotta</td>
<td>New York State Assemblyman Joseph Lentol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Crofoot</td>
<td>New York City Councilwoman Melinda Katz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn Cruz</td>
<td>United States Congresswoman Nydia Velazquez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemarie Daraio</td>
<td>COMET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Den Dekker</td>
<td>New York State Assemblywoman Margaret Markey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra Ellen Glickstein</td>
<td>New York City Councilman Eric Gioia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Hofmann</td>
<td>Greenpoint Waterfront Association for Parks and Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvin Johnson</td>
<td>Long Island City Business Development Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Holowacz</td>
<td>Greenpoint Property Owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette LaMatto</td>
<td>Beadel Street &amp; Vandervoort Avenue Block Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Mihelic</td>
<td>Noble Street Block Association/Newtown Creek Monitoring Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Nunziato</td>
<td>Queens Community Board #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolores Rizzotto</td>
<td>Queens Community Board #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Rossmay</td>
<td>Brooklyn Borough President’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Teich</td>
<td>Acme Architectural Products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noemi Tiniski</td>
<td>Meeker Avenue/Apollo Street Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MaryAnna Zero</td>
<td>Maspeth Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guests

Subi Chakraborti
New York State Department of Transportation

Joan M. Delar
COMET

Harold Fink
New York State Department of Transportation

Gary Giordano
Queens Community Board #5
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Laura Hofmann
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Cathryn Keeshan
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Joseph Ruzalski
United Forties Civic Association

Mark Scott
Queens Borough President’s Office

Dorothy Swick
Newtown Creek Monitoring Committee

Norik Tatevossian
New York State Department of Transportation

Steven Tiniski
Resident
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New York State Department of Transportation

Richard Backlund*
Federal Highway Administration
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Parsons

Luis Calderon
New York State Department of Transportation

Douglas A. Currey
New York State Department of Transportation

Howard Harrington
Helen Neuhaus & Associates

Peter King
New York State Department of Transportation

Joseph Mendez
Parsons

Pat Monte
Vollmer Associates

Jennifer Nelson
New York State Department of Transportation

Helen Neuhaus
Helen Neuhaus & Associates

Brian O’Donnell
Vollmer Associates

Dan Prevost
Parsons

Anita Wright
Helen Neuhaus & Associates

*Also a SAC member
The fifth meeting of the New York State Department of Transportation’s (NYSDOT) Kosciuszko Bridge Project’s Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC) was held on Thursday, February 20, 2003 at Jennings Hall, Brooklyn. (See Attachment A for Attendance List.) This meeting was scheduled to finalize the Working Goals and Objectives and to provide the SAC with information about the Alternatives Analysis process.

Old Business
Helen Neuhaus, Helen Neuhaus & Associates Inc. (HNA), opened the meeting by welcoming newcomers, including Irene Klementowicz, a SAC member who had been unable to attend previous meetings. Ms. Neuhaus congratulated two members of the project team who recently became parents: Robert Adams, NYSDOT, whose wife delivered a baby girl on January 31st and Denise Woodin, HNA, who adopted a baby girl from China in December.

Following adoption of the Minutes of the January 16th SAC meeting without changes, Ms. Neuhaus facilitated a brief discussion of responses to issues and concerns raised at that meeting. These included the following:

- In response to the Committee’s request that SAC members who had missed the first four (4) meetings be contacted in order to determine their interest in serving, letters were sent to ten people (five elected officials and five individuals or representatives of organizations). Representatives from the offices of New York State Senator Martin Connor and New York City Councilwoman Diana Reyna indicated that they would be represented at tonight’s meeting; Irene Klementowicz contacted HNA to express her interest and is present tonight; New York State Senators George Onorato and Serphin Maltese and Assemblyman Vito Lopez did not respond or send a representative. Since the SAC had previously decided that it did not wish to remove elected officials for non-attendance, only the following members will be removed: Phillip Boncaro (New York State Motor Truck Association); Joseph Giulietti (Calvary Cemetery); Rick Russo (Grand Street Business Improvement District) and Barbara Vetell (Greenpoint Avenue/West Street Block Association). Ms. Neuhaus noted that those persons dropped from the SAC will remain on the overall project mailing list.

- Ms. Neuhaus reported that, in accordance with a SAC decision made at the previous meeting, a letter was sent to Philip Galasso (anticipated buyer of the Phelps-Dodge site) inviting him to serve on the Committee. As there has been no response to date, the project team will follow up with Mr. Galasso next week.

- In response to a request for an inventory of state- and city-owned properties within a one-mile radius of the Kosciuszko Bridge that might be developed as parkland, Steve Bennett, Parsons, distributed a handout that identifies these sites. He explained that the
information was extracted from the 2001 New York City Department of Finance Real Property Assessment Database. Members of the SAC expressed appreciation for both the timely response and the comprehensive nature of the list of properties, which was characterized as a useful community resource.

- After Ms. Neuhaus reported that a Yahoo group has been created for the SAC, Mr. Bennett noted that only three SAC members have signed up so far. In response to a suggestion by Chris McBride, AAA, that people use the subject line to indicate that the e-mail message is about the Kosciuszko Bridge project, Anthony Parra, East Williamsburg Valley Industrial Development Corporation (EWVIDCO), noted that Yahoo automatically puts the subject in brackets.

- Ms. Neuhaus indicated that the SAC’s report of loose corrugated metal on the Kosciuszko Bridge was investigated and that the metal was immediately removed.

- At the suggestion of Vincent Arcuri, Queens Community Board #5, the Queens Traffic Safety Council has been added to the list of agencies to be invited to participate in the project’s Inter-Agency Advisory Committee (IAAC).

Goals and Objectives
Ms. Neuhaus reported that the Working Goals and Objectives were revised to incorporate the SAC’s comments and distributed with the draft Minutes of the January meeting. After reviewing the changes, she opened the floor to discussion.

In response to a question from Ms. Klementowicz regarding outreach to the surrounding community, Ms. Neuhaus stated that, as a working committee, the SAC was responsible for developing the Goals and Objectives. However, there was extensive outreach during the scoping process, and there will be additional public forums in the future.

Referring to the sixth objective under the second goal, Richard Beers, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), recommended that the word “public” be added before the phrase “recreational facilities”. (The new sentence would read “Protect public recreational facilities and minimize adverse impacts on their operation during construction.”.) Mr. Beers noted that protection of parkland is a federal requirement (Section 4(f)). A brief discussion followed, during which SAC members expressed their interest in protecting all facilities that serve the public and questioned whether adding that word would leave out private non-profit programs (such as a local kayaking group). After other suggestions were raised, Ms. Neuhaus took a straw poll to determine the Committee’s preference. The results were as follows: leave the objective as is (5); add the word “public” (8); add the phrase “public and not-for-profit” (1); or add the phrase “open to the public” (1). Consensus was then reached on adding the word “public” to the objective.

Noting the similarity of several goals, Mr. Beers observed that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) would group these together under a broader “social, economic and environmental” heading. In response to his recommendation that the same be done in this case, Ms. Neuhaus stated that the Working Goals and Objectives were developed by the SAC for the purpose of evaluating the alternatives and that keeping them separate would facilitate that
evaluation. Mr. Parra concurred, adding that different constituencies (i.e. businesspeople, residents, etc.) have different concerns, which should be reflected in specific objectives. As there was no further discussion, the Working Goals and Objectives were adopted by consensus.

Community Advisor Subcommittee Report
Mr. Arcuri reported that members of the subcommittee--which includes himself; Dolores Rizzotto, Queens Community Board #2; Anthony Nunziato, Queens resident; Annette LaMatto, Brooklyn resident; Mary Gottlieb, Apollo Street/Meeker Avenue Block Association; and Christine Holowacz, Brooklyn resident--met on January 27th to discuss the community advisor issue. The subcommittee assessed the $300,000 budget that was previously described as being available for a community advisor and determined that an outside consultant could be retained for this amount to provide the services required to meet the community’s needs. A letter seeking this level of funding was drafted and will be sent to federal, state and local elected officials. Mr. Arcuri indicated that due to the weather, holidays and illnesses, the letter has not yet been sent.

Introduction to the Alternatives Analysis Process
Pat Monte, Vollmer Associates, began his presentation by pointing to the boards on display around the room. (See Attachment B or small-scale copies of the boards.) Referring to the project time line, he noted that the scoping process has been completed and that the Alternatives Analysis phase, which began during scoping, is moving forward. Mr. Monte explained that this current phase, Alternatives Analysis, is the process by which possible options for the rehabilitation or replacement of the Bridge are evaluated. The process begins with a long list (20 or more) of options (or alternatives) that range from “do nothing” (the required baseline alternative) to complete replacement of the bridge and everything in between. Mr. Monte noted that many of the alternatives on the long list were suggested by the public or members of the SAC during the scoping process. He added that the long list is needed at the beginning in order to consider all potential options; it must be comprehensive to ensure that nothing is overlooked. During this stage, the alternatives are merely ideas, rather than detailed options. If they were to be drawn on a map, they would just appear as lines on a page.

Mr. Monte continued by explaining the two-step screening process. The first step (level one screening) eliminates those alternatives that clearly do not meet project Goals and Objectives. Those alternatives are said to have “fatal flaws.” Examples of alternatives that have fatal flaws include any option that does not provide six lanes of traffic during construction or that would involve significant residential property takings. The screening criteria used during level one are very broad, and there is very little engineering or environmental analysis done at this time. During the second step (level two screening), the remaining alternatives are evaluated in greater detail. Rough plans and sketches of these alternatives are developed, and additional environmental and traffic data is provided. The alternatives remaining after level two screening are studied in depth in the Draft EIS.

Mr. Monte stressed that the Committee will be involved at every step along the way. During the Alternatives Analysis process, the SAC’s role will be to review and provide input on the long list of alternatives; assist in developing criteria that can be used to screen alternatives; review and provide input on the maps/plans of the screened alternatives; and help plan public outreach activities to bring the information to the community. He indicated that the project team will provide Committee members with the information needed to understand the alternatives and
make informed decisions and recommendations. This could include specific activities to assist
the SAC understand individual elements or issues that need to be addressed. Such activities
might be technical workshops to review traffic modeling or bridge engineering issues. In
addition, open houses and public forums will be held for the general public.

Comments and questions are summarized below:
– In response to a question from Ms. Klementowicz, Mr. Monte stated that the project team
will prepare the Draft EIS.
– Mr. Arcuri asked if the alternatives will be shown in simulation, noting that this would help
the community more clearly visualize, and therefore understand, the possible options. Mr.
Bennett replied that aerial photographs were taken for the purpose of creating simulated
illustrations, which are likely to be prepared during the alternatives analysis process.
– In response to questions from Mr. Arcuri and Teresa Toro, Office of New York State Senator
Milave-Dilan/Brooklyn Community Board #1, it was explained that the EIS is a federal
document and that the FHWA is not only very involved in the process but also has veto
power over the document.
– In response to a request from Ms. Klementowicz, Mr. Adams agreed to send copies of the
presentation boards to the SAC along with the Minutes.

A lengthy discussion followed regarding U.S. Coast Guard requirements for the possible
lowering of the Kosciuszko Bridge. Mr. Bennett stated that the Coast Guard has informally
indicated that the bridge could be lowered from 120’ to 90’. He added that the state is not
interested in reducing the height much lower than 90’ because most tugboats are 67’ high and
may be larger in the future. Mr. Bennett further explained that the Coast Guard will not make
any official recommendation until a study of past, present and projected traffic on Newtown
Creek is conducted and comments on the study provided by mariners. Additional remarks and
questions raised at the meeting are summarized below:
• In response to a question from Michael Rossmy, Brooklyn Borough President’s Office,
Mr. Bennett replied that he did not know if the projected year for river traffic studies
would be the same as the project’s design year (30 years forward). He noted that the
study would have to look into the foreseeable future and that any alternative would have
to allow for continued navigation on the creek.
• In response to a question from Mohammad Azfal, New York City Department of
Transportation (NYCDOT), Mr. Bennett indicated that the bridge was originally built
with a 125-foot clearance to allow battleships to navigate the Creek.
• Mr. Nunziato questioned why the height of the Long Island Expressway (LIE) viaduct at
the entrance to the Queens Midtown Tunnel was maintained after rehabilitation. Mr.
Bennett indicated that he did not know.
• Clarifying a point made by Theresa Cianciotta, Assemblyman Joseph Lentol’s Office,
Mr. Bennett explained that lowering the span would be an option for a new bridge
alternative, or for the alternative that calls for double-decking the existing bridge.
• In response to Mr. Rossmy’s question regarding the proposed inter-modal rail yard, Mr.
Bennett stated that this facility would provide for the transfer of freight from trucks to
rail, not barge to rail.
• Answering two questions from Ms. Klementowicz, Mr. Bennett provided the following
information: 1) the impact on the community of lowering the bridge would have to be
studied and 2) other bridges over Newtown Creek are movable and are therefore lower in height.

Preliminary Discussion of Alternatives
Mr. Bennett began his presentation by pointing out the project boundaries: from just south of Morgan Avenue at the Meeker Avenue viaduct in Brooklyn to the interchange with the LIE interchange in Queens. He noted that traffic problems on the bridge start at the Vandervoort Avenue ramp where bottlenecks are created by trucks trying to climb the hill and merge with traffic. On the Queens side, five lanes merge into three as traffic reaches the bridge. This, along with a steep slope, also creates a bottleneck. Mr. Bennett continued with a brief overview of the categories of alternatives being considered:

- **No Build Alternative** - Under this alternative, there would be no major rehabilitation work on the bridge. The structural deficiencies and problems that result in the need for repair work every three years would continue to exist. In response to Mr. Arcuri’s question regarding the availability of federal funds for maintenance and repair contracts, Mr. Adams indicated that the last three repair contracts have been fully funded by the state.

- **Rehabilitation Alternative** - This alternative would involve the repair of all structural deficiencies on the bridge to alleviate the need for regular maintenance. The configuration of the bridge (number of lanes, slope, etc.) would remain exactly the same. Therefore, none of the traffic problems or safety issues would be addressed.

- **Rehabilitation with Additional Lanes Alternative** – With this alternative, additional lanes could be added in a variety of ways: 1) widening the existing bridge; 2) adding a second level, thereby creating a double-decked bridge; or 3) building a parallel bridge next to the existing structure. Ms. Klementowicz asked if a double-decked bridge would be possible. Mr. Bennett stated that it would not be easy. In response to a question from Mr. Afzal, Mr. Bennett explained that construction of a second level would not correct the current problems or deficiencies. He added that the addition of a bikeway/walkway would be considered wherever possible, including with a double-decked bridge.

- **Bridge Replacement Alternative** - This alternative would involve construction of a new bridge at the location of, or adjacent to, the existing bridge. Any new structure would be built fairly close to the current alignment due to the potential impacts (i.e. property takings) associated with moving the bridge; would be built to current safety and design standards; and would include additional lanes. In response to a question from Mike Teich, Acme Steel, Mr. Bennett stated that no decisions have been made regarding a possible new alignment. After noting that the project team toured Acme Steel’s facility, he acknowledged that several of the alternatives could impact the building closest to the ramp. On the other hand, Mr. Bennett underscored the unlikelihood that there would be support for an alternative that destroys the company’s five buildings that are located a block from the bridge. He indicated that the project team will have a better sense of the impacts of each alternative once the process is further along and reiterated that the team will look to the SAC for input on those impacts.
- **Tunnel Alternative** - This alternative would involve construction of a tunnel on or slightly off the existing bridge alignment. As with the bridge replacement alternatives, all traffic safety issues would be addressed.

- **Complementary Measures** - These measures, which would improve traffic operations or provide transportation enhancements, could be used in combination with most of the alternatives. Examples include a bikeway/walkway (requested by several members of the community) and a bus lane (to encourage people to use mass transit).

Mr. Bennett explained that criteria based on the Working Goals and Objectives will be developed to evaluate different alternatives. Some of the items that will be considered include:
- providing additional, and wider, lanes
- providing shoulders, so that disabled vehicles can pull off the road
- lowering the height of the bridge
- removing non-standard features
- improving the area around and below the bridge for community use (i.e. a parking lot or a park with waterfront access under the bridge)

Mr. Bennett also referenced several things that the project would be looking to avoid. These include significant property takings, impacts on the cemetery, and the need to close lanes on the bridge during construction.

A summary of other comments is provided below:
- Ms. Cianciotta asked if cleaning up Newtown Creek could be considered as part of the project. In response, Mr. Nunziato and Mr. Bennett noted that the New York City Department of Environmental Protection is developing a plan for the clean-up of the Creek.
- During a discussion of roadway widening in the bridge corridor, Mr. Bennett clarified that, at most, the road would be widened from the Vandervoort Avenue ramp to the ramps in Queens.
- Mr. Arcuri asked if the state would seek federal funding through the TEA-3 program, noting that the deadline for doing so is tonight. Mr. Beers explained that federal funds have already been identified for the Kosciuszko Bridge Project.

**Other Business**
Ms. Klementowicz announced that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers will be holding a public meeting on the remediation of Newtown Creek on February 27th from 7-9 p.m. Mr. Adams indicated that representatives of the project team will attend. Acting on a suggestion from Mr. Rossmy, it was decided that future SAC meetings will include an agenda item “Update on Related Projects.” Ms. Toro added that the Yahoo SAC group is another good way to share information.

**Public Session**
Laura Hofmann, Barge Park Pals, stated that she had not heard any discussion by the SAC of comments she made at previous meetings. In response, Ms. Neuhaus urged her to take a “leap of faith” in the process. She added that the project team is keeping track, through detailed Minutes, of all input and that some of Ms. Hofmann’s comments related to long-range issues that will be
addressed at a later time. Ms. Hofmann asked for clarification regarding Mr. Bennett’s assertion that cost would not be a factor in considering bridge alternatives. Mr. Bennett explained that cost is not considered during the first level of screening. Ms. Neuhaus added that the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process provides for the evaluation of social, economic, and environmental impacts, not just financial considerations.

In response to a question from Dorothy Swick, Newtown Creek Monitoring Committee, Mr. Bennett stated that the Pulaski Bridge project is under the jurisdiction of NYCDOT.

The next SAC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, March 27th at 6:30 p.m. at LaGuardia Community College, E Building – Room E500, 31-10 Thomson Avenue, Long Island City.

Follow-up Items

1. Contact Philip Galasso regarding his interest in participating in the SAC. Responsibility: HNA.
2. Distribute final adopted Working Goals and Objectives with Minutes of February 20th meeting. Responsibility: HNA.
3. Distribute small-scale versions of presentation boards displayed at meeting with Minutes of February 20th meeting. Responsibility: Parsons, VA, HNA.
4. Add “Update on Related Projects” as a regular agenda item. Responsibility: SAC and Project Team.
5. Prepare computer renderings to visually present alternatives to be evaluated in the Draft EIS. Responsibility: Project Team.
7. Identify location (Queens) for the March 27th SAC meeting. Responsibility: HNA.
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### Project Time Line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Scoping Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoping Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives Analysis Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Draft EIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEIS Hearing, Final EIS and Record of Decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Alternatives Analysis Process

- **Public Scoping Process**
  - All Reasonable Concepts

- **Long List of Alternatives**
  - Eliminate Concepts That Clearly Do Not Meet Project Goals

- **Level 1 Screen**
  - Select Best Concepts for Detailed Study

- **Level 2 Screen**

- **Draft EIS**
Categories of Alternatives

- Maintain Existing Bridge
- Complete Rehabilitation
- Rehabilitation with Additional Capacity
- New Replacement Bridge
- Tunnel

Opportunities and Constraints

- More and/or wider traffic lanes
- Shoulders for disabled vehicles
- Lower the bridge to reduce steep slopes
- Don’t build in the cemetery
- Avoid property takings
- Create new public spaces around or under bridge
The sixth meeting of the New York State Department of Transportation’s (NYSDOT) Kosciuszko Bridge Project’s Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC) was held on Thursday, March 27, 2003 at LaGuardia Community College, Queens. (See Attachment A for Attendance List.) This meeting was scheduled to present the Long List of Alternatives for the rehabilitation or replacement of the Kosciuszko Bridge.

Helen Neuhaus, Helen Neuhaus & Associates (HNA), opened the meeting by welcoming Al Goodman, Borough Engineer with the Brooklyn Borough President’s Office, and Ernest Swain, who will be Rosemarie Daraio’s alternate for COMET. Following adoption of the Minutes of the February 20th meeting without changes, Ms. Neuhaus facilitated a brief discussion of responses to issues and concerns raised at that meeting. These included the following:

- In response to the Committee’s request that Philip Galasso be invited to join the SAC, a letter was sent and follow-up calls were made. When reached, Mr. Galasso expressed his interest in participating and stated that he would designate two individuals to represent his firm (Sagres Partners, LLC).

- Ms. Neuhaus indicated that most of the other follow-up items related to documents requested by SAC members, which have been distributed.

Old Business: Goals and Objectives
Ms. Neuhaus announced that subsequent to the February meeting, Dick Beers, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), suggested two additions and one edit to the Working Goals and Objectives adopted by the SAC. Noting that the project team agreed with the proposed changes, Ms. Neuhaus turned the floor over to Mr. Beers, who offered the following new objectives under the Transportation Goal: “eliminate infrastructure deficiencies” and “provide secure transportation infrastructure.” Mr. Beers also suggested that the phrase “protect and/or enhance” replace the phrase “protect and enhance” in goals one, two and four in the Social, Economic and Environmental category. As there were no comments or objections, the proposed changes were adopted by consensus.

Update on Related Projects
Pursuant to a suggestion made by Michael Rossmy, Brooklyn Borough President’s Office, at the previous meeting, Ms. Neuhaus asked if there were any announcements regarding related projects. Pat Monte, Vollmer Associates, reported that there will be a meeting to discuss the easements required for noise walls on a segment of the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway (BQE) just north of the Kosciuszko Bridge between 61st Street and Broadway in Queens. The meeting is scheduled for Monday, April 8th, 7 p.m. at the New York Cho Dae Church, 71-17 Roosevelt Avenue.

Overview of Alternatives Analysis Process
Mr. Monte explained that the Kosciuszko Bridge Alternatives Analysis process is starting with a “Long List” of 26 options for repairing or replacing the bridge. These alternatives will be subjected to a two-step screening process, in which the SAC will play an active role. Level 1 screening, which is
conceptual rather than detailed, is designed to remove alternatives that clearly do not meet the Goals and Objectives. Examples of these are alternatives that have a significant impact on residential properties. After screening, the alternatives will be ranked in a simple *Consumer Reports* style using the terms Good, Fair and Poor. Mr. Monte noted that it could take three or more meetings for the SAC to evaluate the Long List.

He further explained that during Level 2 screening, the remaining alternatives will be analyzed in greater depth, using criteria that are more quantitative and that cover a broader range of issues. Level 2 screening will include the development of base maps, sketches, and plans. The alternatives remaining after Level 2 screening will receive more detailed examination in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).

After describing the project study area, which generally follows the BQE for 1.1 miles from Morgan Avenue in Brooklyn to the Long Island Expressway (LIE) ramps at 54th Avenue in Queens, Mr. Monte explained that each alternative includes a transition segment, which connects the existing viaduct to the new alternative. He then detailed a number of guiding principles that have been incorporated in each alternative. These include maintaining six lanes of traffic during construction to avoid diverting BQE traffic onto local roadways and, wherever possible, reducing grades, adding shoulders and providing auxiliary lanes. Mr. Monte also noted that the project team will be looking for ways to enhance the alternatives by providing opportunities for public amenities (parks, off-street parking, etc.) and for incorporating complementary strategies (bikeways/walkways, HOV lanes, “smart highway” systems, etc.). He added that although Level 1 does not provide enough detail to consider amenities or complementary strategies, these will be considered in Level 2 screening.

Presentation of Long List of Alternatives

Using a PowerPoint presentation, Steve Bennett, Parsons, reviewed all of the alternatives on the Long List. A handout illustrating the alternatives and the possible construction method for each was provided to SAC members.

Mr. Bennett explained that the alternatives fall into one of the following five categories:

- **No Build Alternative (NB - 1 alternative)**
  This alternative assumes continued maintenance of the bridge, but does not resolve any of the bridge’s structural deficiencies or safety concerns. Required by federal regulations, the No Build Alternative will serve as the benchmark against which all other alternatives are measured.

- **Rehabilitation Alternatives (RH - 3 alternatives)**
  These involve a major reconstruction effort that will eliminate the need for frequent repairs by addressing existing structural problems. The RH alternatives do not include operational (traffic flow) or safety (shoulders, sight distance) improvements. Although the three alternatives in this category are similar, their construction methods differ. RH-1 calls for work to be performed at night with lane closures; RH-2 involves the construction of a three-lane temporary bridge on one side of the existing structure; and RH-3 involves the construction of two one-lane temporary bridges, one on each side of the existing structure.

- **Rehabilitation Alternatives with Auxiliary Lanes (RA - 7 Alternatives)**
  These alternatives involve a major reconstruction effort that will address existing structural problems, eliminate the need for frequent repairs and add one or more auxiliary lanes. Some design improvements will be provided, although safety deficiencies (lack of shoulders, poor sight distance, etc.) will not be corrected. RA-1 and RA-2 involve rehabilitation with
widening on the eastbound and westbound sides, respectively, and RA-3 widens the bridge on both sides. RA-4 creates a double-decked bridge by adding a lower level. RA-5 and RA-6 call for construction of a new parallel bridge on the eastbound and westbound sides, respectively, while RA-7 provides for new parallel bridges on both sides of the existing bridge.

- **Bridge Replacement Alternatives (BR - 12 Alternatives)**
  These alternatives call for complete replacement of the existing structure. With the exception of BR-1, all provide for auxiliary lanes. BR-1 through BR-5 provide for a new bridge on the same route; however, they differ in their construction methodology. BR-6 calls for a double-decked bridge. BR-7 calls for a new bridge north of, but not immediately adjacent to, the existing bridge, while BR-8 is a new bridge immediately north of the existing bridge. BR-9 provides an alternative for a new bridge south of the current bridge. BR-10 through BR-12 provide three options for low-level crossings: a new low-level fixed bridge, a new low-level movable bridge, and filling in Newtown Creek.

- **Tunnel Alternatives (TU - 3 Alternatives)**
  All tunnel alternatives would require long transition sections, connect to the BQE, and go under Newtown Creek and the Long Island Rail Road tracks. The location or size of the tunnel portal has not been identified. The three tunnel options are: a tunnel along the route of the Kosciuszko Bridge, a tunnel north of the bridge, and a tunnel south of the bridge.

Questions and comments relating to the presentations are summarized below:

- Vincent Arcuri, Queens Community Board #5, stated that it might be necessary to move the northern boundary of the project limits, based on conditions at the LIE interchange.
- Mr. Arcuri asked if maintenance performed under the No Build alternative would be completely funded with state monies. Harold Fink, NYSDOT, replied that it could be either state or federally-funded. Mr. Beers added that it depended on the scope of work, and Mr. Bennett noted that the last three repair contracts have been state-funded.
- Mr. Arcuri expressed his view that the nighttime construction suggested for Alternative RH-1 is not realistic. Mr. Bennett noted that similar methods have been used on other bridges, including the Tappan Zee.
- In response to a question from Barbara Mihelic, Noble Street Block Association, Mr. Bennett stated that the Department’s 1995 traffic study will be superceded by a new traffic study that is being performed as part of this project.
- Ms. Daraio, COMET, asked about the purpose of including alternatives that do not resolve safety issues. Mr. Bennett and Ms. Neuhaus replied that it was important to include a broad range of alternatives in the Long List. Mr. Bennett added that the project’s transportation goals address traffic and safety and that alternatives will be measured against these.
- In response to a question from Mr. Rossmy regarding the width of the temporary bridges, Mr. Bennett indicated that the Long List does not go into that level of detail. Noting that shoulders would be required on a temporary bridge, he explained that the most likely scenario would involve removing the railings on the existing bridge and building a temporary bridge immediately adjacent. Teresa Toro, Brooklyn Community Board #1/State Senator Martin Milave Dilan’s office, asked if temporary bridges are usually a standard width. Mr. Bennett answered that the Bailey Bridges are modular structures that come in all sizes.
Mohammad Afzal, New York City Department of Transportation, asked if a temporary bridge would interfere with the existing ramps. Mr. Bennett replied that all ramps would be kept open in order to avoid traffic diversion into the community.

In response to Mr. Arcuri’s observation that supports for a temporary bridge would have an impact on Newtown Creek, Mr. Bennett agreed that the Creek requires a long span for a temporary bridge. However, he noted that since placing a support in the Creek is not an option, other solutions will need to be explored.

Ms. Daraio asked if the three “Rehabilitation with Auxiliary Lanes” alternatives involve property takings. Mr. Bennett explained that widening the bridge would increase the load, which would require a stronger support system. Depending on the method selected, this could involve land acquisition. Mr. Monte reiterated that such decisions are not being made at this time.

Mr. Arcuri observed that Alternative RA-4, “Rehabilitation with a Second (Lower) Level Added” would not change the steep grade of the existing bridge. Mr. Bennett concurred, but noted that the lower level could have a lower grade. In response to Mr. Arcuri’s comment that this alternative would not increase capacity as much as a new bridge, Mr. Bennett indicated that a double-decked bridge could provide almost as much capacity as a new bridge. He added that capacity issues will be more fully addressed during Level 2 screening.

Referring to the Kosciuszko Bridge’s current three-year repair cycle, Michael Hofmann, GWAAP, asked how often a new bridge would require repair. Mr. Bennett responded by explaining the difference between the major repairs that the existing bridge needs and routine maintenance, which largely involves resurfacing and cleaning. He also noted that although new bridges are typically built for a 30-year life cycle, it is anticipated that it might be 50 years before a new Kosciuszko Bridge would require major repairs. He added that the durable materials that would be used to construct the new bridge are likely to minimize the need for frequent maintenance.

Referring to Alternative BR-1, “New Bridge on Same Route-No Additional Lanes”, Mr. Afzal asked if the bridge would be wider since no lanes would be added. Mr. Bennett replied that shoulders would be added, making the new bridge wider than the existing structure. He further explained that any new bridge would be constructed to current design and safety standards.

Referring to Alternative BR-2, “New Bridge on Same Route”, Mr. Arcuri asked if this alternative would create a collector-distributor roadway system to the eastbound LIE. Mr. Bennett stated that it might but reiterated that the illustration of the lanes found in the handout is schematic and is just one example of possible configurations. Mr. Arcuri remarked that traffic back-ups will result if the bridge is built as shown.

With regard to Alternative BR-7, “New Bridge North of the Current Bridge”, Ms. Mihelic asked how far off the current alignment the bridge could go before affecting residences. Mr. Bennett stated that while this alternative appears to have a major impact, it might not. He added that preliminary review of the alternatives indicates that there will be no permanent impact on residences.

Referring to Alternative BR-11, “New Low-Level Movable Bridge”, Christopher McBride, AAA, asked if drawbridges are allowed on interstate highways. Mr. Bennett, Mr. Adams and Mr. Beers answered that although some exist, current policy discourages the construction of new drawbridges on interstate highways.

Mr. Arcuri observed that the approaches to a tunnel would be longer than those to a new bridge, starting north of the LIE. He added that while the tunnel alternatives are worth studying, in reality the gradients to the tunnel approach would be an issue.

Ms. Daraio stated that her evaluation of the alternatives would focus on the location of the entrance and exit ramps. She noted that the LIE between 48th Street and Maurice Avenue is the
scene of frequent accidents, making traffic flow and safety major issues. In response, Mr. Bennett indicated that a full-scale traffic study is currently being conducted. Traffic concerns will be addressed in greater detail in the DEIS. He stated that the project team is aware of the bottleneck problems, adding that it is in everyone’s interest to resolve these traffic safety issues.

In response to Mr. Rossmy’s request for traffic analysis data, Mr. Bennett explained that this work will not be conducted until Level 2 screening has been completed. However, it will probably be one of the first areas studied in the DEIS. He noted that new data will be collected and modeling performed; the information should be available this fall. Mr. Rossmy expressed his interest in reviewing information relating to accidents on the bridge. In response to Mr. Arcuri’s question regarding existing data that links roadway grade to the accident rate, Luis Calderon, NYSDOT, answered that this data is only available for certain types of accidents. Mr. Bennett added that the 1995 traffic study indicated that the average accident rate on the Kosciuszko Bridge is four times the New York State average for similar highways.

Mr. Bennett concluded by stating that the next step in the Alternatives Analysis process is to finalize the Long List. He encouraged SAC members to contact the project team with any additional alternatives and briefly outlined the agenda for the April SAC meeting, which will focus on Level 1 screening criteria and guidelines.

Other Business
Ms. Neuhaus expressed her concern about the drop in attendance at SAC meetings in general and tonight’s meeting in particular. She asked SAC members if they knew of any reasons for the low turnout. Reasons given included: injury, concurrent community meetings (GWAAP and Assemblywoman Margaret Markey’s Town Hall) and a heavy meeting schedule throughout the current week. Stating that the project is moving into an intensive phase, Ms. Neuhaus indicated that the project team had hoped to increase either the frequency or length of SAC meetings, in order to move through Level 1 screening. However, she added that this type of decision obviously could not be made with so few SAC members present. Mr. Arcuri recommended that everyone receive a copy of the handout and be asked to provide comments. Ms. Neuhaus agreed, but noted that the document is best understood with explanation. She then offered a team briefing on the Long List of Alternatives for anyone not present tonight.

Ms. Mihelic asked about the status of the Newtown Creek dredging project. Mr. Arcuri indicated that SAC member Tony Nunziato attended a meeting on this topic last night but is not present at tonight’s meeting to provide a report. Mr. Bennett commented that any new bridge would span the Creek, thereby eliminating the possibility of a ship hitting the supports. Laura Hofmann, Barge Park Pals, noted that swans live on the Creek, and Ms. Mihelic noted the presence of horseshoe crabs.

Public Session
Referring to Alternative RA-7, “Rehabilitation, New Parallel Bridges on Both Sides”, Ms. Hofmann asked about the width of the new bridge. Mr. Bennett replied that the lanes will be 12’ each; the shoulders 10’ on the right and 4’ on the left; and the barriers 4’ total, so a new three-lane bridge would have a minimum width of 54’. In response to Ms. Hofmann’s question regarding demolition methods to be used, Mr. Bennett stated that conventional methods would be used (not blasting) and that environmental factors such as the presence of lead or asbestos would be a consideration. Mr. Fink noted that because lead was once present on the bridge, “Class A Containment” procedures are always used. He added that any asbestos found would be removed pursuant to State Industrial Codes. Lastly,
Ms. Hofmann asked Mr. Bennett for his opinion regarding the alternative that would have the least impact on the community. Mr. Bennett answered “we don’t know yet.”

The next SAC meeting is scheduled for **Thursday, April 24th at 6:30 P.M. at Jennings Hall, 260 Powers Street, Brooklyn.**

**Follow-Up Items**
1. Revise Working Goals and Objectives to reflect FHWA comments, which were accepted by the SAC. Responsibility: HNA
2. Schedule briefing regarding Long List of Alternatives for those SAC members unable to attend the March 27th meeting. Responsibility: HNA
3. Forward traffic data analysis, especially data relating to accident rates to Michael Rossmy (when completed). Responsibility: Parsons
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The seventh meeting of the New York State Department of Transportation’s (NYSDOT) Kosciuszko Bridge Project’s Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC) was held on Thursday, April 24, 2003 at Jennings Hall, Brooklyn. (See Attachment A for Attendance List.) The meeting was scheduled to discuss Level 1 screening criteria for the Long List of Alternatives.

Anita Wright, Helen Neuhaus & Associates Inc. (HNA), opened the meeting by conveying Helen Neuhaus’s apology for her absence--Ms. Neuhaus was called out of town for a family emergency--and by welcoming back Mary Gottlieb, Meeker Avenue/Apollo Street Association, who missed several meetings due to an accident. Ms. Wright asked for comments on the Minutes of the March 27, 2003 SAC meeting. While there were no comments, and the Minutes were adopted by consensus, it was later noted that Vincent Arcuri was incorrectly identified in the Minutes as representing Brooklyn Community Board #1. Ms. Wright stated that the Minutes would be amended to show Mr. Arcuri’s Queens Community Board #5 affiliation.

Ms. Wright then facilitated a brief discussion of the follow-up items from the March 27th meeting. They included:

- The Working Goals and Objectives were revised to incorporate changes and additions suggested by Dick Beers, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and distributed to the SAC along with the Minutes of the March 27th meeting.

- Several SAC members who were unable to attend the March 27th meeting attended a special “make-up” briefing on April 9th. The purpose of the briefing, which was held at NYSDOT’s Region 11 Office, was to ensure that as many SAC members as possible were familiar with the project’s Long List of Alternatives before tonight’s discussion of screening criteria.

- Noting that the next SAC meeting will be held on Thursday, May 15th, Ms. Wright asked for input regarding meeting sites. In response to a question from Joe Ruzalski, United Forties Civic Association, regarding Sunnyside Community Center, Ms. Wright indicated that accessibility seemed to be a problem at that site. It was then suggested that the NYSDOT Region 11 office is a convenient location. Anthony Nunziato, Queens resident, expressed his opinion that Queens SAC members find Jennings Hall very easy to reach. After a brief discussion, it was agreed that future meetings will be held at Jennings Hall, if possible, or at NYSDOT as a back-up site.

- Following the March 27th meeting, Mr. Acuri submitted comments regarding the Long List of Alternatives. Copies of his comments were available at the sign-in table.

- A few months ago, at the SAC’s recommendation, letters were sent to Committee members who had missed all of the meetings to that point in order to determine their
interest in continuing to serve. Noting that there are still a few individuals who have not attended any meetings, or who attended only one of the early meetings, Ms. Wright suggested that a reminder letter be sent asking them to confirm their interest in participating and urging them to attend meetings, as the project is now in a critical phase and their input is needed. Irene Klementowicz, Concerned Citizens of Greenpoint, asked if she could send another representative if she is unable to attend. Ms. Wright stated that SAC members are encouraged to designate alternates, who will receive all SAC materials including Minutes and meeting notices.

Lastly, Ms. Wright suggested that, given the intensity of the work over the next few months, meetings be lengthened by one hour (to run from 6 p.m. to 9 p.m.). She asked the SAC for its opinion. During the discussion that followed, Mr. Nunziato stated that the meetings should not begin until a sufficient number of SAC members are present. Others remarked that a 6:00 p.m. start time is difficult for those who work full-time. It was decided that the meetings will start at 6:30 p.m. sharp and run until 9 p.m., if necessary.

Alternatives Analysis
Steve Bennett, Parsons, briefly reviewed the categories of alternatives that comprise the Long List (which were discussed in detail at the March 27th SAC meeting). They are:

- No Build: the baseline against which all other alternatives are evaluated
- Rehabilitation: alternatives that repair the bridge, but leave the structure as it is now
- Rehabilitation with Auxiliary Lanes: alternatives that include either widening the bridge or building a parallel structure in order to improve traffic flow, while addressing some of the safety issues
- New Bridge
- New Tunnel

Mr. Bennett stated that the Long List includes every “remotely reasonable” idea suggested by the project team and members of the public. Alvin Goodman, Brooklyn Borough President’s Office, asked when cost estimates will be considered. Mr. Bennett answered that because cost analysis is too complicated to do for a large number of alternatives, it will not be performed until the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) phase. In response to a question from Barbara Mihelic, Noble Street Block Association, Mr. Bennett indicated that the “Short List” will be determined by Level 2 screening, which is expected to conclude this fall.

Mr. Bennett then distributed the draft Level 1 screening criteria, which will be used to evaluate the alternatives on the Long List, along with a land use map and aerial photographs that show residential and commercial properties in the study area. He stated that the criteria, which are based on input from the project team and the community, are not detailed but are designed to eliminate alternatives that clearly do not meet the project’s goals and objectives. After noting that the criteria cover transportation, social, economic and environmental issues, Mr. Bennett reviewed the handout with SAC members.

- **Criterion 1: Provide 24-hour operation of the BQE and the long-term use of Newtown Creek as a navigable waterway.**
Mr. Bennett explained that any alternative that does not meet this criterion is considered “fatally flawed” and will be dropped from consideration immediately. For example, the United States Coast Guard would not issue a permit for any alternative that prevents navigation on Newtown Creek. Therefore, there is no point in continuing to evaluate this alternative.

Ms. Mihelic asked if a Newtown Creek water traffic study has been conducted. Mr. Bennett stated that the New York City Department of Transportation surveyed water traffic as part of its study to determine if movable bridges could be converted to fixed bridges. Another study is being conducted as part of the Kosciuszko Bridge project in order to obtain a bridge clearance permit from the Coast Guard. The study will include a survey of existing river traffic, along with the identification of businesses that rely on the waterway for shipping. It will also examine whether the bridge can be lowered without affecting current and future traffic on the creek. Mr. Bennett remarked that preliminary conversations with the Coast Guard indicate that the bridge could be lowered from 125 feet to 90 feet without impeding navigation. Mr. Nunziato asked what the highest point of the roadway leading up to the bridge is currently and questioned whether a 90-foot bridge would eliminate the slope altogether. Mr. Bennett answered that the incline would be approximately half as steep as it is now. He added that the only stretch of roadway that would be changed is between the ramps in Brooklyn and Queens; the approach roads would remain at the same elevation.

Mr. Nunziato asked if a lower bridge would provide sufficient clearance for battleships, should the need arise. In response, Pat Monte, Vollmer Associates, observed that the United States Army Corps of Engineers will be involved in any decision that affects the creek. Mr. Bennett stated that information is available regarding the number and types of boats currently using the creek, but that further study is needed to determine their height and draft. Mr. Nunziato questioned why the Queens-Midtown Tunnel viaduct was not lowered during its recent rehabilitation. Mr. Bennett speculated that lowering the roadway over the creek would have required complete replacement of the viaduct. Peter King, NYSDOT, noted that while the viaduct “deck” needed replacement, the supporting structure was in good condition. Harold Fink, NYSDOT, added that this is not the case with the Kosciuszko Bridge, which requires work on both the deck and the supporting structure. Mr. Nunziato requested that the project team confirm this information with the Coast Guard.

In response to questions from Ms. Klementowicz, Mr. Bennett stated that information would be available in approximately one month regarding the number of businesses using barges on the creek (thought to be about five) and that the creek would have to be dredged to allow for battleships. He added that the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation is conducting a study regarding the remediation of Newtown Creek, which might involve dredging.

- **Criterion 2: Improve traffic operations and safety in the project corridor.**

Mr. Bennett explained that the purpose of the measures in Criteria 2, 3 and 4 is to have measurable, repeatable standards against which to evaluate each alternative. This means that anyone who screens the alternatives using these measures should come up with more or less the same results. The alternatives will be ranked using a *Consumer Reports*-style system of circles. Criterion #2 includes three measures related to traffic operations and safety.
Ira Greenberg, Assemblywoman Catherine Nolan’s Office, requested clarification regarding the difference between Measures 2-1 and 2-3, asking if NYSDOT is seeking to add shoulders or auxiliary lanes. Mr. Bennett explained that NYSDOT is studying the traffic flow and safety aspects of all alternatives. He specifically noted that although adding shoulders and auxiliary lanes would result in traffic flow and safety improvements, such additions would result in a larger bridge, which may in turn have a greater impact on the community. All of these factors need to be considered. Mr. King added that the goal at this point is to be objective and examine each alternative from an engineering, design and operational perspective.

**Criterion 3: Avoid impacts to adjacent property and community facilities.**

Mr. Bennett reviewed the four measures included in Criterion #3, which cover both short-term (construction period) and long-term impacts. In response to Mr. Ruzalski’s observation that there are three houses immediately adjacent to the Maspeth side of the bridge, Mr. Bennett acknowledged that a few of the alternatives will affect one or two of those homes. Ms. Gottlieb noted that although the area surrounding the ramp on the Brooklyn side is residential, this is not reflected on the land use map. In response to Ms. Gottlieb’s question regarding the configuration of new auxiliary lanes, Mr. Bennett explained that these lanes would run between the ramps and would serve for exit and entrance purposes only. Ms. Gottlieb expressed her concern that new lanes would include a small section of Meeker Avenue at the end of the ramp. She noted that the road in that location is brick, which is aesthetically pleasing and muffles sound from the highway. Mr. Bennett assured her that there are no plans to widen that portion of roadway. He added that noise issues will be studied in the DEIS. In response to a question from Ms. Gottlieb, Luis Calderon, NYSDOT, reiterated that the auxiliary lanes would run between the ramps only. Mr. Bennett noted that while NYSDOT’s 1995 traffic study recommended widening the eastbound entrance ramp at Vandervoort Avenue to two lanes, it determined that widening the westbound exit ramp at Apollo Street would not improve traffic operations. He added that all ramps will be studied during the DEIS phase.

A brief discussion followed regarding outreach to residents in the immediate area of the bridge. Answering a question from MaryAnna Zero, Maspeth Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Ruzalski indicated that the homes on the Queens side of the bridge are mostly owner-occupied and that he has notified the residents about the bridge project. In response to a question from Ms. Mihelic, it was noted that the United Forties Civic Association was invited to serve on the SAC in order to represent that community. Ms. Klementowicz remarked that other neighborhood residents should be consulted early in the Alternatives Analysis process. Ms. Wright stated that a public meeting is being planned for this fall.

After reviewing Measure 3-2, which addresses permanent and construction period impacts to businesses, Mr. Bennett indicated that the three rankings in this measure are not specific because there are many unknown factors about construction at the ends of the ramps. He noted that there are five businesses directly under the bridge that will be affected by any alternative. Christine Holowacz, Greenpoint Property Owners, expressed her opinion that Measure 3-2 should be more specific and that there should be a separate measure for the acquisition of commercial property, similar to the measure for the acquisition of residential property. Following up on her comment, Mr. Greenberg asked for the definition of “minimum”, “moderate” and “maximum” as used in Measure 3-2. Mr. Bennett replied that the project team is in the process of determining all of the
potential impacts to businesses and will clarify Measure 3-2 by next month’s meeting. After a brief discussion regarding the varying degrees of impact versus acquisition, consensus was reached on adding a new measure relating to the acquisition of commercial property.

Mr. Bennett proceeded to Measure 3-3, which seeks to avoid permanent adverse impacts to sensitive community areas such as residences, Sgt. Dougherty Park or Calvary Cemetery. In response to Ms. Klementowicz’s concerns about residences near the bridge, Mr. Bennett acknowledged that some of the alternatives would have an impact on residences. However, he noted that if the project avoids residences altogether, there may be a disproportionate impact on businesses. All options have to be weighed so that, in the end, the alternative selected is thoroughly documented and defensible. In response to a question from Ms. Klementowicz, Mr. Bennett indicated that the number of employees and the types of businesses adjacent to the bridge are being investigated. Ms. Mihelic asked about the feasibility of screening the alternatives without information about the businesses. Mr. Bennett answered that the number of potentially affected employees would be available at next month’s meeting.

Mr. Goodman remarked that, in his experience, the methodology being used is very effective in eliminating the worst alternatives. Echoing Mr. Goodman’s comment, Mr. Bennett stated that the idea of Level 1 screening is not to select the best idea, but to eliminate the worst. In addition, Level 1 screening should leave a range of alternatives and should make sense to anyone who examines the resulting list.

There were no comments regarding Measure 3-4, which seeks to avoid temporary impacts to sensitive community areas.

- **Criterion 4: Reduce diversion of traffic from the highway onto local streets, both during construction and long-term.**

Mr. Bennett stated that this criterion considers both traffic operation and impact on the community. Referring to Measure 4-1, which addresses the temporary diversion of traffic onto local streets, Ms. Mihelic asked for the team’s definition of “temporary”. Mr. Bennett answered that construction will take approximately three to five years, depending on the alternative chosen. In response to a question relating to construction activities, Mr. Bennett noted that while New York City policy generally requires that the existing number of lanes remain open during construction, an exception is made when the work is done at night. Mr. Fink stated that NYSDOT’s intent is to keep traffic flowing on all six lanes “24/7”.

There were no comments relating to Measure 4-2, which address the long-term diversion of traffic onto local streets.

Referring to drainage problems in the vicinity of the bridge, Teresa Toro, State Senator Martin Malave Dilan’s Office/Brooklyn Community Board #1, and Gerald Esposito, Brooklyn Community Board #1, asked if all of the alternatives address drainage concerns. If not, Mr. Esposito noted, drainage should be incorporated into the screening criteria so that the issue is considered early in the process. Mr. Bennett indicated that the alternatives can not be differentiated at this level of detail at this time. However, drainage issues will be studied in the DEIS. In response to a question from Ms. Holowacz, Mr. Bennett stated that an Inter-Agency
Advisory Committee (IAAC) is being formed and that the project team will bring the SAC’s drainage concerns to the attention of the New York City Department of Environmental Protection.

Mr. Bennett then described the scoring system for screening the alternatives (see page 5 of the Screening Criteria).

After commending the project team for its work, Mr. Nunziato noted that several of the buildings labeled “V” (for vacant) on the land use map are, in fact, occupied. He encouraged the team to involve Philip Galasso, Sagres Partners, LLC (potential buyer of the Phelps-Dodge property) in the SAC. Ms. Wright replied that Mr. Galasso has been contacted several times but has not responded. In response to Mr. Nunziato’s request for visuals of the construction staging areas, Mr. Fink answered that construction is too far in the future to plan the staging at this point. Ms. Wright stated that Mr. Nunziato’s request will be placed on the list of long-term follow-up items. In conclusion, Mr. Bennett announced that new, high quality aerial photographs were taken last week and will be ready for next month’s SAC meeting.

Update on Related Community Projects
There were no updates.

New Business
Ms. Wright stated that the purpose of the IAAC, which will meet for the first time in mid to late June, is to share information and coordinate activities between city, state, regional and federal agencies. The SAC will be represented on the Committee by NYSDOT and FHWA. Ms. Wright asked if the SAC would like to designate an additional person to serve on the IAAC. Robert Adams, NYSDOT, noted that the meetings will be held during the day three or four times a year. Ms. Holowacz and Mr. Nunziato expressed their support for the IAAC, with Ms. Holowacz suggesting that the IAAC include one person each from Brooklyn and Queens. It was agreed that she and Mr. Nunziato will identify a SAC representative from their respective boroughs. Mr. Esposito asked if the Community Boards and the Borough Presidents would be invited to participate. Mr. Bennett stated that the Borough Engineers of the Queens and Brooklyn Borough Presidents’ Offices are being invited. He added that the meetings will be open to the public. At Mr. Esposito’s request, it was agreed that the chairpersons of Brooklyn Community Board #1 and Queens Community Boards #2 and #5 will also be invited to serve.

Other Business
In response to Ms. Holowacz’s question regarding the status of the community advisor issue, Mr. Nunziato stated that the SAC’s community advisor subcommittee drafted a letter to its elected officials requesting funding to hire an advisor. He noted that Dolores Rizzotto, Queens Community Board #2, was charged with sending the letter but has been out of town. Mr. Fink added that the University Transportation Research Center (UTRC) offer is still on the table. Ms. Gottlieb expressed her view that NYSDOT had given conflicting information about the availability of funding for an independent advisor. Ms. Mihelic asked about the source of funding for the UTRC. Mr. Fink answered that it would come from a statewide funding source that is separate from the Kosciuszko Bridge project. Mr. Nunziato offered to follow-up on the subcommittee’s letter and report back to the SAC.
Public Session
There were no comments from members of the public.

The next SAC meeting is scheduled for **Thursday, May 15th at 6:30 P.M. at Jennings Hall, 260 Powers Street, Brooklyn.**

Follow-Up Items
1. Determine number of businesses along Newtown Creek that use barges to transport goods or materials. (Irene Klementowicz.) Responsibility: Parsons.

2. Provide additional information regarding the number of potentially impacted businesses and employees. Responsibility: Parsons

3. Provide visuals of construction staging areas for alternatives to be studied in the DEIS. (Anthony Nunziato.) Responsibility: Parsons.

4. Investigate why the height of the Queens-Midtown Tunnel viaduct was not lowered when the structure was rehabilitated. (Anthony Nunziato.) Responsibility: Parsons, NYSDOT.


6. Identify two SAC members (1 each from Queens and Brooklyn) to serve on the IAAC. Responsibility: Anthony Nunziato, Christine Holowacz.

7. Invite Community Boards #1 (Brooklyn), #2 (Queens) and #5 (Queens) to serve on the IAAC. (Gerald Esposito.) Responsibility: HNA, NYSDOT, Parsons.

8. Confirm Jennings Hall for May 15th SAC meeting, and request its use for all future SAC meetings. Responsibility: HNA

9. Revise Minutes of March 27th SAC meeting to include Vincent Arcuri’s correct affiliation. Responsibility: HNA.


11. Send letters to SAC non-attendees to encourage their participation in upcoming meetings. Responsibility: HNA
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NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
KOSCIUSZKO BRIDGE PROJECT  
STAKEHOLDERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE: MAY 15, 2003

Minutes

The eighth meeting of the New York State Department of Transportation’s (NYSDOT) Kosciuszko Bridge Project Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC) was held on Thursday, May 15, 2003 at Jennings Hall, Brooklyn. (See Attachment A for Attendance List.) The meeting was scheduled to begin Level 1 screening of the Long List of Alternatives.

Helen Neuhaus, Helen Neuhaus & Associates Inc. (HNA), opened the meeting by welcoming newcomers and asking them to introduce themselves. In response to her request for comments on the Minutes of the April 24, 2003 SAC meeting, Gerald Esposito, Brooklyn Community Board (CB) #1, noted that the Minutes did not accurately reflect his remarks regarding drainage concerns. He stated that he had asked if all of the alternatives address drainage issues. If not, this should be incorporated into the screening criteria. Mr. Esposito indicated that his goal was to raise drainage concerns early in the process-- in the schematic, rather than Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), phase--in order to avoid free-falling rainwater from a new structure. He added that the New York City Department of Environmental Protection should address drainage on the ground. Ms. Neuhaus stated that the Minutes would be amended to reflect this change.

Ms. Neuhaus then facilitated a discussion of the follow-up items from the April 24th meeting. She noted that several of these involved revising, distributing and preparing materials for tonight’s meeting. Other items on the list--such as a question from Irene Klementowicz, Concerned Citizens of Greenpoint, regarding the number of businesses using barges on Newtown Creek, and a request from Anthony Nunziato, Queens resident, for visuals of the construction staging areas--will be placed on a long-range follow-up log, which will be reviewed every month by the project team and shared with the SAC on a regular basis.

- In response to Mr. Nunziato’s question regarding the height of the Queens-Midtown Tunnel viaduct, Robert Adams, NYSDOT, explained that clearance was reduced from 90 to 83 feet when the viaduct was rehabilitated in the early 1990’s. Mr. Nunziato noted, and Mr. Adams concurred, that rather than actually lowering the viaduct, new steel beams were added below the structure.

- Ms. Neuhaus announced that the first meeting of the Kosciuszko Bridge Project’s Inter-Agency Advisory Committee (IAAC) has been scheduled for Tuesday, June 24th at 10 a.m. at the NYSDOT Region 11 Office, Hunter’s Point Plaza, 47-40 21st Street, Long Island City. Noting that Mr. Nunziato and Christine Holowacz, Greenpoint Property Owners, were asked to identify a SAC representative from Queens and Brooklyn, respectively, to serve on the IAAC, Ms. Neuhaus asked if these individuals had been selected. Mr. Nunziato stated that he or Vincent Arcuri, Queens CB #5, will attend the meetings. Ms. Holowacz was not present, but it was thought that she would represent the Brooklyn SAC members. Mr. Adams indicated that a letter will be sent to Ms. Holowacz, asking her to serve or to designate an alternate.
Ms. Neuhaus stated that, at the SAC’s request, all future Committee meetings will be held at Jennings Hall.

Mr. Arcuri reported that the Community Advisor Subcommittee decided to target specific elected officials in its effort to secure funding for an independent advisor. The first letter will be sent from Queens CB #5 to New York State Senator Serphin Maltese, who has access to state transportation funds. He added that CB #5 will ask other community boards to send similar letters.

Ms. Neuhaus reported that outreach, through letters and telephone calls, is continuing to SAC members who have missed several meetings.

Update on Related Projects
Michael Rossmy, Brooklyn Borough President’s Office, announced that the Draft EIS (DEIS) for the Cross Harbor Freight Movement Project is scheduled to be released this July or August.

Referring to the Metropolitan Transportation Authority’s plan to build a citywide bus depot at Grand Avenue and 47th Street, Steve Bennett, Parsons, reported that the design/build contract is out for bids. Mr. Nunziato remarked that this project is very controversial within the community.

Level 1 Screening
Recap of Screening Criteria
Mr. Bennett opened the discussion with a brief recap of the categories of alternatives that comprise the Long List: No Build, Rehabilitation, Rehabilitation with Auxiliary Lanes, New Bridge, and New Tunnel. He noted that the goal of Level 1 screening is to eliminate the worst alternatives. Referring to the revised screening criteria, Mr. Bennett stated that Criterion #3: Avoid impacts to adjacent property and community facilities was modified to reflect suggestions made by the SAC at the previous meeting. A summary of the changes is provided below:

- Measure 3-2, which previously addressed both permanent and temporary (construction-period) impacts to commercial and industrial properties, was divided into two measures. Measure 3-2 now refers to the acquisition of property, while the new Measure 3-5 refers to temporary construction impacts.

- The ratings for Measures 3-2 and 3-5 are now based on the number of potentially affected employees, rather than the actual number of businesses. Mr. Bennett stated that aerial maps, with an overlay of each alternative and information about the estimated number of employees per business and impacts to sensitive community areas, will be available for next month’s discussion of Criterion #3. He added that the employee estimates are intentionally conservative, taking into account any possible impacts. In-depth examination of employee impacts will be conducted during the DEIS phase of the study.

In response to a question from Peter King, NYSDOT, Mr. Bennett explained that the estimated number of employees is based on typical employment density for each type of business. Joseph Ruzalski, United Forties Civic Association, asked how much of the Phelps-Dodge property Philip Galasso, Sagres LLC, plans to purchase. Dan Torchio, Sagres LLC, responded that Mr. Galasso plans to buy the entire site.
Measures 3-3 and 3-4, which address permanent and temporary impacts to sensitive community areas, were revised to include percentages with each ranking. Alternatives will be evaluated based on how much closer (i.e. less than 25%, less than 50% or more than 50%) the structure moves to Sergeant Dougherty Park, Calvary Cemetery or residences. Mr. Bennett noted that moving the bridge closer to a residence is more critical than moving it closer to the park or cemetery, and this is reflected in the screening criteria.

In response to a question from Mr. Rossmy, Mr. Bennett acknowledged that the percentages do not correlate with other quantifiable measures such as emissions. He added that air quality studies will be performed for the DEIS. Questioning the use of percentages rather than actual numbers, Mr. Rossmy observed that 50% of 100-150 feet is significantly different than 50% of 50 feet. Mr. Bennett noted that the project team recognizes that residences on Apollo Street, Brooklyn, are considerably closer to the structure than houses on the Queens side of the bridge. He added that although the project team had considered using actual distances, this is not needed at this level of screening, where the goal is only to screen out the worst alternatives.

**Level 1 Screening**

Given the length of time needed to evaluate each alternative measure by measure and the lack of completed maps due to the short timeframe between the April and May SAC meetings, Criteria #1, 2 and 4 were reviewed at this meeting; the more complicated Criterion #3 will be evaluated at the June SAC meeting. Blank screening worksheets were distributed and large-scale boards were used to record results. Alternatives were displayed using PowerPoint slides.

Before beginning the screening process, Mr. Bennett explained that the No Build Alternative is the baseline against which all other alternatives are evaluated throughout the EIS process. It therefore automatically advances to Level 2 screening.

Referring to **Criterion #1, Provide 24-hour operation of the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway (BQE) and the long-term use of Newtown Creek as a navigable waterway**, Mr. Bennett explained that it appears first because any alternative that fails this criterion is “fatally flawed” and will be dropped from further consideration. For example, the United States Coast Guard (USCG) would not issue a permit for any alternative that blocks Newtown Creek and impedes navigation. Likewise, an alternative that prevents 24-hour, barrier-free travel on the BQE would be rejected by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Using a pass-fail rating, the alternatives were reviewed for their compliance with Criterion #1. Three Structure Replacement Alternatives (BR-10, BR-11 and BR-12) failed and were eliminated from further consideration.

In response to a question from Anthony Parra, EWVIDCO, Mr. Bennett replied that the USCG requires Newtown Creek to remain navigable both during construction and after. He noted that figures available on the New York City Department of Transportation (NYCDOT) web site indicate that movable bridges along Newtown Creek opened for waterborne traffic approximately 600 times in 2002.

Continuing with **Criterion 2: Improve traffic operations and safety in the project corridor**, Mr. Bennett facilitated the screening of the remaining alternatives. A summary of comments and questions raised during the process is provided below:
Referring to Measure 2-2, Mr. Bennett stated that it is not possible to correct the slope on the existing bridge. However, a new structure would allow for a reduced slope, thereby improving traffic flow and safety. Jay Siegel, Siegel Brothers, observed that there is a dip in the BQE viaduct over the Long Island Expressway (LIE), which requires drivers to climb a hill as they access the Kosciuszko Bridge. Questioning why this dip exists, he noted that the slope would not be as steep if the roadway remained at the same grade for the half-mile leading up to the bridge. Mr. Bennett speculated that the dip allows the BQE and LIE to cross each other and tie in at the ramps.

Mr. King asked if the USCG has provided feedback regarding clearance levels. Mr. Bennett replied that the agency has indicated that a 90 foot clearance would be acceptable, adding that he is gathering data for a pre-permitting meeting. Mr. Bennett noted that the bridge currently has a clearance of 125 feet with a slope of approximately 4%. A bridge with 90 foot clearance would have a slope of approximately 2%. In response to a question from Mr. Rossmy, Mr. Bennett stated that the roadway is considered flat terrain, as defined in the NYSDOT Highway Design Manual. In response to Mr. Nunziato’s question concerning whether a 90-foot bridge is a definite goal, Mr. Bennett reiterated that nothing is definite at this point. A Newtown Creek navigation study must be conducted, a pre-permitting meeting held, and design plans completed before the USCG would issue a permit.

Referring to Measure 2-2 as it applies to the tunnel alternatives, Mr. Arcuri noted that a tunnel would require excavation well beneath the creek and tie-ins with the BQE. These factors would result in a significant slope. Mr. Bennett stated that such details as the tunnel profile, tie-ins, slope and the amount of property required will not be determined until Level 2 screening. Other comments related to the tunnel alternatives are provided below:

- In response to a question from Mr. Parra, Mr. Bennett suggested that at this level of screening, a tunnel still offers the possibility of a reduced slope.
- Mr. Ruzalski observed that tractor trailers often exceed 13 feet in height and questioned whether the tunnel would be higher than 14 feet in order to accommodate this.
- Mr. Arcuri noted that ventilation towers and utilities would need to be factored in, when determining the height of the tunnel.
- In response to questions from Gus Amato, United Forties Civic Association, regarding the depth of excavation, Mr. Bennett indicated that the creek is approximately 20 feet deep in the vicinity of the existing bridge; a minimum of five feet beneath that depth and the top of the tunnel would be required. Mr. Arcuri expressed his view that an additional 10-15 feet below the surface would be needed. It was noted that the tunnel would not hit bedrock.

Before Mr. Bennett continued with **Criterion 4: Reduce diversion of traffic from the highway onto local streets, both during construction and long-term**, Dick Beers, FHWA, pointed out that the Rehabilitation Alternatives (RH-1, RH-2 and RH-3) received poor ratings (empty circles) for all three measures under Criterion #2. Therefore, according to the screening guidelines, they should be eliminated from further consideration. Mr. Bennett agreed and proceeded to screen the remaining alternatives based on Criterion #4. None of the alternatives were eliminated during this step.
After Mr. Ruzalski commended Mr. Bennett for his facilitation of this portion of the screening process, SAC members and guests concurred with a round of applause.

Other questions raised during the meeting included the following:

- Barbara Mihelic, Noble Street Block Association, asked if the proposed dredging of Newtown Creek would be extensive enough to allow the passage of ships with deeper drafts. Mr. Bennett replied that the reason for the dredging is to remove hazardous materials. However, such dredging may deepen the channel; this will be taken into account during the Newtown Creek navigation study.

- In response to a question from Mr. Ruzalski, Mr. Bennett answered that a pedestrian walkway has been requested and will be considered. He added that the walkway will be subjected to a cost-benefit analysis.

Other Business
Teresa Toro, New York State Senator Martin Malave Dilan’s Office, announced that NYCDOT is conducting an online survey of truck routes in New York City neighborhoods. She encouraged everyone to complete the survey and lobby NYCDOT to extend the deadline for responses.

The next SAC meeting is scheduled for **Thursday, June 19th at 6:30 P.M. at Jennings Hall, 260 Powers Street, Brooklyn.**

Follow-Up Items
1. Amend minutes of April 24, 2003 SAC meeting to reflect changes proposed by Mr. Esposito. Responsibility: HNA.
2. Send letter of invitation to Christine Holowacz asking her to serve on the IAAC or to designate an alternate. Responsibility: NYSDOT.
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The ninth meeting of the New York State Department of Transportation’s (NYSDOT) Kosciuszko Bridge Project Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC) was held on Thursday, June 19, 2003 at Jennings Hall, Brooklyn. (See Attachment A for Attendance List.) The meeting was scheduled to complete Level 1 screening of the Long List of Alternatives.

Helen Neuhaus, Helen Neuhaus & Associates Inc. (HNA), opened the meeting by asking for a moment of silence for SAC member Tina Filiato (OUTRAGE) who passed away on June 2nd. She then welcomed Joyce Sowinski, NYSDOT Real Estate Group, who was present to answer questions during the discussion of property impacts.

Turning to the Minutes of the April 24th meeting, Ms. Neuhaus stated that these had been revised to more accurately reflect comments made by Gerald Esposito, Brooklyn Community Board (CB) #1. Noting that the changes had been reviewed and accepted by Mr. Esposito, Ms. Neuhaus asked for approval of the Minutes. The April Minutes were adopted unanimously. She then asked for comments on the May 15th meeting Minutes. There were no comments, and these were also adopted unanimously.

Although there were no follow-up items from the previous month, there were a number of announcements:

■ SAC member Joseph Ruzalski, United Forties Civic Association, is recovering from a stroke. While he is home from the hospital and sounding “chipper”, he sent his regrets for missing tonight’s meeting.

■ The first meeting of the Inter-Agency Advisory Committee (IAAC) will be held on Tuesday, June 24, 2003 at 10 a.m. at NYSDOT’s Region 11 office. Ms. Neuhaus reminded the SAC that it would be represented on the IAAC by Christine Holowacz, Greenpoint Property Owners, and Anthony Nunziato, Queens resident.

■ The Kosciuszko Bridge Project team met last week with the team of the Cross Harbor Freight Movement Project to share information and coordinate plans. The Cross Harbor team will give a brief presentation to the SAC, possibly as early as July’s meeting.

■ Dick Beers, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), has been promoted to another position in the agency and will no longer serve on the SAC. Tom Breslin will replace Mr. Beers.

■ Teresa Toro, New York State Senator Martin Malave Dilan, reported that since a public hearing regarding the proposed Trans Gas Energy Plant has been scheduled for Thursday, July 17th, none of the Brooklyn representatives will be able to attend the SAC meeting, which is scheduled for the same night. After a brief discussion, it was decided to reschedule the SAC meeting to Thursday, July 24th and to cancel the August
meeting. Ms. Neuhaus noted that the project team will be available to meet with individual community groups over the summer, as needed.

Ms. Toro also announced that the Newtown Creek Alliance, a group convened by New York City Councilman David Yassky with members from Brooklyn and Queens, will meet on Monday, July 7th at 6:30 p.m. (location to be announced). The agenda will include a presentation by NYSDOT regarding the Department’s Environmental Initiatives program as it relates to the Kosciuszko Bridge Project.

Ms. Holowacz announced that Commissioner Amanda Burden, New York City Department of City Planning, will attend a community meeting on Tuesday, June 24th at 7 p.m. to unveil the City’s proposed waterfront re-zoning plan for Greenpoint and Williamsburg. The meeting will be held at the Polish Slavic Center (177 Kent Street).

Michael Rossmay, Brooklyn Borough President’s Office, reported that the New York State Assembly has passed legislation significantly increasing the fines for truck drivers who use roadways that are not designated truck routes. Sal Cantelmi, OUTRAGE, remarked that he did a radio interview on behalf of Save Our Streets on this issue. Vincent Arcuri, Queens CB #5, stated that the Board has submitted its alternate plan to keep trucks off Grand Avenue. Noting that 6,000 trucks per week travel on Grand Avenue, Mr. Nunziato requested that the SAC advocate on behalf of the CB’s plan. Steve Bennett, Parsons, asked Mr. Nunziato to forward a copy of the proposal to his attention. Mr. Rossmay added that the New York City Department of Transportation will hold a community meeting in each borough regarding its truck survey.

Mr. Arcuri announced that he was recently elected chairperson of Queens CB #5.

Level 1 Screening (Continued from May Meeting)
Mr. Bennett opened the discussion with a brief recap of the categories of alternatives that comprise the Long List: No Build, Rehabilitation, Rehabilitation with Auxiliary Lanes, New Bridge, and New Tunnel. He reminded the SAC that six alternatives were eliminated after being evaluated against Criteria #1, #2 and #4 at last month’s meeting. These included all three Rehabilitation alternatives (RH-1, 2 and 3) and three Bridge Replacement alternatives (BR-10, 11 and 12). The remaining alternatives will be evaluated tonight using Criterion #3: Avoid impacts to adjacent property and community facilities.

Referring to the Land Use Impact Maps that were distributed at the sign-in table, Mr. Bennett explained that the maps illustrate the bridge alignment for each alternative, as well as the location of facilities, residences and businesses. In response to a question from Anthony Parra, EWVIDCO, Mr. Bennett explained that the number of employees shown on the maps was estimated, based on the type of use and field surveys. Although the figures may not be exact at this level, the estimates are close enough to differentiate between the alternatives. Mr. Parra observed that several of the estimates are very inaccurate. While Mr. Bennett agreed that this might be the case, he reiterated that the numbers are close enough for this level of screening. He urged the SAC to look carefully at the alternatives that emerge from Level 1 screening to determine if the estimated numbers resulted in retaining some alternatives that should have been dropped.
Mr. Bennett also noted that the maps reflect a conservative view of the possible impacts. Mitigation for businesses that are expected to be impacted (i.e. Acme Architectural and Milgo Industrial, which are immediately adjacent to the bridge) will be outlined in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).

Mr. Arcuri asked whether businesses relocated by a temporary bridge would return to the same site once the bridge is torn down, or if the relocation is considered permanent. Mr. Bennett answered by describing two types of business impacts: relocation, which would occur in cases where a new bridge ramp is low enough to require acquisition of the business; and disruption, which would affect business operations, but not to the extent that requires relocation. He also explained that NYSDOT’s Real Estate Group will work with displaced businesses to find new sites, hopefully in the same neighborhood. In response to another question from Mr. Arcuri, Mr. Bennett stated that there are no plans at this time for use of the acquired properties. He indicated that the sites could be developed as community amenities if the state has no further use for them. Mr. Arcuri suggested that any industrial properties be turned over to the New York City Economic Development Corporation.

Ms. Holowacz asked if the project team plans to meet with any of the businesses. Mr. Bennett replied that Mr. Parra recently arranged a meeting between team members and Brooklyn-based businesses and that additional discussions will be held. He added that although it might be more productive to meet further into the screening process, the team would be happy to meet anytime. Ms. Neuhaus observed that a few businesses are at tonight’s meeting.

Mr. Bennett noted that all alternatives will connect with the six-lane section of the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway that runs from the Vandervoort Avenue/Apollo Street ramps to slightly past Morgan Avenue. Known as the “Brooklyn Connector” (for the purposes of this project), this stretch of roadway is bordered by industry on the south side and residences on the north side. In order to maintain six lanes of traffic during construction, any temporary structure would be built on the south side to avoid impacting the residences. Mr. Bennett indicated that it would be possible to do this without blocking entrances.

He then reviewed each of Criterion #3’s measures and rankings, noting that in addition to considering the impacts on businesses, effects on residences, Sergeant Dougherty Park and Calvary Cemetery were also measured. Referring to Measure 3-2—Avoid acquisition of commercial and industrial businesses—he explained that the numbers for the different rankings were established by counting the number of employees affected under each alternative and then looking for natural breaks to differentiate between the rankings. Observing that the full circles in Measures 3-2 and 3-5 have different numerical values, Mr. Rossmy asked if this relates to the logical break in the number of employees affected. Mr. Bennett replied that most of the alternatives impact more than 150 employees (the maximum number for a full circle under Measure 3-5). After Mr. Rossmy expressed his discomfort with the ranking numbers, Mr. Bennett stated that the rationale for the system will become clearer as the screening process progresses.

Mr. Nunziato asked for clarification regarding the term “disrupted” in Measure 3-5. Mr. Bennett reiterated that this refers to construction period impacts that fall short of requiring acquisition of the property. He added that while every effort will be made to avoid disruptions, there may be construction activities that require brief business closings. In response to a second question from
Mr. Nunziato, Mr. Bennett indicated that NYSDOT is responsible for assisting businesses that must be relocated. Mr. Parra asked how compensation would be determined if moving permanently crippled the business. Ms. Sowinski answered that NYSDOT has different methods of payment, including “in lieu of payment.” In response to Mr. Parra’s assertion that moving Acme Architectural from its Meeker Avenue building would force the company to close, Mr. Arcuri observed that relocated businesses may end up with more modern, state-of-the-art buildings. However, he noted that companies such as Acme would go out of business if their operations are interrupted for any length of time.

Requesting clarification of the terms “relocation” and “acquisition”, Philip Galasso, Sagres Partners, LLC, asked if certain properties would be condemned if they could not be acquired. Ms. Sowinski replied that the state can acquire property through Eminent Domain. She further explained that federal and state laws require NYSDOT to pay a business for its building and contents, as well as for search fees and relocation expenses. In addition, the Department would assist in finding a new location. Booklets explaining these issues were available at the meeting.

Mr. Bennett then facilitated the evaluation of the nineteen remaining alternatives (excluding the No Build Alternative, which automatically advances to Level 2 screening). Additional concerns raised during the screening are summarized below:

- William Soghor, Milgo Industrial, expressed dismay over the method used to calculate the number of impacted employees, adding that the loss of even a few employees could hurt the entire business. In response, Mr. Arcuri observed that since the impacts to businesses on the Brooklyn side of the bridge are similar for all alternatives, the numbers are relevant for comparison purposes only. He added that the important considerations are whether a critical company will be put out of business and determining appropriate mitigation or compensation. Mr. Arcuri asked if weight could be given to those alternatives that affect less than 150 people. Mr. Bennett indicated that this could be done during Level 2 screening.

- Mr. Rossmay suggested a redistribution of the numbers associated with each ranking, while Mr. Soghor urged the committee to make its decisions based on the real number of people affected. Barbara Mihelic, Noble Street Block Association, and Mr. Bennett reiterated that commercial properties in Brooklyn will be affected by any alternative. Mr. Bennett added that the only other option would be to shift the impacts to the residential side of the bridge.

- In response to the Committee’s concerns, Mr. Bennett noted that the SAC reviewed the criteria prior to screening and agreed that any impacts to businesses would be based on the estimated number of employees at each location. He reiterated that while the criteria for Level 1 screening are very broad, Level 2 screening will be more detailed. At that time, the potential impacts and possible mitigation measures will be more clearly understood. Mr. Bennett also reminded the group that the goal of Level 1 screening is not to pick the best alternative but to eliminate the worst.

- Responding to a question from Ms. Mihelic, Mr. Bennett stated that Alternative RA-4 (Rehabilitation, Second [Lower] Level Added) would permanently relocate the bridge to within approximately 75 feet of homes on the Queens side (more than 50% closer than
the existing bridge). This alternative would not require the relocation of residents. Expressing concern for their safety, Ms. Mihelic remarked that the impact of a closer roadway on the residents’ health should also be considered. Mr. Bennett noted that this would be studied in the DEIS.

At the conclusion of Level 1 screening, the following alternatives were eliminated from further consideration: three Rehabilitation alternatives (RH-1, 2 and 3), one Rehabilitation with Auxiliary Lanes alternative (RA-4), eight Bridge Replacement alternatives (BR-4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12) and two Tunnel alternatives (TU-2 and 3).

Mr. Bennett noted that the effectiveness of the screening process can be determined by looking at the alternatives that were eliminated. If the dropped alternatives do not meet the project goals and objectives, the process has worked. Conversely, if the dropped alternatives meet the project goals better than the remaining alternatives, the process is flawed. Mr. Bennett and Ms. Neuhaus encouraged the SAC to take time to “digest” the information presented during Level 1 screening and to examine the remaining alternatives closely. The next SAC meeting will focus on the group’s comments and questions regarding the screening results.

Alvin Goodman, Brooklyn Borough President’s Office, expressed his view that before alternatives are eliminated, information should be available regarding their cost. In response to Mr. Bennett’s reply that it is not possible to do a full cost analysis on 26 alternatives, Mr. Goodman suggested that preliminary information be developed to provide a sense of the cost differences between the alternatives. Ms. Neuhaus remarked that the purpose of preparing the DEIS is to assess all costs, including social, environmental and economic.

The next SAC meeting is scheduled for **Thursday, July 24th at 6:30 P.M. at Jennings Hall, 260 Powers Street, Brooklyn.**
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The tenth meeting of the New York State Department of Transportation’s (NYSDOT) Kosciuszko Bridge Project Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC) was held on Thursday, July 24, 2003 at Jennings Hall, Brooklyn. (See Attachment A for Attendance List.) The meeting was scheduled to provide a recap of Level 1 screening results and a presentation regarding the Cross Harbor Freight Movement Project.

Helen Neuhaus, Helen Neuhaus & Associates Inc. (HNA), opened the meeting by welcoming back Joe Ruzalski, United Forties Civic Association, who had suffered a stroke and by congratulating Steve Bennett, Parsons, who was married last week. Following adoption of the Minutes of the June 19, 2003 meeting without changes, the following announcements were made:

- The Kosciuszko Bridge Project website has been updated and now includes a public involvement page and the Long List of Alternatives. The website address is: www.dot.state.ny.us/reg/r11/kosciuszko/kosciuszkohome.html.

- Ms. Neuhaus asked SAC members and alternates to sign the image release form that was distributed at the sign-in table. This waiver will allow NYSDOT to use photographs of individuals in newsletters or on the website.

- Robert Adams, NYSDOT, reported that the first Inter-Agency Advisory Committee (IAAC) meeting was held on June 24th. Noting that the goal of the meeting was to bring city, state and federal agencies up-to-date on the project, he added that NYSDOT was pleased that 30 people representing 20 agencies attended, along with SAC members Christine Holowacz, Greenpoint Property Owners, and Anthony Nunziato, Queens resident. Mr. Nunziato stated that the meeting was “excellent.”

Recap of Level 1 Screening

Using a PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Bennett provided a recap of the Level 1 screening process, which was conducted at the May and June SAC meetings. He noted that the screening criteria were based on the project’s Goals and Objectives and were designed to be “measurable and repeatable.” In other words, anyone who performs the screening will end up with more or less the same results. Mr. Bennett stated that the key goal of the process was to narrow the Long List by eliminating the worst alternatives.

Mr. Bennett then reviewed the 12 remaining alternatives: No Build (NB), six Rehabilitation with Auxiliary Lanes (RA) alternatives, four Bridge Replacement (BR) alternatives and one Tunnel (TU) alternative. (See Attachment B for the screening results.) All of these would allow continuous operation of the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway (BQE) and would maintain Newtown Creek as a navigable waterway. Most would improve traffic operations and safety by providing at least two of the three following elements: one or more auxiliary lanes, reduced grades and new shoulders and/or standard lane widths. Mr. Bennett further explained that all of the build
alternatives will minimize the diversion of traffic onto local streets during construction by maintaining six lanes of traffic.

With regard to community impacts on the Brooklyn side of the bridge, none of the alternatives require residential property takings. The final build condition would bring a new or rehabilitated bridge less than 25% closer to homes and Sergeant Dougherty Park. The temporary (construction period) condition would move the structure less than 50% closer to residences and up to the edge of the park.

On the Queens side, two alternatives (BR-5 and TU-1) require the taking of one home on 54th Drive. Six alternatives (NB, RA-1, RA-2, RA-3, RA-6 and TU-1) would result in a new or rehabilitated structure being less than 50% closer to residences, while the other six (RA-5, RA-7, BR-1, BR-2, BR-3 and BR-5) would move the structure more than 50% closer to residences. During the temporary build condition, the structure would move less than 25% closer to residences in all but one alternative (TU-1). The final and temporary conditions for 11 of the 12 alternatives move the bridge to the edge of Calvary Cemetery; TU-1 requires the temporary acquisition of a portion of the cemetery.

Indicating that the impacts to businesses are similar for all alternatives except No Build, Mr. Bennett noted that potential impacts were assessed very conservatively. For companies in both Brooklyn and Queens, it is estimated that 175-205 employees would be relocated and 217-366 would be temporarily disrupted. Using the maps from the original Long List document (distributed at the March SAC meeting), he briefly described the key features of each of the 12 remaining alternatives.

Mr. Bennett observed that the success of Level 1 screening could be measured by looking at the alternatives that remain (are they the better options?) as well as those that were eliminated (are they the worst options?). He indicated that the goal is to start Level 2 screening with a range of alternatives.

Mr. Bennett concluded his presentation by describing the Level 2 screening process. The remaining 12 alternatives will be further developed by surveying and mapping roads and buildings; adding detailed information on grades, travel lanes, shoulders, and footprint of the structure; and examining each alternative’s relationship to existing facilities and sensitive areas. Level 2 screening criteria will be established by enhancing Level 1 criteria and by developing new criteria. The new criteria will include measures that evaluate traffic characteristics; construction duration; construction methods, complexity and staging; and sustainability and vulnerability. Mr. Bennett explained that sustainability refers to the anticipated period of time between completion of the project and future repairs. Vulnerability refers to the structure’s ability to withstand a natural disaster or terrorist attack. The draft Level 2 screening criteria will be presented to the SAC at the September meeting.

The following questions and comments were raised during the presentation:

- Mr. Ruzalski observed that two gas companies (AWISCO and American Gas) that are located under the Kosciuszko Bridge have propane gas and oxygen acetylene tanks on their properties. He questioned how they were able to receive a Certificate of Occupancy so
close to the bridge in light of the dangerous nature of their businesses. Indicating that there were probably no regulations to prevent such a situation when the businesses moved to their present location, Mr. Bennett noted that the siting of a gas company under a bridge would be viewed differently if it were proposed now. Peter King, NYSDOT, speculated that the businesses might be “grandfathered” in. Echoing Mr. Bennett’s comment, he remarked that the Department would not allow that type of facility under one of its structures now. Mr. Nunziato pointed out that these companies will be under the bridge in the final build condition if they are not moved. He suggested that because this is a safety and security issue, NYSDOT should look into the matter very carefully.

In response to Mr. Bennett’s question about the height of the viaduct, Mr. Ruzalski stated that the westbound lanes pass over American Gas, while the eastbound lanes pass by AWISCO. Mr. Bennett noted that some businesses are likely to be disrupted, but not necessarily displaced, by the presence of a new bridge overhead. He added that the operations of every potentially affected company will be studied in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and that every effort will be made to minimize negative impacts.

Stating that the project team has toured several businesses on the Brooklyn side of the bridge, Mr. Adams indicated that it is interested in doing the same in Queens. Mr. Ruzalski offered, on behalf of himself and Gus Amato, United Forties Civic Association, to coordinate outreach to Maspeth-area businesses.

- In response to questions from John Schell, Queens Community Board #5, Mr. Bennett stated that the current grade of the bridge is 4%. Any new structure will have a reduced slope, which will be achieved by lowering the bridge clearance from 125’ to approximately 90’.

- In response to a question from Mr. Ruzalski, Mr. Bennett replied that the tunnel alternative would not necessarily require more land. However, this assessment is based on Level 1 screening of the alternatives, which is still very rough. As previously noted, the alternatives will be further developed during Level 2 screening. At that time, several issues related to the tunnel alternative will be addressed. Answering Mr. Ruzalski’s question regarding the new water tunnel under construction in the vicinity of the bridge, Mr. Bennett assured him that the new tunnel is far below any excavation that would be required for a Kosciuszko tunnel.

- Martha Holstein, Strategic Urban Solutions, asked if Level 2 screening will take the same general approach as Level 1. Mr. Bennett replied that Level 2 screening will be considerably more detailed than Level 1, but less detailed than the level of scrutiny involved in the DEIS. In response to Ms. Holstein’s question regarding the number of alternatives to be studied in the DEIS, Mr. Bennett indicated that it would be at least five, including No Build, in order to have a reasonable range of options.

- David Shaffsick, Durr Mechanical, asked if the footprint of the structure, which will be examined in Level 2, will cover only the bridge or also the area required for
construction. Mr. Bennett answered that although the footprint will show the area needed for temporary bridges, information regarding construction staging will not be available until the DEIS phase.

Ms. Neuhaus concluded the discussion by reminding SAC members that the project team will be available throughout the summer to meet with community groups and residents upon request.

New Business
Mr. Nunziato observed that there is soot, dirt, trees and other debris on the eastbound side of the Kosciuszko Bridge. He requested the immediate sweeping of the bridge and better maintenance in the future. Mr. Adams promised to contact NYSDOT’s field office.

Richard Backlund, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), introduced Thomas Breslin, who has replaced Richard Beers as FHWA’s representative on the SAC.

Presentation on the Cross Harbor Freight Movement Project
As requested by the SAC at previous meetings, a presentation regarding the Cross Harbor Freight Movement Project was arranged with the New York City Economic Development Corporation and members of that project’s consultant team. Using PowerPoint, representatives of the firms STV Inc. and Allee King Rosen & Fleming (AKRF), presented information on the Cross Harbor Project. After numerous procedural and substantive concerns were raised by residents of Maspeth, Ms. Neuhaus recommended, and the Cross Harbor team agreed, that they would meet separately with the community to deal with issues specific to that project.

The next SAC meeting is scheduled for **Thursday, September 18th at 6:30 P.M. at Jennings Hall, 260 Powers Street, Brooklyn.**

Follow-Up Items
1) Coordinate visits to Maspeth-area businesses with Joe Ruzalski. Responsibility: HNA
2) Contact NYSDOT field office regarding debris on the bridge. (Anthony Nunziato) Responsibility: Robert Adams
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NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
KOSCIUSZKO BRIDGE PROJECT  

ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS PROCESS  
LEVEL 1 SCREENING RESULTS  
July 24, 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SELECTED FOR LEVEL 2</th>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RH-1</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation (Night Work with Lane Closures)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RH-2</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation (Temporary Bridge During Construction – Option 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RH-3</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation (Temporary Bridge During Construction – Option 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ RA-1</td>
<td>Rehabilitation, Widen on Eastbound Side</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ RA-2</td>
<td>Rehabilitation, Widen on Westbound Side</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ RA-3</td>
<td>Rehabilitation, Widen on Both Sides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ RA-4</td>
<td>Rehabilitation, Second (Lower) Level Added</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ RA-5</td>
<td>Rehabilitation, New Parallel Bridge on Eastbound Side</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ RA-6</td>
<td>Rehabilitation, New Parallel Bridge on Westbound Side</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ RA-7</td>
<td>Rehabilitation, New Parallel Bridges on Both Sides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ BR-1</td>
<td>New Bridge on Same Route — No Additional Lanes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ BR-2</td>
<td>New Bridge on Same Route – Option 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ BR-3</td>
<td>New Bridge on Same Route – Option 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR-4</td>
<td>New Bridge on Same Route – Option 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ BR-5</td>
<td>New Bridge on Same Route – Option 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR-6</td>
<td>New Double-Decked Bridge (Temp Bridge During Construction)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR-7</td>
<td>New Bridge North of Current Bridge – Route 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR-8</td>
<td>New Bridge North of Current Bridge – Route 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR-9</td>
<td>New Bridge South of Current Bridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR-10</td>
<td>New, Low-Level Fixed Bridge (No Navigation on Newtown Creek)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR-11</td>
<td>New, Low-Level Movable Bridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR-12</td>
<td>New, Low-Level Grade Crossing (Fill Newtown Creek)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ TU-1</td>
<td>Tunnel on Same Route</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TU-2</td>
<td>Tunnel North of Bridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TU-3</td>
<td>Tunnel South of Bridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The eleventh meeting of the New York State Department of Transportation’s (NYSDOT) Kosciuszko Bridge Project Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC) was held on Thursday, September 18, 2003 at Jennings Hall, Brooklyn. (See Attachment A for Attendance List.) The meeting was scheduled to introduce draft Level 2 screening criteria and to present the Traffic Primer that was prepared for the project.

Helen Neuhaus, Helen Neuhaus & Associates (HNA), opened the meeting by thanking CAC members for attending despite impending tropical storm *Isabel*. Following adoption of the Minutes of the July 24, 2003 meeting without changes, Ms. Neuhaus facilitated a discussion of follow-up items from that meeting. These included the following:

- Ms. Neuhaus reported that over the summer, the project team continued its outreach efforts to businesses in the vicinity of the Kosciuszko Bridge. On August 5th, Dan Prevost, Parsons; Denise Woodin, HNA; and Joe Ruzalski and Gus Amato, United Forties Civic Association, visited several Maspeth businesses in order to provide owners and managers with information about the project. Mr. Ruzalski and Mr. Amato subsequently made follow-up visits in the area.

  With assistance from Anthony Parra, EWVIDCO, NYSDOT sent letters and a “Frequently Asked Questions” (FAQs) fact sheet to several businesses on the Brooklyn side of the bridge. The project team will work with Anthony Nunziato, Queens resident and Frank Principe, West Maspeth Local Development Corporation, to distribute a similar information packet to Queens businesses.

- In response to Mr. Nunziato’s report of debris on the bridge, Robert Adams, NYSDOT, contacted the Department’s field office. Ms. Neuhaus noted that keeping the bridge clear of debris will require constant coordination with NYSDOT’s maintenance staff. She encouraged anyone who notices a problem to contact a member of the Kosciuszko Bridge project team.

Introduction to Level 2 Screening
Pat Monte, Vollmer Associates, began the discussion by remarking that Level 2 screening is more complicated than Level 1. He provided a recap of the screening process, noting that Level 1 screening was a success if the worst alternatives were eliminated; the better alternatives were not eliminated; and the results represent a balanced range of alternatives. He stated that there are 12 remaining alternatives: No Build; six Rehabilitation with Auxiliary Lanes alternatives, four Bridge Replacement alternatives and one Tunnel alternative. (See Attachment B.)
Mr. Monte then explained that the alternatives will be further developed during Level 2. The screening criteria, which are based on the project Goals and Objectives, will include enhanced Level 1 criteria along with new criteria. Under the enhanced criteria, the assessment of impacts will be updated to reflect more detailed examination of the alternatives, and the measures will be refined to differentiate between the alternatives. The new criteria will consider current and future traffic conditions; construction duration, methods, complexity, and staging; sustainability (the anticipated period of time between completion of the project and the need for future repairs); and vulnerability (the structure’s ability to withstand a natural disaster or terrorist attack).

Presentation re: Kosciuszko Bridge Traffic Primer
Using the Traffic Primer as a guide, Frank Catalanotto, Parsons, provided an overview of the traffic studies that are being conducted for the project. He stated that the studies will document current traffic conditions, predict future traffic demand and evaluate how well the alternatives will accommodate that traffic demand. He explained that the first task in a traffic study is to identify the study area, which should include all of the roadways and intersections that may be affected by the project. On the basis of NYSDOT’s 1995 traffic study, two areas were selected for the Kosciuszko Bridge Project: a Primary Study Area, which includes the triangle formed by Grand Street/Grand Avenue, the Long Island Expressway and the East River; and a Secondary Study Area which extends from the Primary Study Area boundary to Flushing Avenue and Queens Boulevard. Mr. Catalanotto noted that data collection and analysis concentrate on the Primary Study Area. Only key intersections will be assessed between the Primary and Secondary Study Areas.

Mr. Catalanotto then reviewed the types of data being collected:

- Weekly traffic volumes are collected manually and with Automated Traffic Recorders (ATRs)—machines that continuously capture weekday and weekend travel. Traffic counts can also be obtained by viewing videotapes. For this project, ATRs were set up at 74 locations and manual counts taken at 57 intersections. Both counts were taken during the morning and evening peak periods as well as midday.

  Traffic volume data collected in 2002 showed that approximately 186,000 vehicles crossed the Kosciuszko Bridge on a weekday. For comparison, traffic volume on the Williamsburg Bridge is approximately 110,000 vehicles per day; the Queens Midtown Tunnel carries approximately 80,000 vehicles per day.

- Classification counts identify the percentage of each vehicle type: autos, small trucks (including vans), medium size trucks and tractor-trailers. It is important to know the percentage of trucks because they greatly affect the capacity of a roadway.

- Vehicle Occupancy counts look at the number of people in a vehicle. This information is needed to investigate the potential for providing High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes (HOV), which would be used by buses and vehicles with 2 or more people.

- Travel Time/Speed and Delay Runs are performed in order to determine the time it takes to travel the length of a roadway, and the duration and causes of delays. The travel
time is used to calibrate the traffic simulation program that calculates the Levels of Service (LOS). These travel runs provide insight into possible changes to improve traffic and/or pedestrian movement. Fifteen Travel Time/Speed and Delay Runs were conducted on the expressways, major arterials and some of the local streets.

- **Pedestrian Counts** are taken at major pedestrian movement locations, generally at intersections. Pedestrian volumes are studied in order to analyze signalized intersections to improve the safety of pedestrian crossings.

- The geometric characteristics of the road (i.e. lane and shoulder widths, stopping-sight-distance, roadway grades) are elements that can contribute to accidents. The geometry of the Kosciuszko Bridge will be compared with standard values and studied to determine possible ways of improving traffic safety.

- **Accident data records** are collected and categorized by location, type, and possible causes. Safety analysis is an important factor in designing roadway improvements.

In response to questions from Mr. Nunziato and Barbara Mihelic, Noble Street Block Association regarding the dates and times of the traffic counts, Mr. Catalanotto stated that traffic counts are generally taken in the fall (after school starts and before Thanksgiving). In response to a question from Mr. Nunziato, Mr. Catalanotto confirmed that ATRs were placed on Grand Avenue. Mr. Nunziato and Ms. Mihelic asked for copies of all traffic data, including dates, times, locations and results. Ms. Neuhaus indicated that this information would be forwarded with the September Minutes (see Attachment C). Mr. Nunziato requested that SAC members be notified of any future traffic counts so that they could provide input on locations and times.

In response to a question from Mr. Nunziato, Mr. Catalanotto noted that traffic generated from other projects, such as the Olympic Village, Cross Harbor Inter-Modal Facility and Grand Avenue bus depot would be taken into consideration when predicting future traffic conditions.

He then explained that after all of the data is collected, estimates are made of the traffic-carrying ability of the roadway, which is measured by LOS. A computer program is used to calculate the six LOS ratings—A through F—that have been established to reflect the quality of traffic flow. “A” represents the best LOS or free-flow condition and “F” represents the worst LOS or stop-and-go condition. LOS will be calculated for the BQE from McGuinness Boulevard to the LIE interchange and Meeker Avenue from McGuinness Boulevard to Vandervoort Avenue. Mr. Catalanotto further explained that a computer software program known as VISSIM will be used to simulate traffic conditions on these roadways. Through the use of animation, VISSIM can identify congested areas and points of traffic flow conflict. This will assist in determining the LOS for each of the alternatives. In response to a question from Michael Rossmay, Brooklyn Borough President’s Office, Mr. Catalanotto indicated that the LOS analysis will be completed in “a couple months.” He added that traffic analyses for alternatives that advance to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement stage will include the expressways, major arterials and local streets.
A brief discussion followed regarding the extent of the traffic problems in both Brooklyn and Queens. After Ms. Mihelic and Mr. Ruzalski expressed their skepticism about the project’s ability to alleviate bottlenecks on the bridge, Mr. Monte acknowledged the heavy traffic. He noted that although the project will not reduce the number of vehicles, it could result in better traffic flow and improved safety. Vincent Arcuri, Queens Community Board (CB) #5 observed that through this project, the Brooklyn and Queens contingents are learning to work together on issues of common concern. He called on the SAC to adopt this unified approach beyond the Kosciuszko Bridge project, adding that “our work is just beginning.” In response to Ms. Mihelic’s comment that SAC members live and drive in the project area, Ms. Neuhaus stated that these are the reasons why it is important for them to participate. She continued by saying “no matter how many studies or engineers we have, your input is an important element in figuring out what works.” Emphasizing that the traffic studies must be comprehensive, Mr. Nunziato cited a New York City Department of City Planning proposal for a Home Depot store on the former KeySpan property.

Discussion of Draft Level 2 Screening Criteria
Mr. Monte then reviewed the draft Level 2 screening criteria with the SAC. They are:

- **Criterion 1: Improve long-term transportation operation and safety.**
  The four measures under this criterion address operational conditions and safety on the highway, along with opportunities for pedestrian and bicycle mobility.

- **Criterion 2: Avoid impacts to adjacent property and community facilities.**
  The first measure under this criterion addresses the acquisition of residential property, with the highest rating reserved for alternatives that avoid any residential takings. Measures 2-2 and 2-3 address permanent and temporary impacts to sensitive community areas such as Calvary Cemetery and Sergeant Dougherty Park. Measures 2-4 and 2-5 address temporary and permanent impacts on local businesses by looking at the number of employees relocated or disrupted. Lastly, Measure 2-6 calls for minimizing the disruption of businesses due to the construction of new columns in areas of business activity.

- **Criterion 3: Minimize traffic diversion both during construction and long term.**
  Measure 3-1 evaluates the alternatives in terms of the amount of traffic diverted from the highway onto local streets. Ratings are based on the projected highway LOS under each alternative. Measure 3-2 calls for minimizing the need for future bridge maintenance work, with a completely new bridge or tunnel receiving the highest rating. Measure 3-3 addresses the duration of construction, and Measure 3-4 looks at each alternative’s ability to withstand a disaster. In discussing Measure 3-4, Mr. Monte noted that since a new structure would meet or exceed current design standards, alternatives involving all new construction would rank higher than those involving rehabilitation or maintenance alone. Because tunnels are more susceptible to fires and explosions than bridges, a new tunnel would be built with two tubes, to provide redundancy. Mr. Monte added that the existing bridge has piers that could be hit by a marine vessel or trusses that, if destroyed, could cause the bridge to collapse.
The following questions and comments were raised during the presentation:

- Referring to Measure 3-1, Mr. Nunziato observed that aiming for LOS “C” or greater is not very ambitious. Mr. Arcuri suggested that NYSDOT is trying to be realistic about the LOS that can be achieved on the bridge. Mr. Monte clarified that the measure relates to the LOS at peak hours in the peak direction. In response to a question from Muhammad Afzal, New York City Department of Transportation, Mr. Catalanotto stated that the current LOS depends on the time of day and direction. Generally, traffic in the peak direction travels at LOS “F”, while the non-peak direction is LOS “E”.

- Mr. Arcuri asked how good “operational conditions” would be defined. Mr. Catalanotto answered that on most highways, LOS “C” or greater would mean that traffic is moving at 40-50 miles per hour. In response to a comment from Alvin Goodman, Brooklyn Borough President’s Office, Mr. Catalanotto noted that given the urban nature of the Kosciuszko Bridge corridor, a different framework might be acceptable. Luis Calderon, NYSDOT, added that operational improvements for this measure refer to each alternative’s ability to improve roadway geometry.

- In response to a question from Mr. Amato, Mr. Adams stated that the traffic data has not yet been analyzed to determine how much faster traffic would move under a given alternative. Ms. Mihelic questioned the feasibility of conducting Level 2 screening before any traffic analysis or modeling is done. Mr. Monte acknowledged that the only way to know if an alternative will improve traffic flow is to look at the completed analysis. He explained that Measure 1-1 may need to be revised if all of the screened alternatives fall within the same range.

- Referring to Measure 1-4, Ms. Mihelic noted that a bikeway/walkway on the bridge would increase the number of pedestrians on Meeker and Grand Avenues and that this should be taken into account.

- Referring to Measures 2-2 and 2-3, Ms. Mihelic expressed her preference for using numbers rather than percentages when calculating the distance of an alternative from sensitive community areas. Mr. Arcuri expanded on this point by noting that an alternative that moves the structure 50% closer to a house that is 10 feet away is different than an alternative that moves the structure 75% closer to a house that is 100 feet away. He suggested that the distance be measured to the nearest ten feet. Mr. Goodman asked if the measures could be revised to include both percentages and feet. After Mr. Adams noted that the measures would have to be separated for Brooklyn and Queens, he and Ms. Neuhaus indicated that the project team would revisit this issue.

- In response to questions from Theresa Cianciotta, Assemblyman Joseph Lentol’s office, and Ms. Mihelic, Mr. Monte stated that plans that show the exact locations of properties that might be impacted will be available for Level 2 screening. Mr. Adams added that the project team has gathered information about businesses in the vicinity of the bridge and is trying to reach as many owners and managers as possible.
Referring to Measures 2-4, 2-5 and 2-6, Mr. Rossmy and Mr. Arcuri noted that the range for the number of employees affected in each group is too broad. Mr. Arcuri also maintained that more detailed information is needed in order to determine the potential impacts to businesses surrounding the bridge. Mr. Adams reiterated that further research and outreach will be conducted and will be available to the SAC during Level 2 screening.

Mr. Arcuri observed that in order to evaluate the sustainability of each alternative (Measure 3-2), the SAC would need information about the types of materials to be used. Acknowledging his comment, Mr. Monte indicated that this could be discussed at a later date.

Referring to Measure 3-3, Mr. Arcuri remarked that the duration of construction would depend on whether the work is performed at night, during the day or both. After Ms. Mihelic noted that construction-period impacts start with work on any temporary bridges and continue through the end of the project, Mr. Adams assured her that this will be made explicit during Level 2 screening.

Mr. Goodman suggested that Measure 3-4, which evaluates each alternative in terms of its vulnerability to disaster, be defined as a separate criterion with the caveat that failure to meet this new criterion not be considered a fatal flaw. A brief discussion ensued, during which Philip Galasso, Sagres Partners, questioned the assertion that the existing bridge could be damaged by marine traffic, and Mr. Arcuri pointed out that the vulnerability of even new bridges could vary, depending on the materials used and the type of construction. Harold Fink, NYSDOT, stated that it would be premature to discuss details relating to different types of bridges at this level. It was decided that the criteria would be revised to change Measure 3-4 to Criterion 4.

In response to a request from Mr. Nunziato, it was agreed that the project team would look at ways to incorporate the community’s desire for open space and amenities into the criteria.

In response to a question from Martha Holstein, Strategic Urban Solutions, Ms. Neuhaus stated that Level 2 screening will take “a few months” to complete.

**Discussion re: Public Meeting**
Ms. Neuhaus opened the discussion by noting that the SAC has been meeting for one year and has become much stronger during that time. After remarking that it is now time to bring the community up-to-speed on the committee’s activities and the technical work being conducted for the project, she announced that the project team plans to schedule Open Houses in Brooklyn and Queens in November. These meetings will include a brief recap of the project, an overview of the Goals and Objectives and discussion of Level 1 screening. Ms. Neuhaus added that a newsletter is currently being drafted that will be sent to more than 700 people on the project mailing list prior to the Open Houses. She expressed her hope that SAC members will participate in the meetings.
In the ensuing discussion, SAC members raised concerns about the dates and locations that were proposed for the Open Houses. Based on the SAC’s recommendations, it was agreed that the Queens Open House would not be held on November 10th and that Martin Luther High School would be contacted to determine its availability for the Queens meeting. The project team also agreed to investigate St. Cecilia’s Church and School, St. Anthony’s Church, and the Greenpoint Savings Bank as possible sites for the Brooklyn meeting. Mr. Rossmy noted that the Open Houses should be announced at the next meeting of the Brooklyn Borough Board, which will be held on October 7th. The Queens Borough Board will meet on October 20th. Ms. Neuhaus promised to forward information about the meetings to Mr. Rossmy and Mr. Arcuri before these dates. In response to Ms. Mihelic’s suggestion to publicize the Open Houses by distributing the newsletter at community meetings in October, Ms. Neuhaus asked SAC members to let her know how many copies they need for each of their organizations.

Other Business
- Rick Backlund, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), announced that, as a follow-up to the presentation made at the July 24th SAC meeting, the Cross Harbor Freight Movement Project team has scheduled two public meetings in Queens: October 2nd at the Sunnyside Senior Center, and October 8th at the Greater Ridgewood Center. For further information, SAC members and others may contact Zetlin Communications at (212) 799-8803. Later in the meeting, Mr. Arcuri observed that October 8th is the date of CB #5’s meeting. Since Mr. Backlund was no longer present, Harold Fink, NYSDOT, offered to pass this information along to the Cross Harbor team.

- Mr. Amato stated that some Queens businesses are more concerned about the potential loss of income from billboards on their properties than other takings or impacts. He asked if NYSDOT would compensate businesses for this type of loss, and Mr. Arcuri asked if billboards adjacent to the highway would be considered illegal if they are too close to a widened roadway. Ms. Neuhaus indicated that the project team would look into these issues.

- Noting that SAC meeting attendance is down from last year, Mr. Nunziato suggested that the project team reach out to members who no longer participate. Ms. Neuhaus reminded the SAC that letters were sent to non-attendees in January 2003 and that members (excluding elected officials) who did not respond were removed at that time. She stated that the decision to drop additional members or add new members rests with the SAC. Mr. Nunziato added that despite the lower attendance, there is much continuity with a good core group of people participating. His comment that the project team is doing a “tremendous job” was met with a round of applause. Mr. Arcuri congratulated NYSDOT for “picking a great team.” Mr. Parra then requested information regarding SAC member attendance. After further discussion, it was decided that a letter would be drafted to non-attendees encouraging them to become involved; an updated attendance list will be distributed with the September Minutes.

- Mr. Adams announced that the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation will hold a public meeting regarding the remedial action plan for the Phelps-Dodge site on Tuesday, October 6th at 8 p.m. at the Sunnyside Community Center.
At the request of Ms. Cianciotta, Ms. Neuhaus announced that Assemblyman Lentol and New York State Senator Martin Malave Dilan are sponsoring a new discount Metrocard program for senior citizens in Greenpoint and Williamsburg.

The next SAC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 16th at 6:30 P.M. at Jennings Hall, 260 Powers Street, Brooklyn.

Follow-up Items
1. Forward copies of letters sent to Brooklyn businesses to Michael Rossmy. Responsibility: HNA.

2. Include traffic data (dates, times, locations and results) with September meeting Minutes (Anthony Nunziato, Barbara Mihelic). Responsibility: HNA, Parsons.

3. Notify the SAC of any additional traffic data collection efforts so that they can provide input on times, locations, etc. (Anthony Nunziato). Responsibility: HNA, Parsons.

4. Revise Measures 2-2 and 2-3 of the Level 2 Screening criteria in order to clarify distance (in feet) of alternatives to homes or community facilities (Barbara Mihelic, Alvin Goodman). Responsibility: Project Team

5. Revise Level 2 Screening criteria to define Measure 3-4 as a separate criterion (Alvin Goodman). Responsibility: Project Team.

6. Revise Level 2 Screening criteria to add a measure rating alternatives on their ability to provide open space, parkland or community amenities. (Anthony Nunziato, Vincent Arcuri, Barbara Mihelic). Responsibility: Project Team

7. Finalize dates and locations for Brooklyn and Queens Open Houses. Responsibility: HNA.

8. Distribute project newsletter to mailing list in October and forward multiple copies to SAC members and community organizations (Barbara Mihelic). Responsibility: HNA.

9. Update SAC attendance chart for distribution with September meeting Minutes (Anthony Parra). Responsibility: HNA.


11. Inform Cross Harbor Freight Movement Project team that its planned community meeting on October 2nd conflicts with the Community Board #5 meeting (Vincent Arcuri). Responsibility: Harold Fink, NYSDOT.

12. Contact NYSDOT field office regarding chunks of concrete on the ground at the Meeker/Morgan exit of the BQE (Dorothy Swick). Responsibility: NYSDOT.
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ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS PROCESS
LEVEL 2 ALTERNATIVES
September 18, 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RA-1</td>
<td>Rehabilitation, Widen on Eastbound Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA-2</td>
<td>Rehabilitation, Widen on Westbound Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA-3</td>
<td>Rehabilitation, Widen on Both Sides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA-5</td>
<td>Rehabilitation, New Parallel Bridge on Eastbound Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA-6</td>
<td>Rehabilitation, New Parallel Bridge on Westbound Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA-7</td>
<td>Rehabilitation, New Parallel Bridges on Both Sides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR-1</td>
<td>New Bridge on Same Route—No Additional Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR-2</td>
<td>New Bridge on Same Route—Permanent Eastbound Parallel Bridge; Temporary Westbound Parallel Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR-3</td>
<td>New Bridge on Same Route—Permanent Eastbound and Westbound Parallel Bridges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR-5</td>
<td>New Bridge on Same Route—Permanent Eastbound Parallel Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TU-1</td>
<td>Tunnel on Same Route</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1
KOSCIUSZKO BRIDGE PROJECT
Automatic Traffic Recorder (ATR) Count Locations

ATR counts were taken 24 hours a day for at least 7 days between 11/9/02 and 11/24/02

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location ID</th>
<th>Roadway/Expressway</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Location Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>BQE</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Mainline before exit to Flushing Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>BQE</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Exit to Flushing Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>BQE</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Ent. from Williamsburg St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>BQE</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Exit to Metropolitan Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>BQE</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Ent. from Williamsburg Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>BQE</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Exit to Humboldt St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>BQE</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Exit to McGuinness Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>BQE</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Ent. from Meeker Ave/Vandervoort Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>BQE</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Mainline after Meeker Ave ent./Vandervoort Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>BQE</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Exit to LIE service road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11</td>
<td>LIE</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Exit to EB BQE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12</td>
<td>BQE</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Exit to WB service road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13</td>
<td>BQE</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Exit to 48th St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14</td>
<td>LIE service road</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Ent. from 48th St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A15</td>
<td>LIE service road</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Exit to Maurice Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A16</td>
<td>LIE</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Ent. from Borden Ave/60th St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A17</td>
<td>LIE</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Mainline between 48th St and 58th St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A18</td>
<td>LIE</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Mainline between 48th St and 58th St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A19</td>
<td>LIE</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Exit to Maurice Ave/63rd St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A20</td>
<td>LIE</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Exit to service road for BQE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A21</td>
<td>LIE service road</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Ent. from Borden Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A22</td>
<td>LIE service road</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Exit to LIE WB mainline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A23</td>
<td>LIE service road</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Exit to 48th St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A24</td>
<td>LIE service road</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Exit to BQE WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A25</td>
<td>BQE</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Mainline after ent. from EB LIE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A26</td>
<td>BQE</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Mainline after ent. from 61st St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A27</td>
<td>BQE</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Exit to WB LIE/Hunters Point Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A28</td>
<td>LIE</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Exit to Greenpoint Ave/39th St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A29</td>
<td>LIE</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Ent. from Van Dam St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A30</td>
<td>LIE</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Exit to Van Dam St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A31</td>
<td>LIE</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Exit to WB BQE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A32</td>
<td>BQE</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Ent. From 51st Ave/43rd St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A33</td>
<td>BQE</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Mainline after Kosciuszko Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A34</td>
<td>BQE</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Exit to Meeker Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A35</td>
<td>BQE</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Ent. from Meeker Ave/McGuinness Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A36</td>
<td>BQE</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Ent. from McGuinness Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A37</td>
<td>BQE</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Exit to Metropolitan Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A38</td>
<td>BQE</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Ent. from Metropolitan Ave/Marcy Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A39</td>
<td>BQE</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Exit to Williamsburg Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A40</td>
<td>BQE</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Exit to Flushing Ave/Kent Ave/Williamsburg St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A41</td>
<td>BQE</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Ent. from Flushing Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A42</td>
<td>BQE</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Mainline after ent. from Flushing Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A43</td>
<td>Kent Ave</td>
<td>NB/SB</td>
<td>Between S11th St &amp; S8th St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A44</td>
<td>Grant St</td>
<td>EB/WB</td>
<td>Between Bushwick Ave &amp; Waterbury St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A45</td>
<td>Metropolitan Ave</td>
<td>EB/WB</td>
<td>Between Bushwick Ave &amp; Olive St</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 1
KOSCIUSZKO BRIDGE PROJECT
Automatic Traffic Recorder (ATR) Count Locations

ATR counts were taken 24 hours a day for at least 7 days between 11/9/02 and 11/24/02

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location ID</th>
<th>Roadway/Expressway</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Location Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A46</td>
<td>Morgan Ave</td>
<td>NB/SB</td>
<td>Between Richardson St &amp; Maspeth Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A47</td>
<td>Vandervoort Ave</td>
<td>NB/SB</td>
<td>Between Richardson St &amp; Maspeth Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A48</td>
<td>Grand Ave</td>
<td>EB/WB</td>
<td>Between Gardner Ave &amp; 47th St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A49</td>
<td>Flushing Ave</td>
<td>EB/WB</td>
<td>Between Metropolitan Ave &amp; Woodward Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A50</td>
<td>Page Pl</td>
<td>NB/SB</td>
<td>Between Grand Ave &amp; Maspeth Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A51</td>
<td>Rust Ave</td>
<td>NB/SB</td>
<td>Between Grand Ave &amp; 58th Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A52</td>
<td>Flushing Ave</td>
<td>EB/WB</td>
<td>Between Grand Ave &amp; 58th Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A53</td>
<td>Kent Ave</td>
<td>NB/SB</td>
<td>Between N10th St &amp; N9th St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A54</td>
<td>McGuinness Blvd</td>
<td>NB/SB</td>
<td>Between Norman Ave &amp; Nassau Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A55</td>
<td>McGuinness Blvd</td>
<td>NB/SB</td>
<td>Between Huron St &amp; India St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A56</td>
<td>McGuinness Blvd</td>
<td>NB/SB</td>
<td>Between Pulaski Bridge &amp; Freeman St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A57</td>
<td>Greenpoint Ave</td>
<td>EB/WB</td>
<td>Between Franklin St &amp; Manhattan Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A58</td>
<td>Greenpoint Ave</td>
<td>EB/WB</td>
<td>Between Humboldt St &amp; Russell St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A59</td>
<td>Jackson Ave</td>
<td>EB/WB</td>
<td>Between 21st St &amp; 11th St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A60</td>
<td>Van Dam St</td>
<td>NB/SB</td>
<td>Between 47th Ave &amp; 48th Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A61</td>
<td>Greenpoint Ave</td>
<td>EB/WB</td>
<td>Between Bradley Ave &amp; LIE EB service road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A62</td>
<td>Queens Blvd</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Between 58th St &amp; 59th St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A63</td>
<td>Queens Blvd</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Between 58th St &amp; 59th St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A64</td>
<td>Maurice Ave</td>
<td>NB/SB</td>
<td>Between 55th Dr &amp; Borden Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A65</td>
<td>LIE</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Exit to service road to WB BQE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A66</td>
<td>Borden Ave</td>
<td>EB/WB</td>
<td>Between 23rd St &amp; 21st St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A67</td>
<td>Flushing Ave</td>
<td>EB/WB</td>
<td>Between Nostrand Ave &amp; Union Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A68</td>
<td>LIE</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Mainline after exit to 21st St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A69</td>
<td>LIE</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Mainline after ent. from Van Dam St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A70</td>
<td>LIE</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Mainline HOV lane after ent. from Van Dam St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A71</td>
<td>Meeker Ave</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Between McGuinness Blvd &amp; Porter Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A72</td>
<td>Meeker Ave</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Between McGuinness Blvd &amp; Porter Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A73</td>
<td>Meeker Ave</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Between Metropolitan Ave &amp; McGuinness Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A74</td>
<td>Meeker Ave</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Between Metropolitan Ave &amp; McGuinness Blvd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2
KOSCIUSZKO BRIDGE PROJECT
Manual Turning Movement Count (TMC) Locations

TMCs were taken from 6 a.m. – 10 a.m., 11 a.m. – 2 p.m., and 3 p.m. - 7 p.m. on one weekday (11/19/02 or 11/20/02) and from 10 a.m. – 3 p.m. on one weekend day (11/9/02, 11/23/02, or 12/7/02).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location ID</th>
<th>Intersection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Kent Ave @ Williamsburg St W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Kent Ave @ Williamsburg St E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>Metropolitan Ave @ Marcy Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Meeker Ave WB @ Metropolitan Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>Meeker Ave EB @ Metropolitan Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>Metropolitan Av @ Vandervoort Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>Metropolitan Ave @ Stewart Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>Meeker Ave EB @ Humboldt St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9</td>
<td>Meeker Ave WB @ McGuinness Blvd (include RT from McGuinness Blvd to WB BQE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T10</td>
<td>Meeker Ave WB @ Kingsland Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T11</td>
<td>Meeker Ave EB @ Kingsland Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T12</td>
<td>Meeker Ave WB @ Morgan Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T13</td>
<td>Meeker Ave EB @ Morgan Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T14</td>
<td>Meeker Ave WB @ Vandervoort Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T15</td>
<td>Meeker Ave EB @ Vandervoort Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T16</td>
<td>Greenpoint Ave @ Franklin St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T17</td>
<td>Greenpoint Ave @ Manhattan Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T18</td>
<td>Greenpoint Ave @ McGuinness Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T19</td>
<td>Greenpoint Ave @ Humboldt Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T20</td>
<td>Greenpoint Ave @ Kingsland Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T21</td>
<td>Greenpoint Ave @ Review Ave/Van Dam St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T22</td>
<td>Greenpoint Ave @ LIE SB service road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T23</td>
<td>Greenpoint Ave @ LIE WB service road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T24</td>
<td>Greenpoint Ave @ Hunters Point Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T25</td>
<td>Greenpoint Ave @ Queens Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T26</td>
<td>Franklin St @ India St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T27</td>
<td>Jackson Ave @ Hunters Point Ave/11th St (All movements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T28</td>
<td>Jackson Ave @ Thompson Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T29</td>
<td>Queens Blvd @ 69th St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T30</td>
<td>Grand Ave @ 69th St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T31</td>
<td>Grand Ave @ LIE WB service road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T32</td>
<td>Grand Ave @ LIE EB service road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T33</td>
<td>Maurice Ave @ LIE WB service road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T34</td>
<td>Maurice Ave @ LIE EB service road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T35</td>
<td>Maurice Ave @ Maspeth Ave/58th St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T36</td>
<td>Grand Ave @ Page Pl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T37</td>
<td>Metropolitan Ave @ Flushing Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T38</td>
<td>Grand Ave @ Stewart Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T39</td>
<td>Metropolitan Ave @ Gardner Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T40</td>
<td>Metropolitan Ave @ Morgan Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T41</td>
<td>Grand St @ Morgan Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T42</td>
<td>Metropolitan Ave @ Humboldt Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T43</td>
<td>Grand St @ Bushwick st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T44</td>
<td>Flushing Ave @ Humboldt St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T45</td>
<td>Grand Ave @ Rust St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T46</td>
<td>58th St @ LIE service road EB &amp; WB/Borden Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T47</td>
<td>Van Dam St @ Hunters Point Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T48</td>
<td>Van Dam St @ LIE WB service road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T49</td>
<td>Van Dam St @ LIE EB service road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T50</td>
<td>Grand St @ Vandervoort Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T51</td>
<td>Flushing Ave @ Classon Ave/Rutledge St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T52</td>
<td>McGuinness Blvd @ India St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T53</td>
<td>Maurice Ave @ 69th St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T54</td>
<td>Borden Ave @ Queens Midtown Tunnel ent./exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T55</td>
<td>McGuinness Blvd @ Freeman St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T56</td>
<td>48th St @ Laurel Hill Blvd EB &amp; WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T57</td>
<td>48th St @ Exit Ramps from EB BQE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Classification/Occupancy counts were taken from 6 a.m. – 10 a.m., 11 a.m. – 2 p.m., and 3 p.m. – 7 p.m. on one weekday (11/19/02 or 11/20/02) and from 10 a.m. – 3 p.m on one weekend day (11/23/02).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location ID</th>
<th>Location Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O1</td>
<td>Meeker Ave On-Ramp to BQE EB @ Vandervoort Ave (A8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2</td>
<td>EB BQE Off-Ramp to LIE WB (A12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O3</td>
<td>EB BQE Off-Ramp to LIE EB (A13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O4</td>
<td>LIE WB service road exit to WB BQE (A24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O5</td>
<td>LIE EB service road exit WB BQE (A31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O6</td>
<td>BQE WB entrance from Borden Ave/43rd St (A32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O7</td>
<td>Meeker Ave Off-Ramp from BQE WB @ Apollo St (A34)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pedestrian counts were taken from 6 a.m. – 10 a.m., 11 a.m. – 2 p.m., and 3 p.m. – 7 p.m. on one weekday (11/19/02 or 11/20/02) and from 10 a.m. – 3 p.m. on one weekend day (11/23/02).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location ID</th>
<th>Location Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>Meeker Ave WB @ Metropolitan Ave (T4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>Meeker Ave EB @ Metropolitan Ave (T5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>Meeker Ave EB @ Humboldt St (T8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>Meeker Ave WB @ McGuinness Blvd (T9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>Greenpoint Ave @ McGuinness Blvd (T18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>Greenpoint Ave @ Queens Blvd (T25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>Grand Ave @ LIE WB service road (T31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>Grand Ave @ LIE EB service road (T32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td>Maurice Ave @ LIE WB service road (T33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
<td>Maurice Ave @ LIE EB service road (T34)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project team would like the SAC’s assistance with our pedestrian data collection efforts. The team has a good understanding of vehicle traffic patterns in the study area based on the 1995 study and this study’s extensive data collection effort. However, we recognize that the community may have a better understanding of pedestrian issues in the area. We would like your assistance in identifying locations where additional pedestrian counts would be appropriate. These locations should either be near the BQE or one of the major arterials in the study area (Grand Ave/Grand St, Greenpoint Ave, etc.). It would also be helpful if you could include approximate times that would be appropriate to perform the pedestrian counts (i.e. end of the school day, lunchtime, etc.).

Please review the list above and bring any suggestions for additional locations to the October 16, 2003 SAC meeting or provide them to Bob Adam at radams@gw.dot.state.ny.us or (718) 482-4683 before October 16.
The twelfth meeting of the New York State Department of Transportation’s (NYSDOT) Kosciuszko Bridge Project Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC) was held on Thursday, October 16, 2003 at Jennings Hall, Brooklyn. (See Attachment A for Attendance List.) The meeting was scheduled to continue discussion of the Draft Level 2 screening criteria and the upcoming Public Open Houses.

Ms. Neuhaus opened the meeting by asking for comments on the Minutes of the September 18, 2003 SAC meeting. Following adoption of the Minutes without changes, Ms. Neuhaus facilitated a discussion of follow-up items from that meeting. These included the following:

- In response to requests from Barbara Mihelic, Noble Street Block Association, and Anthony Nunziato, Queens resident, for detailed information regarding the dates, times and locations of traffic counts, this information was distributed with the September 18th Minutes. Ms. Neuhaus noted that the raw data from these counts, while available for review, was too extensive to include in the mailing. Referring to a note sent to the SAC with the Minutes, she stated that the project team is seeking SAC input regarding possible locations and times for additional pedestrian counts.

- As a follow-up to a discussion at the September meeting, a SAC attendance chart was distributed with the Minutes and a draft letter to non-attendees distributed at the October meeting. Ms. Neuhaus reminded SAC members that a similar letter was sent to non-attendees in January and that a few people were removed from the Committee at that time. She noted that all SAC members receive the monthly Minutes, whether they attend the meetings or not. Ms. Neuhaus added that the SAC is composed of a strong core group that is “incredibly effective.”

During the ensuing discussion, SAC members suggested a number of ways to reach out to other members, as well as the public at large. Expressing frustration that Queens Community Board #2 is not more active in the SAC, Joseph Ruzalski, United Forties Civic Association (UFCA), noted that he and Gus Amato, UFCA, routinely share the information contained in the Minutes with members of their group. Theresa Cianciotta, Assemblyman Joseph Lentol, voiced her concern that many of the local residents who attended meetings a year ago no longer do so. She speculated that since they have not participated in the process, they will become upset if problems arise. In response to Ms. Cianciotta’s inquiry regarding a project “hotline,” Ms. Neuhaus stated that any member of the public may call her office for information. Mr. Ruzalski complimented the project team on its efforts to keep the community informed.

Ms. Mihelic observed that she has seen brief articles about the Kosciuszko Bridge Project in local community newspapers. In response, Peter King, NYSDOT, recommended that the project team order subscriptions for the newspapers that cover neighborhoods in the project
area. Ms. Mihelic also suggested that the project team produce a one-page monthly newsletter that summarizes SAC activities for distribution to the general public. Ms. Neuhaus indicated that both of these ideas would be considered.

Referring to the draft letter to SAC non-attendees, Michael Hofmann, GWAAP, and Anthony Parra, EWVIDCO, stated that the letter should be “tougher.” Mr. Parra added that it should reflect the SAC’s desire for full participation. Ms. Mihelic commented that SAC members should call their elected officials regarding their lack of involvement. After further discussion, it was agreed that the letter to non-attendees would be revised but that no one would be removed from the Committee at this time.

Ms. Neuhaus reported that the project team is continuing its outreach efforts to businesses on both sides of the bridge through the distribution of personalized letters and a Frequently Asked Questions document. In addition, a business survey (see Attachment B) is being developed. The survey will be conducted by project team members, who will visit businesses in Brooklyn and Queens and talk to company owners or managers. Ms. Neuhaus noted that the information collected will be helpful during Level 2 screening. In response to her suggestion that a SAC representative from each borough join the project team in the field, Mr. Parra and Mr. Ruzalski offered to assist. In response to Ms. Neuhaus’ request for input on the survey, Michael Rossmy, Brooklyn Borough President’s Office, recommended that a question be added regarding the routes used for deliveries and shipments.

Continued Discussion re: Level 2 Screening Criteria

Steve Bennett, Parsons, opened the discussion by reviewing the changes that were made to the Level 2 Screening Criteria in response to SAC comments. Specific changes included amending Measures 2-2 and 2-3 in order to clarify the distance (in feet) of alternatives to homes or community facilities and making Measure 3-4 a separate criterion (now Criterion 4).

In addition, it was noted that Mr. Nunziato had requested the addition of a measure that rates alternatives on their ability to provide open space, parkland or community amenities. Responding to this request, Mr. Bennett explained that since any of the alternatives can, and will, provide for amenities, this measure could not be used to differentiate between the alternatives. Furthermore, since the creation of open space or community amenities often requires the acquisition of property, such a measure would directly contradict the goal of avoiding property takings. After indicating that the requested measure was not added for these reasons, Mr. Bennett reiterated that NYSDOT is committed to providing community enhancements in connection with all of its projects. This is reflected in the Department’s Environmental Initiative, which is described on its website (www.dot.state.ny.us/eab/envinit.html). Mr. Bennett also reminded the SAC that the project Goals and Objectives call for exploring opportunities for the creation of parks and open space, which will be done as part of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) process. In a final comment, Ms. Mihelic noted that the community simply wants to ensure that this project will facilitate creating vest pocket parks or similar amenities.

Mr. Bennett continued by stating that Criteria 1 and 3, which relate to traffic operations on the highway and the diversion of traffic onto local streets, favor the new bridge (BR) alternatives. Criterion 2, which calls for avoiding impacts to residences and community facilities, favors the
Rehabilitation with Auxiliary Lanes (RA) alternatives. He explained that since the two groups of alternatives compete with each other, they will be evaluated separately. As a result, the best alternatives from each category will remain at the end of Level 2 screening. Mr. Bennett further explained that while the same criteria will be used for both the RA and BR alternatives, some of the measures will be different. He indicated that all numbers shown in brackets are subject to change, pending completion of traffic analyses and business studies. In addition to the revisions suggested by the SAC, the project team made the following changes:

- **Criterion 2, Measure 1-1:** This measure previously evaluated each alternative in terms of the Level of Service (LOS) provided. Because the concept of highway speed is easier to understand, the measure now uses three ranges of speed. The ranges are higher under the BR alternatives.

- **Criterion 2:** For the purposes of simplicity and accuracy, the impacts to community facilities (i.e. Sergeant Dougherty Park, Calvary Cemetery) and the impacts to residences will be examined in separate measures. Since the new bridge alternatives will have full lanes and shoulders, and will move closer to sensitive community areas, the numbers are different for the BR measures.

- **Criterion 2, Measure 2-7:** This new measure looks at the number and location of new bridge columns and their impact on businesses.

The following is a summary of comments, questions and discussion relating to the revised criteria:

- In response to a question from Mr. Rossmy regarding the correlation between LOS and highway speed, Frank Catalanotto, Parsons, replied that although the project team attempted to relate LOS to speed, this was not possible.

- Answering a question from Mr. Rossmy regarding Measure 1-2, Mr. Bennett explained that the addition of full shoulders and standard lanes would not be possible with the rehabilitation of the existing bridge. However, the addition of shoulders and standard lanes (representing approximately one-third of the total roadway width) would be possible with those RA alternatives that call for the construction of a new parallel bridge.

- In response to Mr. Ruzalski’s comment regarding the short acceleration lanes on the ramps, Mr. Bennett stated that this problem will be addressed under any alternative. The acceleration lane on a new bridge would be considerably longer.

- Mr. Ruzalski inquired about the construction of a new ramp to the Phelps-Dodge property, noting that this would require the acquisition of additional property. Mr. Bennett replied that a new ramp, either to the Phelps-Dodge site or the Cross Harbor Intermodal yard, is not being considered at this time. He stated that the Cross Harbor project team has indicated that the intermodal yard is not expected to generate enough traffic to warrant its own ramp. He added that this issue may be revisited in the future if necessary. In response to Mr. Ruzalski’s request, Mr. Bennett agreed to keep the SAC informed of coordination efforts between the Cross Harbor and Kosciuszko Bridge project teams.
Referring to Measure 1-4, Mr. Bennett explained that this measure considers the feasibility of creating a bikeway/walkway for each alternative. While a new bridge could accommodate a bikeway/walkway, a tunnel and certain RA alternatives could not. Teresa Toro, Senator Martin Milave Dilan, asked if it would be possible to construct a bikeway/walkway on a cantilevered platform. Mr. Bennett replied that this is being examined by project engineers, who are currently reviewing the structural aspects of widening the bridge. He added that a 20’ widening of the bridge would be required to accommodate auxiliary lanes.

Observing that Calvary Cemetery lies at the Queens end of the bridge, Mary Gottlieb, Meeker Avenue/Apollo Street Association, asked about the destination of cyclists crossing the bridge in that direction. Mr. King replied that the idea is to create a comprehensive system with the Kosciuszko Bridge bikeway/walkway linking to a network of other bicycle and pedestrian pathways. He added that the New York City Department of City Planning (DCP) has developed a master plan with approximately 500 miles of bikeway/walkway. In response to further questions from Ms. Gottlieb, Mr. Bennett replied that although this section of the bridge might accommodate cyclists, pedestrians and “mothers with baby carriages” in the same right-of-way, that would depend on the width of the bridge. Ms. Mihelic asked if the bikeway/walkway could be built over the bridge. Mr. Bennett answered that all construction would have to meet Americans with Disabilities Act regulations. This level of detail will be considered during the DEIS phase. In response to a question from Ms. Gottlieb, Mr. Bennett stated that certain Queens residences are more than 100’ from the existing structure.

Referring to Measures 2-1 and 2-2, Mr. Bennett noted that there are homes on Apollo Street that are currently 45’ from the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway (BQE). The only way to evaluate an alternative in these cases is to look at whether the alternative moves any closer, thereby impacting the local environment. In response to a question from Ms. Mihelic, Mr. Bennett stated that certain Queens residences are more than 100’ from the existing structure.

In response to a question from Ms. Gottlieb, Mr. Bennett explained that the section of the BQE between Van Dam and Apollo Streets is known as the Brooklyn connector. Although work will be done on this stretch, it will not be built closer to the residences on the westbound side. Ms. Gottlieb remarked that a temporary bridge at that location would have a serious impact on residential properties. Mr. Bennett stated that any temporary structure would be built on the eastbound side of the connector (the opposite side of the BQE from residential properties). While businesses on the eastbound side of the connector may be affected by a temporary bridge, steps would be taken to minimize the impact, such as providing only three lanes at less than standard widths.

In response to Ms. Mihelic’s question about possible plans to institute tolls on New York City bridges, Mr. King stated that, philosophically, Mayor Michael Bloomberg supports the tolls. However, he understands that, politically and programmatically, it is not feasible. Mr. Bennett added that the plan under consideration only calls for tolls on bridges entering Manhattan.
Referring to Criterion 3, Mr. Bennett stated that preliminary traffic modeling will allow project engineers to predict traffic demand for the year 2045 (30 years past the anticipated end of construction, which is the industry standard). The model will also forecast the number of vehicles that the bridge could accommodate and the number of vehicles potentially diverted from the bridge. He explained that if vehicles cannot cross the bridge, they will either choose a different time to travel, a different mode of travel, or a different route (e.g. the local streets). Although preliminary modeling will not show which of these choices drivers would make, such information will be available in the DEIS. It is expected that less traffic would be diverted with a new bridge.

In response to a question from Mr. Rossmy regarding traffic projections for the Cross Harbor project, Mr. Catalanotto indicated that those projections probably did not go as far as 2045. Mr. Rossmy also asked how the values for Measure 3-1 were determined. Mr. Catalanotto responded that project engineers assumed a 0.5% increase per year and then calculated the difference between current bridge traffic and future demand.

Referring to Measure 3-3, Mr. Bennett noted that construction could be potentially accelerated for any of the alternatives. For the purposes of Level 2 screening, conventional daytime construction will be assumed. However, the DEIS will examine options for shortening the construction period. In response to a question from Ms. Mihelic, Mr. Bennett observed that this could be accomplished through weekend work or extra shifts. Agreeing with Ms. Mihelic that quality should not be sacrificed for speed, he stated that pieces of the bridge could be pre-fabricated off-site and installed quickly and efficiently. Ms. Gottlieb remarked that night work would disrupt the sleep of local residents.

In response to a question from Christine Holowacz, Greenpoint Property Owners, Mr. Bennett stated that Criterion 4 is based on the concept of redundancy (i.e., if one element of the bridge fails, back-up elements will allow the bridge to remain standing). He noted that this issue has received more attention since September 11th and that federal codes require redundancy wherever possible.

Ms. Neuhaus suggested that, in the interest of time, continued discussion of traffic data be postponed until the next meeting. She reiterated the project team’s request for additional pedestrian count locations; however, no one offered any recommendations.

Continued Discussion re: Open Houses
Ms. Neuhaus announced that the Open Houses will be held on Thursday, November 13th at St. Cecilia’s School in Greenpoint and Thursday, November 20th at Martin Luther High School in Maspeth. Observing that no public meetings have been held since the scoping meetings in May 2002, she added that the purpose of the Open Houses is to bring the project to the broader community. Ms. Neuhaus expressed her hope for a strong SAC presence, stating that the Question and Answer and Open House portions of the meetings would provide opportunities for SAC participation.
Ms. Holowacz reported that the New York City Department of City Planning (DCP) has scheduled a public scoping meeting for the Greenpoint Rezoning Plan on November 13th. She noted that because this is an important issue for the community, many people are likely to attend the DCP meeting rather than the Kosciuszko Bridge Project Open House. Ms. Neuhaus stated that the date of the Brooklyn Open House was changed from November 10th at the request of the SAC and after outreach to individuals and community groups. In addition, the dates are provided in the Project Update and flyer announcing the Open Houses, which have been printed and are ready for mailing to a list of approximately 800 people. Ms. Toro noted that the DCP meeting was just announced the previous day and suggested that since the scooping meeting starts at 4:30 p.m., and the Open House at 6:30 p.m., interested community members could attend both meetings. Ms. Neuhaus added that since the presentation will be the same at both the Queens and Brooklyn meetings, Brooklyn residents would also have the opportunity to attend the Queens meeting. At the request of Laura Hofmann, Barge Park Pals, Mr. Adams agreed to contact DCP to inquire about the possibility of changing the date of its meeting.

[Subsequent to the SAC meeting, the Brooklyn Open House was rescheduled for Tuesday, December 2nd at Automotive High School in Greenpoint.]

In the ensuing discussion on meeting notifications, Ms. Neuhaus explained that, in addition to the Project Update and flyer, display ads would be placed in community and citywide publications, including Spanish, Italian and Polish language newspapers. Ms. Mihelic recommended that meeting information be forwarded to local churches for inclusion in their bulletins, and Mr. Rossmy requested that it be provided to the Borough President’s staff for announcement of the Open Houses at the November Borough Board meeting.

Ms. Neuhaus then reviewed the proposed agenda for the Open Houses: welcome and introduction of NYSDOT Region 11 Director Douglas Currey or his representative (possibly by a SAC member); project background through scoping (by Robert Adams, NYSDOT); discussion of the public outreach program and SAC (possibly by a SAC member); Alternatives Analysis through Level 1 screening (by Mr. Bennett); a look ahead (by Mr. Adams); and a Question and Answer session. In response to Ms. Neuhaus’ suggestion that a SAC representative from each borough open the meeting and introduce Committee members, Mr. Parra volunteered. As there were no volunteers from Queens, Ms. Neuhaus stated that this person would be identified at a later date.

In response to a question from Mr. Ruzalski, Ms. Neuhaus indicated that microphones will be available for all speakers, including members of the public. She added that the meeting will be audio taped and a meeting report distributed. The discussion concluded with SAC approval of the proposed agenda. Ms. Hofmann commended the project team for including the community in the meeting agenda.

Other Business
Ms. Mihelic asked if the loose steel joints on the Meeker Avenue viaduct had been repaired. Mr. Adams informed her that NYSDOT personnel inspected the viaduct and found that, in addition to loose joints, catch basins on that section of the BQE needed repair. Either problem could have caused the noise reported by Ms. Mihelic and other residents. As a result of the inspection, the joints were fixed by an NYSDOT contractor during the week of October 6th, and the catch basin issue
referred to the New York City Department of Environmental Protection. After Ms. Mihelic asked if a mechanism existed to report such problems in the future, Mr. Adams invited community residents to call him with Kosciuszko Bridge-related issues and offered to provide the telephone number for the field office for the current painting job (located under the bridge) at the next SAC meeting.

REMINDER: The December SAC meeting has been cancelled. The next SAC meeting is scheduled for **Thursday, January 15, 2004 at 6:30 P.M. at Jennings Hall, 260 Powers Street, Brooklyn.**

Follow-Up Items

1. Revise and send letter to SAC non-attendees. Responsibility: HNA.

2. Consider preparing a monthly newsletter summarizing SAC activities and project progress. (Barbara Mihelic). Responsibility: Project Team.

3. Contact DCP regarding the possibility of changing the date of its November 13\textsuperscript{th} scoping meeting (Laura Hofmann). Responsibility: Robert Adams, NYSDOT.

4. Distribute Open House flyers to local churches. Responsibility: HNA.

5. Provide Open House notifications to additional local newspapers, including the *Greenpoint Star* and *Greenline*. Responsibility: HNA.

6. Forward information regarding Open Houses to Michael Rossmey for announcement at the November Borough Board meeting. Responsibility: HNA.

7. Coordinate with Anthony Parra regarding his participation in the Brooklyn Open House; identify Queens SAC member for a similar role in the Queens Open House. Responsibility: HNA.

8. Send letter and FAQs to Queens businesses identified by Frank Principe. Responsibility: HNA.

9. Consider subscribing to local newspapers that cover communities affected by the project. Responsibility: HNA.

10. Consider revising business survey to include question about the routes used for shipping and deliveries. Responsibility: Parsons.

11. Continue discussion of traffic data at next SAC meeting. Responsibility: Project Team.
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Survey of Local Businesses

Business Name _________________________________________________________________

Building Location ______________________________________________________________

Mailing Address ________________________________________________________________

Phone ___________________________   Fax ________________________________

Email Address _________________________________________________________________

Business Owner/Manager ________________________________________________________

Contact person during business hours _____________________________________________

Would you like to be added to the project mailing list?  ☐ Yes  ☐ No

---

**Type and description of business**

☐ Manufacturing  ☐ Warehouse  ☐ Waste Transfer  ☐ Professional Services

☐ Restaurant  ☐ Retail  ☐ Parking  ☐ Wholesale/Supply

☐ Distribution  ☐ Storage  ☐ Maintenance/Repair Services

☐ Import/Export  ☐ Printing  ☐ Food Processing

☐ Other

Type of activities that occur at this location (if different):

☐ Manufacturing  ☐ Warehouse  ☐ Waste Transfer  ☐ Professional Services

☐ Restaurant  ☐ Retail  ☐ Parking  ☐ Wholesale/Supply

☐ Distribution  ☐ Storage  ☐ Maintenance/Repair Services

☐ Import/Export  ☐ Printing  ☐ Food Processing

☐ Other

---

**Employees**

Total number of company employees ________________

Number of employees at this location ________________
**Business Hours**

Weekdays _______ a.m. to _______ p.m.
Saturday _______ a.m. to _______ p.m.
Sunday _______ a.m. to _______ p.m.

**Deliveries**

Average number of incoming deliveries per day _______________________________________
Average number of outgoing shipments per day _______________________________________  
Location of loading dock/area _____________________________________________________

**Additional Information**

Please provide any additional information you think the project team should know about your business or operations.

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

Name of person completing survey ____________________________ Title __________________

Please return the completed survey in the postage paid envelope provided. If you have any questions or require assistance completing the survey, please contact:

Denise Woodin
Helen Neuhaus & Associates
212-532-4175

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated. Thank you.
The 13th meeting of the New York State Department of Transportation’s (NYSDOT) Kosciuszko Bridge Project Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC) was held on Thursday, January 22, 2004 at Jennings Hall, Brooklyn. (See Attachment A for Attendance List.) The meeting was scheduled to provide an introduction to Level 2 screening.

Ms. Neuhaus opened the meeting by wishing everyone a Happy New Year and by asking for comments on the Minutes of the October 16, 2003 SAC meeting. Following adoption of the Minutes without changes, she facilitated a discussion of follow-up items from that meeting. These included the following:

Ms. Neuhaus noted that several of the follow-up items related to the Open Houses that were held on November 20, 2003 (Queens) and December 2, 2003 (Brooklyn). Newsletters and flyers were mailed to SAC members who had requested them and advertisements were placed in eleven local, citywide and foreign language newspapers. Ms. Neuhaus thanked Anthony Nunziato, Maspeth Chamber of Commerce, and Anthony Parra, East Williamsburg Valley Industrial Development Corporation for their assistance at the Open Houses. Praising their presentations, she stated “you did the SAC proud.”

In response to the SAC’s request to make the draft letter to absentee committee members “a little tougher,” Ms. Neuhaus distributed a revised letter, along with an attendance chart. During the ensuing discussion, SAC members expressed concern that committee members who do not attend regularly will not understand the issues. However, the SAC also expressed reluctance to remove anyone at this point, particularly elected officials and others who may have extenuating circumstances (i.e., illness). Robert Adams, NYSDOT, noted that the intent of the letter is not to remove anyone from the SAC but to inform members who have been absent that the project is entering an important phase and that their involvement is important.

New York City Councilwoman Diana Reyna apologized for her absence over the past year and introduced Betty Dantzler and Coral Young Gee, who will represent her on the SAC from this point forward. Councilwoman Reyna stated that she will meet with NYSDOT for a project briefing.

Joseph Ruzalski, United Forties Civic Association (UFCA), suggested that the Minutes be sent only to those individuals who attend the meetings. Echoing Mr. Adams’ comment, Mr. Parra noted that it is important to “aggressively pursue” absentee members because the project is moving ahead quickly and community participation is essential. In response to a request from Evelyn Cruz, Congresswoman Nydia Velazquez’s Office, Ms.
Neuhaus agreed to contact the new director of the Grand Street Business Improvement District to determine his or her interest in joining the SAC. In response to a concern raised by Rosemary Felle, Citizens of Maspeth and Elmhurst Together, Mr. Adams reiterated that there are no plans to remove anyone from the committee. The discussion concluded with consensus to send the revised letter to SAC members who have missed several meetings.

Ms. Neuhaus announced that the project team has subscribed to five community newspapers: *Queens Chronicle* (Mid Queens edition), *Times Newsweekly*, *Queens Ledger*, *Greenpoint Star* and *Greenline*. The *Greenpoint Williamsburg Gazette* will be ordered this August (the earliest that this newspaper will begin subscriptions). Councilwoman Reyna also recommended subscriptions to the *Bushwick Observer* and *Williamsburg News*.

Ms. Neuhaus reported that in response to a request from Barbara Mihelic, Noble Street Block Association, the project team discussed the possibility of producing a monthly newsletter that would summarize SAC activities and project milestones. After careful consideration, it was decided that this would not be the most productive use of project resources. Ms. Neuhaus explained that the full mailing list includes 800 individuals, organizations and agencies. Most of these have never attended a meeting or event and have shown little interest in the project. She noted that the SAC meeting Minutes are available to interested persons through the mail, on the website and at repositories. Ms. Neuhaus added that since the Minutes cover all SAC activities and all project information is brought before the SAC, the Minutes are the best source of up-to-date information.

In response to Ms. Felle’s question regarding the possibility of a quarterly newsletter, Ms. Neuhaus indicated that the project team hopes to produce newsletters more frequently than it has in the past. She noted that newsletters, even if they are brief and simple, are extremely time-consuming and expensive. Answering a question from Michael Rossmy, Brooklyn Borough President’s Office, Ms. Neuhaus stated that the Minutes are sent to all SAC members and other meeting attendees. Observing that, at this point, a monthly newsletter would be repetitious, Vincent Arcuri, Queens Community Board (CB) #5, suggested distribution of a milestone-driven newsletter. After further discussion, it was agreed that the project team would produce a newsletter that would focus on milestones but would aim for quarterly distribution.

Ms. Neuhaus stated that outreach has continued to businesses located in the vicinity of the Kosciuszko Bridge. Using a list provided by Frank Principe, West Maspeth Local Development Corporation, the project team sent letters and a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) document to Queens businesses. (Letter and FAQs were sent to Brooklyn businesses last summer.) In addition, a door-to-door survey was conducted in both Maspeth and Greenpoint. Ms. Neuhaus turned the floor over to Denise Woodin, HNA, to discuss the survey.

Ms. Woodin reported that during November and December, she and Joseph Mendez, Parsons, visited 22 businesses on Cherry Street, Meeker Avenue and selected side streets.
in Greenpoint and along 43rd Street and its side streets in Maspeth. They were assisted in Brooklyn by Mr. Parra and in Queens by Mr. Ruzalski and Gus Amato, UFCA. The survey team met with 11 company owners or managers, each of whom completed a survey. Eleven additional surveys were left with workers or subsequently faxed to the business. Of these, three were returned. Ms. Woodin observed that for the most part, business owners and managers were cordial and forthcoming. A few of the Maspeth individuals remembered the team’s visit to the area last summer, which indicated that the community is becoming familiar with project team members and the project itself. She concluded by expressing her view that conducting a door-to-door survey was a productive and positive experience and by thanking Mr. Parra, Mr. Amato and Mr. Ruzalski for braving the cold to assist with the surveys.

Noting that there are three homes on 43rd Street in the industrial area, Mr. Ruzalski stated that he and Mr. Amato have tried, unsuccessfully, to contact the residents several times. Ms. Woodin added that the project team has also visited these homes twice and left materials. She explained that these properties are likely to be affected by two of the alternatives. A SAC member suggested that NYSDOT send a formal letter regarding the project and its potential impact to the residents and to the property owner.

Introduction to Level 2 Screening
Referring to a handout, Mr. Bennett explained that this document is an introduction to the materials that will be used to evaluate the 11 remaining build alternatives during Level 2 screening. Using the No Build, RA-5 and BR-2 alternatives as examples, the document provides the following information:

Pages i and ii: Explanation of Figures
Mr. Bennett noted that during Level 1 screening, the alternatives were just shown as lines on a map. However, for Level 2 screening, each alternative will be illustrated in greater detail. These illustrations will include:

- Plan View – a view of the lane configuration, ramps and roadway. These drawings are not to scale.
- Staging Diagram – an illustration of where traffic would be maintained during construction and the lane configuration upon completion of construction. Mr. Bennett explained that all lane configurations shown are based on NYSDOT’s 1995 traffic study and represent a “best guess” as to which configuration will work with each alternative. Recognizing that a wider bridge would have more impacts on the surrounding community, the project team took a conservative approach, showing lane configurations that result in a worst-case scenario. Mr. Bennett added that a detailed study of all alternatives will be conducted during the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) phase and that the lane configurations could change at that time.
- Elevation – a side view of the bridge after construction.
- Land Use Impacts – aerial photographs with overlays showing the alignment of temporary and permanent structures, as well as the location, type and number of

---

1 Due to the bulk of this document, it is not being mailed as an attachment. If you would like a copy, please contact Ms. Woodin at 212-532-4175 or denise@hna1977.com. Please note, however, that the information provided in this document will be included in the handout for the February SAC meeting.
employees for each business. Mr. Bennett explained that a circle indicates that the alternative is expected to disrupt the business. While disruption would not involve property takings and would allow the business to continue operating during and after construction, there would be some intrusion onto the property (i.e., a new column). A square indicates that the alternative would require the displacement (or taking) of the property. Mr. Bennett added that since the Brooklyn maps cover two pages, the shaded area represents the portion of the photograph that overlaps from one page to the other.

- Estimated Impacts – a box tallying the estimated temporary and permanent impacts on residences, community facilities and employees for each segment of each alternative.

**Page 4: Summary Sheet (for Alternative RA-5)**

Mr. Bennett explained that a summary sheet will accompany each alternative. It will include a brief description of the alternative, a comparison of the existing bridge and the alternative and information on operational performance. The latter looks at the average vehicle speed across the bridge for both the east and westbound directions during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours, as well as the number of potentially diverted vehicles during peak periods. Mr. Bennett pointed out that although the data for the a.m. peak hours is complete, the data for the p.m. hours is not. However, it will be available at next month’s SAC meeting. He added that preliminary traffic analysis has been done for each of the alternatives; a more detailed analysis will be presented in the DEIS.

In terms of potentially diverted vehicles, Mr. Bennett explained that this represents the difference between the number of vehicles that want to use the bridge and the number of vehicles that the bridge can carry. He emphasized that not all of the potentially diverted vehicles will turn to local roadways. Diversion could mean that the driver decides to take a different route, travel at a non-peak time, or use mass transit. The impact of diverted traffic on local streets will be examined in the DEIS.

The Summary Page also includes information regarding Property and Community Impacts, Impacts of Columns, Bikeway/Walkway Feasibility, Long Term Maintenance, Redundancy and Construction Duration.

Comments and questions raised during and following Mr. Bennett’s presentation are summarized below:

- In response to a question from Ms. Dantzler, Mr. Bennett indicated that two of the alternatives will require the taking of three homes in Queens. There will be no residential takings in Brooklyn; however, some alternatives would require the acquisition of business properties.

- Mr. Nunziato asked why property takings would be necessary in cases where the impact is only temporary. Mr. Bennett explained that the temporary ramps might be low enough to hit the roofs of certain businesses. In response to further questions from Mr. Nunziato, Mr. Bennett indicated that although it would be possible for a company to return to its building after construction, that could mean several years. Mr. Adams and Ms. Neuhaus stated that the project team was being very conservative by anticipating the worst-case
scenario. Acknowledging this, Mr. Nunziato maintained that the business owner should be informed if eventual return is an option. Peter King, NYSDOT, suggested that the Land Use Impacts document reflect two possibilities: situations in which the property owner might be able to reclaim the land, and situations in which this would be impossible. Mr. Arcuri remarked that the economic impact to the business would have to be investigated on a case-by-case basis, adding that it is too early to know the full range of impacts. Mr. Bennett confirmed that all anticipated impacts will be examined in the DEIS, after which the project team will hold discussions with the affected property owners.

In response to a question from Ms. Felle, Mr. Bennett clarified that references to “affected businesses” do not necessarily mean that workers will lose their jobs. He also explained that when a business is acquired, the state assists with finding a new property (ideally in the same area) and pays for all reasonable relocation expenses. Mr. Bennett acknowledged that some businesses might not be able to find an appropriate site nearby and that a few business owners have indicated that moving would entail extreme hardship. However, he observed that there seems to be a fair amount of open commercial real estate in Greenpoint and Williamsburg. Mr. Parra confirmed this but noted that many of the manufacturing companies use heavy equipment and would be “devastated” if forced to move.

Following up on an issue raised at a previous meeting, Mr. Amato asked if property owners would be compensated for the loss of income from billboards on their land. Mr. Adams answered that he had consulted with NYSDOT’s Real Estate group and was informed that some compensation would be available. Mr. Nunziato cautioned that the Department should investigate the legality of these billboards before any compensation is made.

In response to a question from Mr. Rossmy, Mr. Bennett stated that operational performance looks at average speed for a section of the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway (BQE) that slightly exceeds the project limits.

In response to Mr. King’s question regarding the modeling software used for traffic analysis, Mr. Bennett answered that VISSIM is currently being used; BPM (Best Practice Model) will be used for the DEIS. Mr. Bennett added that for the preliminary traffic analysis, the current number of vehicles was projected to the year 2045 with a ½ percent increase per year. He noted that this growth rate is consistent with the rate used on other projects. In response to another question from Mr. King, Mr. Bennett replied that data for future projections will be obtained from the New York Metropolitan Transportation Council.

In response to a question from Mr. Arcuri, Mr. Bennett indicated that traffic studies are generally conducted at times of the year when traffic is heaviest. Traffic counts for this project were done in the fall with recounts of certain data the following spring. Traffic studies covered the project’s primary and secondary study areas.
In response to a question from Martha Holstein, Urban Strategic Solutions, Mr. Bennett explained that estimates of potentially diverted vehicles refer to the final build condition. During construction, efforts will be made to maintain traffic as it now operates.

During a discussion regarding the Cross Harbor Freight Movement Project and its impact on the Kosciuszko Bridge Project and the surrounding community, Mr. Bennett noted that the projected traffic increases from that project will be incorporated into the Kosciuszko Bridge DEIS. Mr. Nunziato encouraged the Kosciuszko Bridge Project team to consider not only traffic increases, but also design changes to accommodate the additional vehicles (i.e. new ramps and/or additional lanes). Mr. Amato, Mr. Arcuri and Mr. Ruzalski also expressed concern about the Cross Harbor Project, noting in particular the large number of trucks expected if the project is approved. Mr. Ruzalski commented that a ramp would be necessary and that additional property acquisitions would be involved. Mr. Bennett stated that the two teams have discussed traffic concerns and that the Cross Harbor team is reportedly looking into ways to mitigate the impact of the extra vehicles. Mr. Bennett indicated that anything proposed by the team that would affect the Kosciuszko Bridge Project would be examined very closely.

In response to further questions from Mr. Rossmy, the following information was provided:

- if the Cross Harbor DEIS is issued in February 2004, as planned, the draft traffic data included in that document will be used for the Kosciuszko Bridge Project DEIS. If there are major changes in the numbers between the Cross Harbor DEIS and Final EIS, the Kosciuszko team will adjust its results accordingly.
- the Kosciuszko Bridge Project is using the most sophisticated traffic modeling available.
- the Kosciuszko Bridge DEIS is expected to be completed in the spring or summer of 2005.

Mr. Nunziato requested copies of the Minutes of meetings between the Cross Harbor and Kosciuszko Bridge project teams. Mr. Adams agreed to look into obtaining these. Mr. Arcuri noted that Minutes of CB #5’s working session with the Cross Harbor project team are available and can be forwarded to the Kosciuszko team.

Following Mr. Adams’ observation that the Kosciuszko Bridge Project will assume construction of the proposed citywide bus depot, Mr. Arcuri added that the reconstruction of the Grand Avenue Bridge should also be considered.

Vincent Abate, Brooklyn CB #1, raised the issue of traffic problems in the area of Vandervoort Avenue. Mr. Bennett acknowledged this concern, as well as the difficulties facing truck drivers who make left turns on Morgan Avenue and Vandervoort Avenue. He indicated that the project could examine possible solutions for the tight turning radii at these locations.

In response to questions from Mansoor Khan, New York City Department of Transportation, Mr. Bennett reiterated that the alternatives shown in the handout are only
two of the eleven remaining alternatives under consideration. He also explained that it is too early to consider which type of bridge will be recommended. This will be addressed in the DEIS.

- Mr. Arcuri observed that the configuration of RA-5, as shown in the plan view, may need to be wider than presently shown, therefore increasing the impact on businesses. He noted that it may be necessary to construct an additional lane on the eastbound side where the Vandervoort Avenue ramp traffic merges with the LIE-bound BQE traffic. Mr. Bennett pointed out that the traffic model, when completed, will show the pluses and minuses of each alternative. He also noted that the Land Use Impact maps prepared for each alternative are conservative with regard to impact on businesses since the ideal lane configuration has not yet been determined. Mr. Nunziato suggested that the project team look at the BQE north of the LIE, en route to LaGuardia Airport, for an example of poor highway planning.

- Referring to the recently completed business surveys, Mr. Parra asked if the employee numbers will be updated before next month’s SAC meeting. Mr. Bennett answered that they would. Mr. Arcuri asked if the SAC would have input regarding the relocation of businesses, adding that the Maspeth community is not anxious to receive the waste transfer stations (currently located in Brooklyn) that might be displaced. Mr. Bennett stated that it is unlikely that the SAC could play such a role but that individual members could work through their Community Boards or elected officials. He noted that all businesses are considered of equal worth for the purpose of this project. Mr. Nunziato asked if NYSDOT would attempt to keep the displaced businesses in the same borough. Mr. Bennett explained that the Department’s Real Estate group would try to identify three properties in the area and present those choices to the business owner.

- Mr. Arcuri remarked that it is important to understand the operations at the buildings that may be acquired and the jobs that will be relocated. He added that while transient truckers should not be counted as affected employees, displacing a building that is part of a larger production process would have a significant impact. Noting that the Acme Steel building likely to be affected is the “epicenter” of its business, Mr. Parra asserted that any move would severely damage this company. Mr. Bennett acknowledged the impact on Acme, observing that its loading dock is directly adjacent to the bridge. He noted that the project team intends to work closely with Acme’s owners. Mr. Adams added that NYSDOT realized early in the process that Acme would be affected and invited Marc Teich, one of the company’s owners, to serve on the SAC.

- Referring to the potential impacts to Calvary Cemetery, Mr. Ruzalski questioned that facility’s apparent lack of concern as demonstrated by its absence from SAC meetings. Mr. Arcuri observed that cemeteries are legally protected from takings and other impacts. Reiterating a comment she made at the Queens Open House, Ms. Felle suggested that it might be better to encroach on the cemetery—even to the extent of temporarily relocating graves—than to displace residents from their homes. Ms. Neuhaus and Mr. Adams noted that this would be very difficult and unpopular. Citing an example, Mr. Arcuri stated that moving gravesites is a long, complicated process involving, among other parties, all
living relatives of the deceased. Mr. Ruzalski remarked that there is plenty of room for a temporary structure between Laurel Hill Boulevard and the cemetery.

After receiving assurances that the SAC was comfortable with the process and information detailed in the booklet, Ms. Neuhaus suggested that there was no need to prolong the meeting in order to review an additional example.

Recap of Open Houses
Ms. Neuhaus opened the discussion by expressing her disappointment with the turnout at the Open Houses. Noting that a total of approximately 80 people attended both meetings, she asked the SAC for feedback on the meeting, as well as recommendations for improving attendance at future meetings.

Offering a different viewpoint, Mr. Parra stated that the outreach was effective and that several new people attended the meeting. He commented that if even one person learns about the project, “that’s a success.” Referring to the Project Update distributed prior to the Open Houses, Ms. Gee echoed Mr. Parra, saying that the newsletter has served its purpose if it educates even one-tenth of the mailing list.

Mr. Nunziato suggested that the project team consider placing public announcements on Queens Public Television and Brooklyn Public Television to publicize future meetings. It was also agreed that there should be widespread distribution of flyers to senior centers and community organizations.

The next SAC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, February 19, 2004 at 6:30 P.M. at Jennings Hall, 260 Powers Street, Brooklyn.

Follow-up Items
1. Send letter to SAC non-attendees. Responsibility: HNA.

2. Prepare a newsletter at project milestones (to be produced and distributed on a quarterly basis or as appropriate). Responsibility: Project Team.

3. Consider subscribing to the Bushwick Observer and Williamsburg News (Council Member Diana Reyna). Responsibility: HNA.

4. Invite the new director of the Grand Street Business Improvement District to join the SAC (Evelyn Cruz). Responsibility: HNA.

5. Send certified letters to the Queens homeowners who would be affected by two of the alternatives currently under consideration. Responsibility: Parsons.
6. Consider public announcements on Queens Public Television and Brooklyn Public Television for future public meetings. Also, consider widespread distribution of flyers to senior centers and community organizations (Anthony Nunziato). Responsibility: Project team.

7. Determine availability of Minutes from meetings between the Cross Harbor Freight Movement Study team and the Kosciuszko Bridge Project team for forwarding to Anthony Nunziato. Responsibility: Parsons, NYSDOT.

8. Contact Queens Community Board #5 to obtain Minutes from working group meeting between the Cross Harbor team and the Community Board. Responsibility: HNA

9. Provide information regarding the status of the Grand Avenue Bridge reconstruction project. Responsibility: Robert Adams in coordination with Muhammad Afzal, New York City Department of Transportation.
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KOSCIUSZKO BRIDGE PROJECT  
STAKEHOLDERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE: February 19, 2004

Minutes

The 14th meeting of the New York State Department of Transportation’s (NYSDOT) Kosciuszko Bridge Project Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC) was held on Thursday, February 19, 2004 at Jennings Hall, Brooklyn. (See Attachment A for Attendance List.) The meeting was scheduled to review the materials to be used in Level 2 screening.

Helen Neuhaus, Helen Neuhaus & Associates (HNA) opened the meeting by asking for comments on the Minutes of the January 22, 2004 meeting. There were no comments, and the Minutes were adopted by consensus. Ms. Neuhaus then facilitated a discussion of follow-up items from that meeting. These included the following:

- Ms. Neuhaus reported that letters were sent to SAC members who had missed several meetings encouraging them to participate. Referring to the high turnout at tonight’s meeting, she observed that the letter was effective. Ms. Neuhaus also noted that Teresa Toro will now represent the Tri-State Transportation Campaign on the Committee.

- In response to a request from Councilwoman Diana Reyna, the project team has subscribed to the Bushwick Observer and the Williamsburg News. (Subscriptions were previously ordered for the Queens Chronicle, Times Newsweekly, Queens Ledger, Greenpoint Star and Greenline.)

- In response to a suggestion from Evelyn Cruz, Congresswoman Nydia Velazquez’s Office, a letter was sent to Eudovia Arroyo, District Manager of the Grand Street Business Improvement District (BID), inviting the BID to participate in the SAC. Ms. Arroyo indicated her interest in tonight’s meeting but was unable to attend due to illness.

- Minutes from a meeting between the Kosciuszko Bridge Project team and the Cross Harbor Freight Movement Project team were forwarded to Anthony Nunziato, Maspeth Chamber of Commerce, as requested.

- Minutes from Community Board (CB) #5’s meeting with the Cross Harbor team were obtained from the Board office.

- Following up on an issue raised at the January meeting, Ms. Neuhaus asked Muhammad Afzal, New York City Department of Transportation (NYCDOT) to report on the status of reconstruction of the Grand Street Bridge. Mr. Afzal stated that he brought a fact sheet about the project (see Attachment B) and that construction is expected to start in 2012. Observing that the bridge is in “deplorable” condition, Mr. Nunziato asked if maintenance would be performed in the meantime. Mr. Afzal replied that there is no “open flag condition” at this time. Anthony Parra, East Williamsburg Valley Industrial Development Corporation (EWVIDCO), remarked that businesses have called him about the bridge, leading him to contact NYCDOT’s Arterial Maintenance Manager. In response to a question from Ms. Neuhaus, Mr. Afzal replied that the reconstruction project would include a community outreach program.

Ms. Neuhaus also noted the following items under Old Business:

- The project team briefed Councilwoman Reyna and her staffperson, Coral Gee, on February 17th to bring them up-to-date on the project. The Councilwoman recommended
that general project information be sent to the local newspapers in order to reach more people. Toward that end, the project team will send the “Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)” document that was mailed to businesses in Brooklyn and Queens, along with a cover letter.

- Ms. Neuhaus reported that the project web page update is taking longer than expected. However, the repositories are current and contain all project information.
- The meeting report for the Brooklyn and Queens Open Houses was mailed to all attendees and members of the SAC at the end of January.

Review of Level 2 Screening Materials
Referring to the Level 2 Screening handout,\(^1\) Mr. Bennett noted that the information presented for each alternative is more detailed than it was for Level 1 screening. The illustrations for Level 2 screening include: Plan View, Staging Diagram, Elevation, and Land Use Impact maps. Mr. Bennett indicated that based on the business surveys conducted by the project team and other research, the maps now show more accurate employee numbers. Other information included in the document relates to Operational Performance, Property and Community Impacts, Impacts of Columns, Bikeway/Walkway Feasibility, Long Term Maintenance, Redundancy and Construction Duration. This information is presented in a Summary Sheet for each of the alternatives.

Using PowerPoint, Mr. Bennett then reviewed the following additional information that is not contained in the handout:
- The Level 2 traffic analysis covered a limited area and looked at average speeds on the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway (BQE) and potential diversions from the highway. Traffic increases were estimated at one-half percent per year until 2045, with a 23% overall increase.
- If the No Build alternative is selected, three bottlenecks will continue to exist in the year 2045: on the westbound side near the Long Island Expressway (LIE) interchange where traffic enters from the LIE and 43rd Street ramps and near the center of the bridge where the four lanes merge to three; on the eastbound side near the Vandervoort Avenue entrance ramp where the ramp traffic enters the BQE.
- Under the Build alternatives, one bottleneck will exist in the year 2045: on the westbound side just before the Apollo Street exit ramp. Mr. Bennett explained that it would not be possible to alleviate this bottleneck because the width of the westbound BQE at this point would remain three lanes and this project does not propose to widen the BQE west of the Apollo Street exit ramp.
- The existing (and No Build) distance between the bridge and residences is 45’ in Brooklyn and 87’ in Queens; the distance between the bridge and public spaces is 51’ in Brooklyn (Sgt. Dougherty Park) and 54’ in Queens (Calvary Cemetery).
- For alternatives that widen the existing bridge, columns will be placed an average of 180’ apart. Columns for temporary structures will be spaced approximately 100’ apart. For the Bridge Replacement alternatives, columns will be placed approximately every 250’. These may impact businesses between Stewart Avenue and Newtown Creek in Brooklyn.

\(^1\) Due to the bulk of this document, it is not being mailed as an attachment. If you would like a copy, please contact Denise Woodin at 212-532-4175 or denise@hna1977.com.
and along 43rd Street in Queens. On the Queens side, American Compressed Gasses on Laurel Hill Boulevard may also be affected.

- General information regarding construction duration was shown; it is anticipated that work will take place in several stages over the course of approximately five years. Mr. Bennett noted that while the construction time could be shortened for any of the alternatives, at this time only conventional construction timelines are being considered. He added that more specific schedule information is available upon request.

The following questions and comments were raised during the PowerPoint presentation:

- In response to a question from Barbara Mihelic, Noble Street Block Association, Mr. Bennett stated that he believes that the three potentially impacted homes in Queens are occupied by tenants rather than by the owners.

- Christine Holowacz, Greenpoint Property Owners, asked why there are differences in the spacing of the columns. Mr. Bennett explained that in order to keep costs down, any temporary bridge would be constructed from off-the-shelf pieces. Because the spans are shorter, the temporary bridge would require additional (or more closely spaced) columns. He further explained that for alternatives that call for widening the existing bridge, new columns must be built parallel to the existing columns. Lastly, current technology makes it easier to construct longer spans, thereby decreasing the number of columns needed for a new bridge. This would also reduce the impact on adjacent properties.

- In response to a question from Vincent Arcuri, Queens CB #5, Mr. Bennett explained that "potentially diverted vehicles" refers to a situation where demand exceeds capacity. Peter King, NYSDOT, added that a driver will choose the route or mode of transportation that minimizes his or her travel time. As traffic is diverted, a balance eventually occurs, so that all routes and modes achieve the same Level of Service. He noted that traffic modeling will illustrate this pattern.

- Joe Ruzalski, United Forties Civic Association (UFCA), asked if representatives of the Cross Harbor Project have contacted the Kosciuszko Bridge Project team regarding the construction of a ramp from the BQE to the proposed intermodal yard in Queens. Mr. Bennett replied that the two teams have been in contact and that the Cross Harbor team is studying various ways to mitigate the additional traffic expected as a result of that project. The Kosciuszko team will examine any recommendations that affect its project. Mr. King remarked that the Cross Harbor Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is scheduled for release within the next few weeks.

Mr. Bennett then reviewed each alternative, along with its corresponding diagrams, maps and data as shown in the handout. The following comments and questions were raised during the presentation:

_Rehabilitation with Auxiliary Lanes (RA) Alternatives_

- Referring to RA-1, Mr. Bennett stated that in order to add an auxiliary lane without creating a "cattle chute", the bridge truss across the channel span must be removed. This is the case with any of the alternatives that widen the existing bridge. In response to questions from Mr. Arcuri and Ms. Mihelic, he explained that this could be accomplished by building a new support structure underneath the existing truss. The new truss would be of similar height, but slightly longer than the existing one.

- Mr. Bennett noted that standard shoulder widths are 4’ on the left side and 10’ on the right side. He explained that while RA-1 calls for a 10’ shoulder on the right-hand side,
it is not completely compliant with current standards because it does not include a shoulder on the left-hand side.

- In response to a question regarding cost estimates, Mr. Bennett confirmed that these will be examined in the DEIS. He added that the costs will vary for each alternative, based on several factors, including the extent of property acquisition.

- Christopher McBride, Automobile Association of America, and Alison Hirsh, Assemblyman Vito Lopez’s Office, observed that travel speeds show little improvement under several of the RA alternatives. Acknowledging that travel speed would not increase significantly (and may even decrease under certain alternatives and certain conditions), Mr. Bennett stated that overall operational performance would improve due to more vehicle throughput and fewer traffic diversions from the highway. He noted that since RA-1 involves only minimal reconstruction, there would be only minimal improvements. Reminding the Committee that the westbound bottleneck just before the Apollo Street exit ramp will exist with all of the remaining build alternatives, Mr. Bennett indicated that it will be easier to observe how traffic will behave once the SAC views the animated simulation.

- Referring to RA-5, Mr. Bennett stated that the lane configuration is based on NYSDOT’s 1995 traffic study. Because this alternative calls for two bridges at different elevations (the existing structure and a new, lower, parallel bridge), traffic will be separated. Mr. Nunziato observed that drivers exiting the Williamsburg Bridge would have to cross over to the left lane to access the BQE, then cross back over to the right lane for the LIE. Acknowledging that the lane separation might cause some confusion, Mr. Bennett stated that without it, conditions would be chaotic. He emphasized that this configuration is not final and will be studied in the DEIS. Mr. Nunziato suggested that it would be helpful to determine the destination of drivers coming off the Williamsburg Bridge. Mr. Bennett replied that an Origin and Destination (O&D) Study was conducted as part of the 1995 traffic study and that the results of that study will be used for this project.

- In response to a question from Tom Campagna, Queens Borough President’s Office, Mr. Bennett stated that RA-5 would not necessarily cost more than the other RA alternatives. He noted that widening the existing bridge could be more complicated and more expensive than building a new bridge.

- In response to Ms. Mihelic’s question regarding RA-5’s impact on Calvary Cemetery, Mr. Adams stated that the phrase “up to the edge of cemetery” on the Land Use impacts page indicates that the structure will move up to the property line.

**Bridge Replacement (BR) Alternatives**

- In response to a question from Mr. Campagna, Mr. Bennett and Mr. Adams emphasized that while a Bridge Replacement alternative might appear to be the best solution, it is important to evaluate all of the alternatives using the screening process.

- Referring to BR-1, Ms. Holowacz observed that the number of potentially diverted vehicles for this alternative is only slightly lower than it is for the existing bridge. Mr. Adams explained that this is because the number of lanes remains the same. However, it was noted that operational safety will improve with the addition of shoulders and standard lane widths.

- Referring to BR-2, Mr. Bennett stated that more businesses would be affected under this alternative than under some of the others. In response to a request from Ms. Mihelic and Ms. Holowacz, he agreed to provide a list of all of the potentially impacted businesses, including their names and the nature of the business.
Ms. Gee asked if any of the temporary bridges could be incorporated into the permanent structure. Mr. Bennett explained that because the permanent bridge will be designed to last at least 50 years (as opposed to three years for a temporary bridge), the construction methods will be different.

Referring to BR-5, Mr. Adams noted that this alternative would involve major impacts, including residential acquisition in Queens, partial acquisition of Sgt. Dougherty Park and the relocation of several businesses. However, the advantage of this alternative is that the final structure would be farther away from many Brooklyn residences than the existing bridge. Mr. Bennett clarified that while only one of the homes in Queens would be physically impacted, the bridge would encroach on the building lots of the other two. Therefore, it is being assumed that NYSDOT would acquire all three properties.

Referring to the Tunnel alternative (TU-1), Mr. Bennett explained that in order to connect with the LIE, the tunnel would require an 8% grade. (The grade on the existing bridge is 4%.) He noted that this alternative involves significant land use impacts on both businesses and residences, including the acquisition of the three homes in Queens, the partial acquisition of Sgt. Dougherty Park and the construction of a temporary bridge within ten feet of certain Brooklyn residences. In response to a question from Alvin Goodman, Brooklyn Borough President’s Office, regarding a longer approach, Mr. Bennett stated that the project engineers looked at various options, including a large spiral.

Other Comments and Questions

In response to a question from Mary Gottlieb, Meeker Avenue/Apollo Street Association, Mr. Bennett explained that the temporary bridge would extend south of the project work area in order to provide adequate room for the shifting of three lanes of traffic. He also noted that a shorter temporary bridge would result in slower traffic. Mr. Bennett emphasized that these issues will be studied in the DEIS.

In response to a question regarding impacts to Acme Steel, Mr. Bennett commented that Acme’s loading dock is immediately adjacent to the Vandervoort Street ramp. He stated that the project team has discussed the project and its potential impacts with Acme’s owners. Ms. Mihelic suggested that any open space created by the acquisition of Acme’s building could be re-developed as parkland.

Mr. Ruzalski asked if NYSDOT has started to identify new locations for the businesses and residents that will be displaced. Mr. Adams replied that it is not possible to know which businesses will be affected until the list of alternatives is narrowed. In response to Mr. Ruzalski’s observation that American Compressed Gasses will have to move, Mr. Bennett noted that the project team has met with this business. In a survey completed by the company, the owners indicated that due to the nature of their business, it would be extremely difficult to relocate. In response to a question regarding the possible displacement of the New York Police Department impound facility, Mr. Bennett acknowledged that it would have to relocate during construction.

In response to a question from Ms. Mihelic, Mr. Bennett confirmed that affected streets will be reconstructed following removal of the temporary bridges.

Several SAC members expressed concern regarding air quality during construction. Noting that there are several schools in the vicinity of the bridge, Ms. Mihelic asked if air quality would be monitored. Mr. Bennett indicated that while the paint recently applied to the bridge is lead-free, air quality monitoring would nevertheless be conducted during construction. He added that any construction on the Phelps-Dodge property—a hazardous
waste site—would require close monitoring of the surrounding area. Gus Amato, UFCA, remarked that contamination from the Mobil oil spill is an issue on the Brooklyn side of the bridge. Ms. Holowacz noted that the excavation of contaminated oil from Newtown Creek soil released harmful vapors into the air. Mr. Bennett assured the Committee that soil testing would be done and all hazardous materials contained.

Noting that many SAC members use area highways on a daily basis, Ms. Mihelic emphasized the need for clear signage that leaves drivers enough time to move into the correct lane. In response to a question from Welland Fuller, Assemblywoman Margaret Markey’s Office, Mr. Bennett indicated that new signage will be posted on the highway leading up to the construction area.

In response to a question from Mr. Ruzalski, Mr. Bennett confirmed that barriers will be constructed along temporary roadways to prevent run-off from damaging the graves in Calvary Cemetery. Mr. Amato noted that water currently collects on the bridge, leading to run-off onto Laurel Hill Boulevard and the formation of ice, which damages the bridge joints. He asked if this would be a problem with any new or temporary structures. Mr. Bennett indicated that it would not, as engineers now have a better understanding of how to prevent this problem.

In response to Ms. Mihelic’s question regarding run-off from temporary structures, Mr. Bennett stated that NYSDOT will take steps to avoid additional flooding in areas of Greenpoint and Williamsburg that currently lack sewer connections. He added that this issue will be examined in detail during the final design phase. Mr. Adams noted that the project team has discussed existing drainage problems with the New York City Department of Environmental Protection.

Commenting that “this is not an academic exercise,” Ms. Neuhaus encouraged SAC members to annotate their handouts and remember the anecdotal information raised during meeting discussions. She stated that these personal observations will be helpful during the screening process.

Other Business/Announcements

- In response to a question from Mr. Ruzalski, Mr. Bennett indicated that he is not aware of any proposals to install a new bridge at the site of the former Penny Bridge (at Review Avenue). He added that any new bridge would need to be movable and that NYCDOT has stopped building movable bridges.

- Mr. Ruzalski asked if the project team could provide him with a letter to distribute to residents of the three houses in Queens. Mr. Adams replied that the project team is preparing a packet (letter, FAQs and Project Update), which will be mailed to both the property owners and the residents. A copy of the letter will be made available to Mr. Ruzalski after it is sent.

- Mr. Adams announced that he received a fact sheet from the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation regarding the remediation of the Phelps-Dodge property. He will provide a copy of this document to any interested person.

- Ms. Hirsh announced that Assemblyman Lopez is sponsoring a conference on the redevelopment of brownfield sites, with a focus on affordable housing. The daylong conference will be held on March 25th at the Polish-Slavic Center, 177 Kent Street, Greenpoint.

The next SAC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, March 18, 2004 at 6:30 P.M. at Jennings Hall, 260 Powers Street, Brooklyn.
Follow-Up Items

1. Send registered letters and FAQs to potentially affected residential property owners and tenants in Queens. Responsibility: Parsons.

2. Send FAQs and cover memo to community newspapers (Councilwoman Diana Reyna). Responsibility: HNA.

3. Complete project website updates. Responsibility: NYSDOT, HNA.

4. Provide SAC with list of businesses shown on land use impacts maps (Barbara Mihelic/Christine Holowacz). Responsibility: Parsons.

5. Provide Joe Ruzalski with copies of letters sent to Queens residential property owners. Responsibility: HNA.
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FACT SHEET

Grand Street Bridge

BIN: 2-24038-0

Contract No.: HBK1161

Feature Carried: Grand Street

Feature Crossed: Newtown Creek

Borough of: Brooklyn / Queens

Community Board No. 1 (Brooklyn) Council District: 34 (Brooklyn)

Community Board No. 5 (Queens) Council District: 26 (Queens)

Project Director: Balam Chandiramani, P.E.

Office: (212) 788-1830

Emergency Contact Number: (917) 509-4925

Project Manager: Dan John, P.E., Project Manager

Office: (212) 788-1964 / BOC

Emergency Contact Number: (917) 816-5385

Project Engineer: Valery Fedotov

Office: (212) 788-1788

Emergency Contact Number: (718) 436-3601

Contractor: Edwards & Kelcey – Martin Kendall, P.E., Project Manager

Office: (212) 221-1782

Emergency Contact Number: (212) 984-2000

Construction Fiscal Year: FY 2012

Estimated Construction Cost: NA

Funding: 100% City

Current Status: NYCDOT has presented to Community Board No. 1 and Community Board No. 5 three alternatives for fixed type bridge. Community Board No. 1 has supported the alternative, which is a Basket Handle Tied Arch design. Still no input from the Community Board No. 5 at this matter. Edwards and Kelcey has submitted Revised Bridge Application Permit to USCG on June 26, 2002. USCG has issued Public Notice 1-584 dated September 30, 2002.

Traffic Counts: AADT: 11870; % Truck Traffic: 31% AM

Traffic LANES: 1 - 3.0m (9.84ft) lane each direction.

Description of Existing Bridge: Movable swing span bridge with center pivot pier. Superstructure consist of steel truss-floor beams system with steel grating flooring. Substructure consists of masonry abutments and center pivot pier.

Utilities: Electrical conduit to service the bridge lighting and warning lights.

Open Flags: None

NYS Condition Rating: 4.458

Scope of Work: Replacement of existing swing span bridge with the fixed type bridge

Traffic Stipulations: 4.0m (13.12) height restriction. Substandard lane width allow one Truck side by side over the bridge.
The 15th meeting of the New York State Department of Transportation’s (NYSDOT) Kosciuszko Bridge Project Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC) was held on Thursday, March 18, 2004 at Jennings Hall, Brooklyn. (See Attachment A for Attendance List.) The meeting was scheduled to present animated simulations of traffic study results, review Level 2 screening criteria and begin Level 2 screening.

Helen Neuhaus, Helen Neuhaus & Associates (HNA), opened the meeting by asking for comments on the Minutes of the February 19th meeting. There were no comments, and the Minutes were adopted by consensus. She welcomed Dorothy Swick, who has attended many SAC meetings and who will now serve on the Committee as an alternate for Christine Holowacz, Greenpoint Property Owners/Newtown Creek Monitoring Committee. Ms. Neuhaus then facilitated a discussion of follow-up items from the February meeting. These included the following:

- As requested, a list of all commercial properties potentially affected by the project was provided. Ms. Neuhaus expressed her concern that the list, if taken out of context, might needlessly alarm certain businesses or individuals. She cautioned the SAC to use it carefully. Barbara Mihelic, Noble Street Block Association, noted that construction on the bridge will have an impact on everyone in the surrounding area.

- Registered letters were sent to, and received by, the owners of the three houses on 43rd Street and 54th Drive in Maspeth. Letters (not registered) were also mailed to the tenants. NYSDOT has not yet received any response.

- In response to Councilwoman Diana Reyna’s request that general project information be sent to the local newspapers, NYSDOT is preparing a mailing that will include a cover letter and the Frequently Asked Questions document that was sent to businesses in Brooklyn and Queens. On a related matter, Ms. Mihelic asked if tonight’s SAC meeting was listed on the community calendar pages of local newspapers. Ms. Neuhaus indicated that notices were not sent to the papers but could be in the future.

Traffic Analysis and Simulation
Using PowerPoint, Dan Prevost, Parsons, presented the Level 2 traffic analysis and simulation. He began by noting that the analysis covered a limited area that included the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway (BQE) from the Long Island Expressway (LIE) to Metropolitan Avenue as well as Meeker Avenue and its intersections with Kingsland, Morgan, and Vandervoort Avenues and McGuinness Boulevard. Mr. Prevost stated that the purpose of the traffic modeling was to determine the average speed on the BQE and the number of potential diversions from the highway. He emphasized that not all of the diversions will end up on local streets; some drivers may choose to travel at different times or use different modes of transportation.

Mr. Prevost then showed illustrations of the bottlenecks that currently exist and would continue to exist in the year 2045 with the No Build alternative. Under the No Build alternative, a bottleneck would remain on the eastbound side at the Vandervoort Avenue ramp where four lanes merge into three; two bottlenecks would remain on the westbound side where five lanes of traffic from the
BQE and the LIE interchange merge into four lanes and near the main span where four lanes merge into three. Under Build alternatives that include the addition of a second lane on the Vandervoort Avenue ramp and two auxiliary lanes from the ramp to the LIE interchange, the bottleneck on the eastbound side would be eliminated. Mr. Prevost explained that drivers may still face congestion in this section but that the physical constraints would no longer exist. On the westbound side, the addition of an auxiliary lane from the LIE interchange to Apollo Street, as is provided under many of the Build alternatives, would eliminate the bottlenecks on the Queens side of the bridge. However, one bottleneck would exist at the Apollo Street ramp where the highway narrows from four lanes to three.

Responding to questions raised at the February SAC meeting, Mr. Prevost confirmed that the westbound travel speed would remain the same or decrease slightly under most of the Build alternatives. He explained that this is a result of the bottleneck at the Apollo Street ramp. Noting that the only way to eliminate the bottleneck would be to construct a new lane between the ramp and the Williamsburg Bridge, he emphasized that this is not being considered. Mr. Prevost added that overall traffic conditions would improve under the Build alternatives, with faster access to the BQE and fewer potential diversions.

Before presenting the traffic animations, Mr. Prevost explained that traffic simulation and analysis was performed for all Level 2 alternatives, including No Build, using computer software known as “VISSIM.” VISSIM analysis was conducted for both the morning and evening peak hours (6:45-8:45 a.m. and 4:45-6:45 p.m.). Traffic volumes were projected to the year 2045 using a standard growth factor of one-half percent per year. The simulations were based on these numbers, as well as real world conditions such as vehicle interaction; types of vehicles (cars, trucks, buses); driver behavior; and lane widths and grades. Mr. Prevost noted that two animations (traffic on the BQE and on local streets) would be shown for three alternatives: No Build, Rehabilitation with Auxiliary Lanes Alternative RA-5, and Bridge Replacement Alternative BR-3. He added that the animations reflect approximately 1.5 minutes during the two-hour evening peak period and that conditions varied during that period.

At the conclusion of the traffic simulation presentation, Mr. Prevost provided the following additional data, which is also contained in the Level 2 booklets distributed last month:

- The average eastbound travel speed during peak hours shows the greatest improvement under alternatives RA-5, RA-6, RA-7, BR-2, BR-3 and BR-5 (45-50 miles per hour [mph] versus 16-18 mph under No Build). Although RA-1, RA-2 and RA-3 call for widening the existing structure, this improvement alone would make little or no difference to the travel speed. Travel speeds would also not improve with BR-1, which would lower the bridge and provide standard lane widths and shoulders but still only provide for three eastbound travel lanes. While the tunnel alternative (TU-1) has the same lane configuration as the new bridge alternatives, the steep grade required would counteract any improvements.

- The average number of potential eastbound diversions under the No Build, RA-2 and BR-1 alternatives remains the same as it is now (approximately 600 vehicles per hour during the peak periods). This is because no auxiliary lanes are added on the eastbound side. The other alternatives, which all add auxiliary lanes in this direction, show a decrease in the number of potential diversions (from 600 to 100-200 vehicles per hour).

- Because of the bottleneck at the Apollo Street ramp, none of the alternatives would improve the average westbound travel speed during peak hours. The No Build speed is estimated at 20 mph; travel speeds under the other alternatives range from 13 to 20 mph.
The average number of potential diversions in the westbound direction under No Build, RA-1 and BR-1 remains the same as it is now (800 vehicles per hour during the peak periods). As on the eastbound side, this is because no auxiliary lanes are added on the westbound side. The other alternatives, which add auxiliary lanes in this direction, show a decrease in the number of potential diversions (from 800 to 400-700 vehicles per hour).

The following questions and comments were raised during Mr. Prevost’s presentation:

- In response to a question from Michael Rossmy, Brooklyn Borough President’s Office, Mr. Prevost stated that all traffic (highway and local) was projected at the same rate of growth.
- Referring to the No Build simulation, Ms. Mihelic asked if the vehicle mix shown is representative of actual traffic. Mr. Prevost confirmed that the proportion of cars, trucks and buses is based on the classification counts conducted in 2002. Observing that the proposed redistribution of waste transfer stations will result in fewer trucks on local streets, Ms. Mihelic asked if this was taken into account. Mr. Prevost indicated that the VISSIM model, as applied for Level 2 screening, only considered existing traffic composition. The Best Practice Model (BPM), which will be used for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), will examine future conditions and projects, including the Cross Harbor Freight Movement Project, Olympic Village and Greenpoint Re-zoning Plan.
- In response to Mr. Rossmy’s question regarding the volume of projected traffic for No Build and RA-5 and the resulting diversion to local streets, Mr. Prevost stated that the demand would be the same for each. Mr. Catalanotto added that because RA-5 provides greater capacity, more traffic would remain on the highway.
- Mr. King asked if the BPM model would project to the same year as VISSIM. Mr. Prevost confirmed that it would.
- In response to additional questions regarding the VISSIM model and the animation, Mr. Prevost provided the following information:
  - the travel behavior shown in the animation was randomly generated by the computer and was not programmed in.
  - the model considers turning restrictions; turning lanes are shown in the animation.
  - the traffic signal timing shown in the animation reflects actual signal timing. Vincent Arcuri, Queens Community Board (CB) #5, remarked that traffic flow could potentially be improved under any of the alternatives by adjusting signal timing. Robert Adams, NYSDOT, stated that this would be examined in the DEIS.
  - a longer acceleration lane from westbound approaches could be modeled using VISSIM. However, Mr. Catalanotto pointed out that this would only move the bottleneck from one location to another (closer to the main span).
- Referring to the slides showing travel speeds on the highway, Mr. Rossmy asked if there is a comparable graphic showing traffic conditions on local streets. Although such a graphic was not available, Steve Bennett, Parsons, noted that the number of potentially diverted vehicles is an indication of conditions on local streets.

Review of Level 2 Screening Criteria
Mr. Bennett reviewed the Level 2 screening criteria, which were revised to include more accurate employee numbers. He stated that the RA and BR alternatives would be screened separately to ensure that a range of alternatives (at a minimum, the two highest scoring alternatives in each category) is examined in the DEIS. Mr. Adams then displayed aerial photographs showing the
current distance between the BQE and key properties that are considered under Criterion 2 measures. The distances are:
- From the BQE to residences along Meeker Avenue: 45’
- From the BQE to Sgt. Dougherty Park: 51’
- From the Apollo Street ramp to residences on the corner of Van Dam Street: 110’
- From the BQE to Calvary Cemetery: 54’
- From the BQE to the first residence on 54th Drive: 87’

Referring to Measure 1-1, Mr. Bennett noted that since there was very little difference in the average westbound speeds, only the average eastbound travel speeds would be used to differentiate between the alternatives. The travel speed groupings are a result of naturally occurring breaks in the data. Referring to Measure 1-3, Mr. Bennett reminded the SAC that because non-standard sight distance currently exists at the approach to the main span, sight distances cannot be corrected on the existing bridge under the rehabilitation alternatives.

The following questions and comments were raised during the discussion of Level 2 screening criteria:

- Ms. Mihelic remarked that even under the No Build alternative, a bikeway/walkway could be constructed on an elevated platform over the existing bridge. Mr. Bennett stated that the Federal Highway Administration, which is funding the project, would be unlikely to fund a bikeway/walkway in the absence of a project that would improve traffic operations.
- Martha Holstein, Strategic Urban Solutions, observed that Measure 2-2, which addresses construction period impacts to residential properties, assumes that a temporary structure might move closer to nearby homes than a permanent structure. Mr. Bennett confirmed this, stating that moving traffic closer to residences, even on a temporary basis, is one factor that must be examined. Adding that the duration of construction would also be a consideration, Mr. Arcuri noted that a shorter construction period might offset the impacts of a closer temporary structure.
- Referring to Measures 2-5 and 2-6, Ms. Mihelic asked if the employee numbers, on the whole, have increased or decreased as a result of the updated information. Mr. Bennett replied that overall, the numbers are slightly higher. As an example, he cited Acme Steel, where the original employee count was based on the average number of manufacturing jobs per square foot. However, these numbers were revised after the project team received a business survey from Acme indicating a higher number of employees than originally estimated. Furthermore, it was determined that Acme’s design operations are also housed at this location; design offices have a much higher density than manufacturing sites. Estimates for several other businesses were lowered based on the survey. For example, Maharaja Foods, which was originally thought to have 14 employees, reported only one employee. In response to a question from Mr. Arcuri, Mr. Bennett indicated that it would be possible to consider the number of businesses affected, as well as the number of employees.
- Anthony Nunziato, Maspeth Chamber of Commerce, asked why the employee numbers are higher for Measure 2-6 (temporary disruption) than for Measure 2-5 (employee relocation). Mr. Bennett explained that the three rankings for each measure were determined by reviewing the number of employees affected by each alternative and looking for natural breaks in the data.
- Mr. Arcuri asked whether Measure 2-5 addresses the concern expressed by some business representatives that their business could not survive if one portion of the operation was impacted by an alternative. Mr. Bennett replied that the DEIS will include very detailed
information on commercial properties, including how each alternative would affect the entire business.

Referring to Measure 3-1, Mr. King asked if it is possible to identify the routes that would be most significantly impacted by vehicles diverted from the highway. Mr. Bennett replied that although Level 2 screening only considers the number of potential diversions, the DEIS will include a detailed examination of traffic diversion.

A number of construction-related issues were raised, which resulted in the following comments:
- Construction impacts on neighborhoods are an important consideration, and round-the-clock work will not be an option.
- Some nighttime work may be scheduled. [Mr. Arcuri observed that studies have shown that night shift work is counterproductive and costs a minimum of 10% more in overtime.]
- It is too early in the process to determine whether weekend work will be scheduled.
- Quality will not be sacrificed for speed, and engineers will oversee all aspects of construction.
- There are numerous ways to shorten construction schedules, including early completion incentives for contractors and use of pre-fabricated pieces for bridges.
- All alternatives will maintain bridge traffic during construction, either on a temporary bridge, a portion of the existing bridge, or a new permanent bridge.

Level 2 Screening
Mr. Adams explained that unlike Level 1 screening, which used Consumer Reports-style circles to rate the alternatives, Level 2 will use numbers (0, 1 and 2), with 2 being the highest rating. Referring to a display board of the blank screening matrix, he noted that the No Build alternative is shown as automatically advancing to the DEIS, as required by federal regulations. Mr. Bennett then led the SAC in screening Alternative RA-1.

The following questions and comments were raised during the screening process:
- In response to a question from Mr. Nunziato, Mr. Bennett stated that the ability to build a bikeway/walkway (Measure 1-4) depends on the physical configuration of the bridge. He added that construction of a new bridge would provide greater flexibility than rehabilitation of the existing bridge. In response to Mr. Nunziato’s remark that the rating “may preclude” seems unnecessary, since any given alternative would either preclude or not preclude a bikeway/walkway, Mr. Arcuri indicated that the ability to provide this amenity will not be known until the final design stage.
- In response to Mr. Nunziato’s additional questions regarding Measures 2-5 and 2-6, Mr. Bennett referred to the Land Use Impacts maps in the Level 2 handout. He explained that the circles represent businesses that would be disrupted by construction activities that might preclude use of loading docks or parking lots or require temporary evacuation of a building. He added that whereas alternatives that include a ramp high enough to pass over the property (thereby allowing the business to remain in place) would result in employee disruption, those with lower ramps would require employee relocation. These are indicated by squares on the maps. Mr. Adams indicated that Measure 2-5, which involves employee relocation, impacts an entirely different group of businesses than Measure 2-6, which involves employee disruption. Mr. Adams encouraged Mr. Nunziato to review the maps, total the numbers in the circles and squares, and look for breaks in the data, as was done by the project team.
Philip Galasso, Sagres Partners, LLC, asked for a definition of “temporary” as it relates to Measures 2-5 and 2-6. Mr. Adams replied that temporary means that physical relocation of the business is not required. Mr. Bennett added that, at this point, there is no specified length of time for an impact to be considered temporary. However, if a business is forced to close for a significant period of time and suffers serious financial losses, the property might be acquired by the State and the business compensated.

Ms. Neuhaus suggested that the SAC complete screening of Alternative RA-1 this evening and begin next month’s meeting with further discussion of Measures 2-5 and 2-6.

Announcements/Other Business

- Referring to the New York City Department of Transportation handout regarding Grand Street Bridge reconstruction (distributed with the February SAC Minutes), Mr. Arcuri clarified that CB #5 opposes a fixed bridge at this location but did not take a formal vote.
- In response to a question from Coral Gee, Councilwoman Reyna’s Office, Mr. Bennett stated that although the Olympics, if held in New York City, would not affect traffic modeling, Olympic-related development would. Ms. Neuhaus added that such development might also influence public funding priorities.
- Observing that most of the alternatives affect Acme Steel, Jose Leon, East Williamsburg Valley Industrial Development Corporation, asked if NYSDOT would consider allowing Acme to use part of Sgt. Dougherty Park during construction. Mr. Bennett replied that this suggestion has been raised in the past and could certainly be considered.
- In response to a question from Mr. Nunziato, Mr. Adams indicated that NYSDOT is tentatively planning an Inter-Agency Advisory Committee meeting for late May.
- Michael Hofmann, Greenpoint Waterfront Association for Parks and Planning, announced that Brooklyn CB #1’s Parks and Open Space Subcommittee will meet with the New York City Department of City Planning on Tuesday, March 30th at 6:30 p.m. [Note: this meeting was subsequently rescheduled for Monday, April 12th, at 6:30 p.m. at the Swinging 60's Senior Center, 211 Ainslie Street, Brooklyn].

The next SAC meeting is scheduled for **Thursday, April 15, 2004 at 6:30 P.M. at Jennings Hall, 260 Powers Street, Brooklyn.**

Follow-Up Items

1. Consider using the calendars of community newspapers to announce SAC meeting dates (Barbara Mihelic). Responsibility: Project Team.
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Minutes

The 16th meeting of the New York State Department of Transportation’s (NYSDOT) Kosciuszko Bridge Project Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC) was held on Thursday, April 15, 2004 at Jennings Hall, Brooklyn. (See Attachment A for Attendance List.) The meeting was scheduled to conduct Level 2 screening.

Helen Neuhaus, Helen Neuhaus & Associates (HNA), opened the meeting by asking for comments on the Minutes of the March 18th meeting. Noting that Michael Rossmy, Brooklyn Borough President’s Office, was inadvertently left off that meeting’s attendance list, she stated that the list has been corrected. There were no other comments, and the Minutes were adopted by consensus. Ms. Neuhaus then facilitated a discussion of the one follow-up item from that meeting, as well as other old business:

■ In response to a suggestion from Barbara Mihelic, Noble Street Block Association, an announcement regarding the SAC meeting was sent to the Community Calendar page of the following newspapers: Times Newsweekly (Queens), Queens Chronicle, Queens Ledger, Bushwick Observer, Greenpoint Star, Greenpoint Gazette and Greenpoint-Williamsburg Gazette. Announcements will be sent to these newspapers every month from this point forward.

■ As a follow-up to an issue raised by Jose Leon, East Williamsburg Valley Industrial Development Corporation (EWVIDCO), members of the project team met with EWVIDCO and Acme Steel on March 31st regarding the possible construction-period use of Sgt. Dougherty Park for Acme’s loading dock.

■ Robert Adams, NYSDOT; Steve Bennett, Parsons; and Denise Woodin, HNA met with the Transportation Committee of Queens Community Board (CB) #2 on April 13th. The purpose of the meeting was to provide a project update and answer the Committee’s questions regarding Level 2 alternatives.

■ In response to a suggestion by Annette LaMatto, Joseph Mendez, Parsons and Steven Tiniski, Meeker Avenue/Apollo Street Association, distributed approximately 1,000 “Frequently Asked Questions” documents with cover letters to Greenpoint residents living in the vicinity of the Kosciuszko Bridge. Dorothy Swick, Newtown Creek Monitoring Committee, and Ms. Neuhaus reported that they have received telephone calls about the project from individuals who received the information.

■ Mr. Adams announced that after several attempts by the project team and United Forties Civic Association, contact has been made with a resident of one of the houses in Queens that might be impacted by the project. Mr. Adams stated that he has spoken with the resident several times and will continue to maintain a dialogue with this individual and his family. In response to a question from Anthony Parra, EWVIDCO, Mr. Adams stated that the same family owns the three residential properties on 43rd Street and 54th Drive and that some members of the family also reside in the houses.

■ Mr. Parra observed that certain alternatives that passed Level 1 screening did so by a slim margin. He asked if the results would have been different if the new, more accurate,
employee numbers had been used. Mr. Bennett replied that the Level 1 alternatives were re-examined using the new numbers and that while the rating for one of the alternatives was affected, the outcome remained the same. He added that specific information is available and will be forwarded to Mr. Parra.

Review of Level 2 Screening Criteria
As a follow-up to questions raised at the March meeting by Anthony Nunziato, Maspeth Chamber of Commerce, concerning the difference in break lines between Measures 2-5 (employee relocation) and 2-6 (temporary employee disruption), Mr. Bennett gave a PowerPoint presentation that showed how the break lines were determined for several of the screening measures. He began by explaining that five of the measures are qualitative, 10 are quantitative, and the groupings for each quantitative measure were determined by looking for natural breaks in the data. He reminded the SAC that in order to ensure that the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) includes a range of alternatives, the Rehabilitation with Auxiliary Lanes (RA) alternatives and the Bridge Replacement (BR- New Bridge and Tunnel) alternatives would be screened separately.

Referring to Measure 2-7 (construction of new columns), Mr. Bennett noted that specific information is available regarding the locations of new columns. However, it is not being presented because the locations are preliminary and NYSDOT does not want to needlessly alarm businesses that may not be impacted. He added that this information is available to the SAC upon request. Referring to Measure 3-3 (construction duration), Mr. Bennett explained that the timeframes are for comparison only and assume conventional construction methods. He remarked that the DEIS will study ways to shorten the length of the construction period.

There were no questions or discussion regarding the presentation.

Level 2 Screening
Mr. Adams introduced Level 2 screening by observing that while the purpose of Level 1 screening was to eliminate the worst alternatives, the purpose of Level 2 is to identify the best alternatives. He reminded the SAC that numbers (0,1,2) will be used to rank the alternatives, as opposed to the Consumer Reports-style circles used for Level 1. Mr. Adams noted that the goal is to end up with the two top scoring alternatives from each category (RA and BR), which will be studied, along with the No Build alternative, in the DEIS. He added that if an additional alternative ranked almost as high as the top scoring alternatives, it might be considered as well. Using PowerPoint, Mr. Bennett provided a recap of RA-1, which was screened at the March meeting, and continued with the remaining alternatives.

The following questions and comments were raised during the screening process:
- In response to a question from Mr. Parra, Mr. Adams confirmed that the tunnel alternative (TU-1) will be screened along with the new bridge alternatives.
- In response to Mr. Parra’s questions regarding the duration of construction contracts, Mr. Bennett explained that, to some extent, duration is related to the need for contractors to obtain bonding for the entire period of the contract. These bonds are limited to a maximum of five years. Concurring with Mr. Parra’s observation that many jobs last longer than five years, Mr. Adams stated that in those cases, several contracts are issued,
each requiring a separate bond. Mr. Bennett added that a shorter construction period would reduce impacts on the community.

- Referring to Measure 4, Mr. Parra asked if BR-5 and TU-1 would be equally vulnerable to disaster. Mr. Bennett replied that tunnels are inherently more disaster-prone than bridges.
- In response to a question from Mark Scott, Queens Borough President’s Office, Mr. Adams stated that the expected timeline for completing the DEIS is Spring 2005. Ms. Mihelic asked if any work on the DEIS has started. Mr. Adams replied that traffic studies have been initiated; these will be included in the document.

At the end of the screening process, the following alternatives were selected for examination in the DEIS:

- No Build
- RA-5: Rehabilitation, New Parallel Bridge on Eastbound Side
- RA-6: Rehabilitation, New Parallel Bridge on Westbound Side
- BR-2: New Bridge on Same Route, Option 1
- BR-3: New Bridge on Same Route, Option 2
- BR-5: New Bridge on Same Route, Option 4

Ms. Neuhaus indicated that the agenda for the May SAC meeting will include a review of the selected alternatives and discussion of the next steps in the process.

Other Business

- Vincent Arcuri, Queens CB #5, reported that the Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) presented information regarding the Grand Avenue citywide bus depot to the Board last night. The project, which is in the preliminary design stage, is expected to take four years to complete and will involve the re-routing of certain buses. Mr. Arcuri stated that the MTA has made a commitment to review bus routes in the area.
- Alvin Goodman, Brooklyn Borough President’s Office, commented that the Cross Harbor Freight Movement Study DEIS is expected to be released next week. A public hearing will be held; it has not yet been scheduled.
- Ms. Woodin asked SAC members and guests to sign an image release that would allow NYSDOT to use photos of individuals in project newsletters and on the website.
- Mr. Adams stated that NYSDOT is tentatively planning to schedule an Inter-Agency Advisory Committee (IAAC) meeting for late May or early June. In response to his question regarding the best days to hold the meeting, Gerald Esposito, Brooklyn CB #1, asked Mr. Adams to avoid the third Thursday of the month (CB #1’s District Service Cabinet meeting) and the second Tuesday (Brooklyn Borough President’s Borough Service Cabinet meeting).

The next SAC meeting is scheduled for **Thursday, May 20, 2004 at 6:30 P.M. at Jennings Hall, 260 Powers Street, Brooklyn.**
Follow-Up Items
1. Provide information regarding effect of revised employee numbers on alternatives that failed Level 1 screening by a slim margin (Anthony Parra). Responsibility: Parsons.
2. Schedule IAAC meeting for late May or early June. Responsibility: NYSDOT
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NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
KOSCIUSZKO BRIDGE PROJECT
STAKEHOLDERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE: MAY 20, 2004

Minutes

The 17th meeting of the New York State Department of Transportation’s (NYSDOT) Kosciuszko Bridge Project Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC) was held on Thursday, May 20, 2004 at Jennings Hall, Brooklyn. (See Attachment A for Attendance List.) The meeting was scheduled to review and finalize the list of alternatives to be examined in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), provide an overview of the DEIS, and obtain input from the SAC regarding planned developments in the project study area.

Helen Neuhaus, Helen Neuhaus & Associates (HNA), opened the meeting by reflecting on the long vibrant life of SAC member Frank Principe, West Maspeth Local Development Corporation, who passed away on May 3rd at the age of 94. She then asked for comments on the Minutes of the April 15, 2004 meeting. Following adoption of the Minutes without changes, Ms. Neuhaus facilitated a discussion of follow-up items from that meeting. These included:

- An Inter-Agency Advisory Committee (IAAC) meeting has been scheduled for Wednesday, June 16th at 10 a.m. in Room 820 of NYSDOT’s Region 11 Office, 47-40 21st Street, Long Island City. Anthony Nunziato and Christine Holowacz are the SAC representatives to the IAAC.

- In response to a request from Anthony Parra, EWVIDCO, Steve Bennett, Parsons, provided information regarding the effect of revised employee numbers on Level 1 screening results. Mr. Bennett noted that only one alternative, Alternative RA-3, was affected by the revised numbers. He explained that this alternative received an empty circle (indicating a low score) for Measure 3-2, Employee Relocation; it would have received a half-filled circle (indicating a medium score) with the revised employee numbers. Either way, RA-3 would have passed Level 1 screening.

Recap of Level 2 Screening

Using PowerPoint, Mr. Bennett briefly reviewed the Level 2 screening process and the six (6) alternatives selected for study in the DEIS. In addition, a handout of the completed screening matrix and descriptions of each alternative was distributed. Mr. Bennett explained that the DEIS will include a No Build alternative, along with 2 Rehabilitation with Auxiliary Lanes (RA) and 3 New Bridge (BR) alternatives. He noted that Alternatives RA-5 and RA-6 received scores of 19 and 18, respectively, which are considerably higher than the next highest scoring alternatives, RA-1 and RA-2, which were ranked at 15 each. He further explained that because the scores were close, three BR alternatives were selected: BR-2, BR-3 and BR-5. These received scores of 21, 22, and 22, respectively. The 6 alternatives listed above will be advanced to the DEIS phase of the project.

Ms. Neuhaus congratulated the SAC on its successful completion of the Level 2 Screening process, emphasizing that achievement of this major milestone in less than two years is a tribute to the hard work and dedication of the Committee. After reiterating that she is proud to work with this group, Ms. Neuhaus led the project team in a round of applause.
Overview of DEIS Studies
Pat Monte, Vollmer Associates, echoed Ms. Neuhaus’ praise of the SAC, adding that the work was done with enthusiasm and real interest in tackling the tough issues. Using PowerPoint, he then reviewed the DEIS timeline and the principal purpose of the DEIS, which is to evaluate and compare the social, economic and environmental impacts of all alternatives and provide a basis for the selection of a preferred alternative. The DEIS phase will include continued agency and public participation. Mr. Monte noted that because SAC members understand community issues best, the Committee will continue to play an important role as the DEIS moves forward. He then discussed the major components of the DEIS. These include:

- **Project Description** – a concise description of the project location and proposed action.
- **Purpose and Need** – this section will address traffic safety and congestion, as well as the structural condition of the bridge.
- **Goals and Objectives** – these were developed in Fall 2002 and Winter 2003 in partnership with the SAC.
- **DEIS Alternatives** – this section will include detailed descriptions and graphics for each alternative.
- **Engineering Studies** – this section will include design criteria (the guidelines and standards used in the design of roadways and bridges), cost estimates and construction schedules.
- **Environmental Impact Assessments** – these sections will evaluate each alternative (including the No Build) for its transportation, social, economic and environmental impacts. The DEIS will examine both project-specific and cumulative impacts. Mr. Monte reviewed a number of specific issues that will be studied:
  - **Transportation**: highway/local streets, public transportation, pedestrians/bicyclists.
  - **Social**: affected populations, neighborhood character, community facilities, emergency services. An example of an issue that will be studied in this section is residential property acquisition, which may be a factor in Queens.
  - **Economic**: regional and local economy, established business districts, business relocations. An example is the acquisition of business properties.
  - **Environmental**: air and noise, contaminated/hazardous materials, construction impacts, general ecology and wildlife, historical and cultural resources, parks and recreational facilities, surface waters/wetlands, visual resources. This section will include an assessment of each alternative’s impact on Sgt. Dougherty Park and on bicyclists and pedestrians and will identify opportunities for community amenities. Storm water management and potential impacts on Newtown Creek will also be studied. Mr. Monte noted that NYSDOT will be responsible for channeling stormwater run-off from the bridge into a collection system. If such a system does not exist, the Department will work with New York City agencies to resolve the problem.
- **Alternative Comparison Summary** – this section will include a summary of impacts (both negative and positive), a comparison of each alternative’s ability to meet the Goals and Objectives, and the construction schedule and cost of each alternative.

Mr. Monte stated that the anticipated publication date of the DEIS is mid 2005. Federal, state and local agencies and members of the public will have an opportunity to comment on the document; public hearings, to be held in Brooklyn and Queens, are anticipated for Fall 2005. Mr. Monte concluded by reiterating that the SAC will play a vital and ongoing role in the DEIS.
process by providing a community perspective on the transportation, social, economic, and environmental issues to be addressed in the document.

The following comments and questions were raised during Mr. Monte’s presentation:

- In response to a question from Barbara Mihelic, Noble Street Block Association, Mr. Bennett confirmed that demolition of the bridge will be examined in the Construction Impacts section of the DEIS.

- Vincent Arcuri, Queens Community Board (CB) #5, asked if the DEIS will include recommendations for new parks. Mr. Monte explained that such recommendations will be made as part of the “Section 4(f)” process, which governs the acquisition of parks. Under this federal regulation, NYSDOT is required to consider whether there is a “prudent and feasible alternative” to any taking of, or impact on, parkland. If such an alternative does not exist, mitigation measures must be included in the final recommendation. Theresa Cianciotta, Assemblyman Joseph Lentol, indicated that local residents would be “very upset” if Sgt. Dougherty Park were taken. Mr. Monte assured her that Section 4(f) requires the replacement of any parkland taken for the purposes of the project. In response to comments by Laura Hofmann, Barge Park Pals, and Ms. Mihelic, Mr. Monte and Mr. Arcuri clarified that Section 4(f) applies to both property takings and other impacts resulting from city, state or federal actions. Ms. Cianciotta noted that the contaminated soil in the area should be considered when looking at potential new parkland.

- Mr. Monte remarked that community amenities will be considered as part of the project. Robert Adams, NYSDOT, added that amenities such as streetscapes might also be possible under the Department’s Environmental Initiative program.

- Observing that many children in the Greenpoint community suffer from asthma, Ms. Mihelic emphasized the importance of air quality monitoring near schools. She expressed her view that this subject is important enough to merit its own section in the DEIS. After Ms. Neuhaus indicated that air and noise monitoring will be discussed in greater detail at next month’s meeting, Mr. Monte added that the SAC will be asked for input regarding sensitive sites where monitoring receptors might be placed.

- Referring to property acquisitions, Mr. Adams reported that the project team has made contact with the family that owns the three houses in Maspeth that might be impacted by the project. He noted that a meeting was scheduled but postponed due to the illness of a family member. It is expected that the meeting will be re-scheduled.

- Referring to the stormwater management section of the DEIS, Ms. Mihelic observed that the only water collection system that exists in Greenpoint is a pipe that empties into the street. She asked if an in-ground system would be installed as part of the project to ensure that water does not run into Newtown Creek or onto local roadways. A brief discussion ensued regarding the type of system that would be used and if the water would be treated. While these questions cannot be answered until further information is gathered, Mr. Bennett emphasized that the capacity of the existing sewer lines will be examined before any connections are made. If increased capacity is required, NYSDOT and the New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP) will coordinate their efforts to resolve this problem. Alvin Goodman, Brooklyn Borough President’s Office, stated that the City is currently conducting a “Use and Standards Attainment” project for Newtown Creek; this might represent an opportunity for a partnership between the City
Referring to the Project Description section, Mr. Arcuri asked if the DEIS will address the project’s impact on the Long Island Expressway (LIE) interchange. Mr. Bennett replied that while the LIE interchange is not presently included in the scope of work, it is a significant part of the traffic study and will be discussed in that section. Dolores Rizzotto, Queens CB #2, observed that there are major safety issues associated with the interchange, which will be exacerbated by any additional capacity on the BQE. Mr. Monte emphasized that none of the alternatives involve additional capacity, only auxiliary lanes to facilitate entering and exiting the highway. Mr. Arcuri reiterated his view that the project should be expanded to include this interchange.

Joseph Ruzalski, United Forties Civic Association, called on NYSDOT to consider a ramp from the eastbound bridge to the proposed Cross Harbor Freight Movement Intermodal Yard. This comment prompted a discussion of the Cross Harbor DEIS and its public outreach effort. (See Other Business.)

Discussion of Planned Developments
This discussion was supported by a handout that included a map showing known planned developments in the study area and a list of agencies that were contacted regarding any developments under their jurisdiction. (See Attachment B.) Mr. Bennett also gave a brief PowerPoint presentation that identified the developments and asked the SAC for its input regarding additional projects. Noting that the United States Coast Guard (USCG) is now involved in national security matters, Mr. Arcuri asked why it was not included on the agency list. Mr. Bennett explained that because the USCG is considered a “Cooperating Agency” for the Kosciuszko Bridge EIS, ongoing dialogue between NYSDOT and USCG is already under way.

The following additional projects were identified by the SAC:

- **NYCDEP Sludge Force Main.** This major pipeline, which will carry sludge from the Newtown Creek Water Pollution Control Plant (WPCP), will run from an inlet adjacent to the Greenpoint Marine Transfer Station into Queens. The project is expected to have a three year construction period. Ms. Rizzotto stated that additional information could be obtained from John Leonforte, NYCDEP.
- **Lower Manhattan/Long Island Rail Road/JFK Access Alternatives Study.** Mr. Arcuri noted that this project involves three alternative routes; one may use part of the Long Island Rail Road’s Montauk branch line. In response to a question from Mr. Bennett, Mr. Arcuri remarked that this project would potentially affect traffic in the Kosciuszko Bridge study area if it requires raising the overpasses.
- **Newtown Creek WPCP Aeration Facility.** In response to Mr. Bennett’s observation that NYCDEP appears to have relatively few employees at this location, Ms. Holowacz urged him to consider the number of construction workers, contractors and subcontractors who work at the site. She also cited the parking problems associated with this project and emphasized the importance of ensuring that construction contracts include specific penalties and incentives in order to avoid impacts on the surrounding neighborhood.
- **Sunnyside Yard Pedestrian Crossing.**
- **Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) Finance Center.**
- **Kent Avenue/Franklin Street reconstruction project.**
Flushing Avenue reconstruction. It was noted that this project, on Flushing Avenue, between the Flatbush Avenue Extension and Cypress Avenue, is expected to be completed in January 2007, one year prior to the earliest possible start of construction on the Kosciuszko Bridge. [This information was confirmed following the meeting.]

Other Business
- Following Mr. Ruzalski’s remarks regarding the proposed Cross Harbor Freight Movement Intermodal Yard, some SAC members commented on the project’s recently-released DEIS and the lack of public outreach and notification for the project’s upcoming hearings. Mr. Arcuri reported that the Cross Harbor project team made presentations to CB #5 and to the Queens Borough Board. Mr. Goodman stated that his Office contacted the Cross Harbor team to request that presentations be made, and the DEIS sent, to all affected Brooklyn Community Boards. Ms. Neuhaus indicated that she has information on the dates and locations of the public hearings and that this information is also available at www.crossharborstudy.com. Coral Gee, Councilwoman Diana Reyna, offered to contact Alice Cheng, New York City Economic Development Corporation, to request that the hearing dates and locations be listed in community newspapers.
- Mary Gottlieb, Meeker Avenue/Apollo Street Association, noted that the area under the viaduct near Apollo Street is no longer available for public parking. Dorothy Swick, Newtown Creek Monitoring Committee, reported that NYSDOT is using the area as a temporary staging site for installing Intelligent Transportation System digital signage on the BQE, between the Brooklyn-Battery Tunnel and the Grand Central Parkway.
- Teresa Toro, Tri-State Transportation Campaign, requested that the project website be updated on a more frequent basis. Mr. Adams replied that the website will be updated over the next few weeks and that a new NYSDOT staffperson, along with the project team, will be responsible for keeping it more current.
- In response to Ms. Mihelic’s question regarding an on-site community liaison for the project, Mr. Adams stated that this would be considered during the construction phase.
- Ms. Mihelic thanked Ms. Neuhaus for offering to hire summer interns from the Bard High School Early College program.

Looking Ahead
Ms. Neuhaus proposed the following agenda items for the June 17th SAC meeting: finalize list of planned developments; discuss possible locations for air quality and noise monitoring; begin to plan October public forums; and celebrate the completion of the Level 2 Screening process. After suggesting that the SAC take a break during July and August, she noted that the regular September meeting date falls on Rosh Hashanah. Ms. Neuhaus asked the SAC to think about alternate dates for this meeting. She also noted that the project team will produce and distribute a newsletter over the Summer.

Ms. Gottlieb strongly recommended that the Brooklyn public forum be held at St. Cecilia’s Church, which is considered safe and accessible by many Greenpoint residents. Ms. Neuhaus agreed to contact the church as soon as a date is selected. Denise Woodin, HNA, asked SAC members to contact her at denise@hna1977.com with the dates of October community board and civic group meetings or other events in order to avoid any conflicts. In response to Ms. Neuhaus’ request for SAC assistance in planning the forums, Christine Holowacz, Greenpoint
Property Owners, and Ms. Gottlieb offered to help. Ms. Neuhaus indicated that she would also seek assistance from a Queens SAC member.

The next SAC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, June 17, 2004 at 6:30 P.M. at Jennings Hall, 260 Powers Street, Brooklyn.

Follow-Up Items
1. Compile list of October community meetings in order to avoid conflicts when scheduling Kosciuszko public meetings. Responsibility: HNA.

2. Request use of St. Cecilia’s Church for Brooklyn public meeting (Mary Gottlieb). Responsibility: HNA.

3. Identify Queens SAC member(s) to assist with planning public forums. Responsibility: HNA.

4. Update project website more frequently (Teresa Toro). Responsibility: Project Team.

5. Schedule September SAC meeting and confirm use of Jennings Hall. Responsibility: HNA.
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A letter was sent on March 3, 2004 to the following agencies to request their assistance in identifying transportation and development projects that could impact traffic in and along the I-278 corridor in Brooklyn and Queens in the vicinity of the Kosciuszko Bridge.

Brooklyn Economic Development Corporation
Con Edison
Keyspan
MTA – Bridge & Tunnels
MTA – Long Island Rail Road
MTA – New York City Transit
MTA – New York City Transit – Buses
New York City Department of City Planning – Brooklyn Borough Office
New York City Department of City Planning – Queens Borough Office
New York City Department of City Planning – Transportation Division
New York City Department of Environmental Protection – Office of Environmental Planning and Assessment
New York City Department of Parks and Recreation – Brooklyn Office
New York City Department of Parks and Recreation – Queens Office
New York City Department of Transportation – Bridges & Tunnels
New York City Department of Transportation – Brooklyn Division
New York City Department of Transportation – Capital Planning & Development
New York City Department of Transportation – Division of Street and Arterial Maintenance
New York City Department of Transportation – OCMC – Highways
New York City Department of Transportation – Queens Division
New York City Economic Development Corporation
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
Office of the Brooklyn Borough President
Office of the Queens Borough President
The Port Authority of NY & NJ – Office of Policy and Planning
Queens County Overall Economic Development Corporation
US Army Corps of Engineers
Verizon
The 18th meeting of the New York State Department of Transportation’s (NYSDOT) Kosciuszko Bridge Project Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC) was held on Thursday, June 17, 2004 at Jennings Hall, Brooklyn. (See Attachment A for Attendance List.) The meeting was scheduled to begin discussing the studies that will be conducted during the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) process.

Helen Neuhaus, Helen Neuhaus & Associates (HNA), opened the meeting by asking for comments on the Minutes of the May 20, 2004 meeting. There were no comments, and the Minutes were adopted unanimously. She then facilitated a discussion of Old Business items, including the following:

- Robert Adams, NYSDOT, provided a report on the project’s second Inter-Agency Advisory Committee (IAAC) meeting, which was held on Wednesday, June 16th. He noted that many key agencies and utilities were represented, including the United States Coast Guard; Federal Highway Administration (FHWA); New York City Departments of Transportation, Sanitation, Environmental Protection, Police, Health and City Planning; New York Metropolitan Transportation Council; KeySpan; Con Edison; and the Brooklyn and Queens Borough Presidents’ Offices. In addition, the SAC was represented at the meeting by Christine Holowacz, Greenpoint Property Owners, and Anthony Nunziato, Maspeth Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Adams stated that the project team hopes to meet with the New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP) this summer regarding drainage concerns.

- Following up on Mr. Adams’ report, Ms. Neuhaus stated that she recently spoke with Deputy Commissioner Doug Greeley, NYCDEP, who offered to compile a list of NYCDEP projects planned for the area around the Kosciuszko Bridge and to meet with the SAC this fall. Ms. Neuhaus remarked that her firm is working with Deputy Commissioner Greeley on other projects and has found him to be very community-minded.

- In response to a request from Assemblywoman Catherine Nolan, NYSDOT Regional Director Douglas Currey, Jennifer Nelson, NYSDOT, and Mr. Adams traveled to Albany to provide a project briefing for Assemblywoman Nolan, Assemblyman Joseph Lentol, Assemblywoman Margaret Markey and their legislative staff. Commenting that the meeting was very positive, Mr. Adams added that the legislators seemed well informed about the project. He commended their SAC representatives: Theresa Cianciotta (Assemblyman Lentol), and Welland Fuller (Assemblywoman Markey).
After reminding the SAC that the Committee will not meet in either July or August, Ms. Neuhaus stated that because the regular September meeting date (September 16th) falls on Rosh Hashanah, alternate dates should be considered. Following a brief discussion, consensus was reached on holding the meeting on Wednesday, September 22nd.

Ms. Neuhaus indicated that the project team has come up with several possible dates in late October for Public Meetings in Brooklyn and Queens. She noted that, pursuant to the SAC’s wishes, every effort is being made to hold the Brooklyn meeting at St. Cecilia’s Church. Mary Gottlieb, Meeker Avenue/Apollo Street Association, requested that Ms. Neuhaus contact her as soon as the Brooklyn meeting date is confirmed so that she can plan her schedule around it. (Subsequent to the SAC meeting, the following dates and locations were confirmed: Tuesday, October 19th at Martin Luther High School in Maspeth, and Wednesday, October 27th at St. Cecilia’s Church.) There will be no SAC meeting in October. Noting that Ms. Gottlieb and Ms. Holowacz have volunteered to serve on a planning subcommittee for the meetings, Ms. Neuhaus asked if any of the Queens SAC members would be interested in helping as well. Mr. Nunziato offered to join the subcommittee, which will meet over the summer. Barbara Mihelic, Noble Street Block Association and Mike Hofmann, Greenpoint Waterfront Association for Parks and Planning, also expressed interest.

In response to a question from Joseph Ruzalski, United Forties Civic Association, Ms. Neuhaus stated that the project team will be working on a newsletter that will be distributed this summer.

In response to a request from Teresa Toro, Tri-State Transportation Campaign, at the May SAC meeting, Mr. Adams reported that the project website has been updated. NYSDOT is in the process of changing the site’s look in order to give it a more professional appearance.

Discussion of Planned Developments
Mr. Bennett stated that the map showing planned developments in the project study area was revised after last month’s meeting to include comments from the SAC and IAAC. (See Attachment B.) New projects include the Sunnyside Yard Pedestrian Bridge; Metropolitan Transportation Authority’s Revenue Handling Facility; Flushing Avenue reconstruction; Kent Avenue/Franklin Street reconstruction; and the East Side Access Project. Several other projects mentioned by SAC and IAAC members are not included on the map because they either fall outside the study area or because their exact location has not yet been determined.

In response to a question from Ms. Gottlieb, Mr. Bennett stated that the Kosciuszko Bridge is not shown because the purpose of the map is to look at other projects. Ms. Gottlieb suggested that the bridge be included as a reference point. In response to a question from Vincent Arcuri, Queens Community Board #5, Mr. Bennett acknowledged that omitting the Grand Street/Grand Avenue Bridge reconstruction project was an oversight. He indicated that both bridges would be added to the map.
Mr. Arcuri observed that certain projects, while outside the study area, might have an impact on the Kosciuszko Bridge Project during construction. He cited as an example the Metropolitan Avenue/Fresh Pond Road Bridge, which will involve lane closure during reconstruction. Mr. Bennett stated that he would inquire into the schedule for that project. Following up on a comment from Gus Amato, United Forties Civic Association, Katie Falgoust, OUTRAGE, noted that New York City’s proposed New Solid Waste Management Plan includes alternatives for existing Marine Transfer Stations in Greenpoint/Williamsburg and Maspeth. Scoping meetings will be held on June 30th in Sunnyside and July 1st in Williamsburg.

Gabriel Paniza, Councilman Eric Gioia, commented that the New York City Department of City Planning is about to start a rezoning study for Maspeth and Woodside. After confirming that this study will examine down-zoning, Mr. Bennett stated while it will be considered in the DEIS, more emphasis will be placed on projects that add traffic to the project area.

Presentation re: Air Quality and Noise Studies
Using PowerPoint, Bruce Neiger, Parsons, provided an overview of the approach that will be used to assess the project’s potential air quality and noise impacts. He began by noting that the Federal Clean Air Act of 1970 identified pollutants and set air quality standards for ambient (existing background) conditions. The DEIS must demonstrate that these standards will be met by any selected alternative. After explaining that air pollution is generated by stationary sources (e.g., factories, heating and power plants, chimneys) and mobile sources (diesel trains, cars, trucks and other vehicles), Mr. Neiger observed that projects such as the Kosciuszko Bridge are primarily concerned with mobile sources.

He then explained that vehicular pollutants include carbon monoxide (CO—a colorless, odorless, and toxic gas), particulate matter (PM—i.e. dust) and chemicals that form ozone (smog). CO emissions increase with higher traffic volumes, congestion, slower speeds and the use of gasoline (as opposed to diesel fuel). Factors that increase PM include higher traffic volumes, diesel-fueled trucks, and roadway dust. Mr. Neiger noted that New York State is currently in attainment for CO and inhalable particles (PM 10) but that standards have not yet been set for fine particles (PM2.5). He assured the SAC that design and mitigation efforts will guarantee that the project meets federal standards. Mr. Neiger further explained that although New York State is moving toward attainment of ozone standards, this has not yet been achieved. He noted that ozone is a regional, rather than a project-level, concern that is addressed by the state on all projects.

Mr. Neiger stated that local air quality analyses will be conducted at selected locations adjacent to the highway and along diversion routes within the traffic study area. The air quality model will predict results for the peak traffic year under worst-case meteorological conditions. He emphasized that air quality analysis considers worst-case, rather than typical or even above average, pollutant concentrations. Following comparison of these results with federal standards, mitigation will be considered, if necessary. Mr. Neiger concluded by noting that the DEIS will examine the effect of construction activities and traffic diversion on air quality. He also reminded the SAC that in order to avoid traffic diversion, six lanes will remain open on the bridge throughout construction.
Questions and comments raised during the air quality portion of the presentation are summarized below:

- In response to a question from Ms. Gottlieb, Mr. Neiger explained that the National Ambient Air Quality Standards were set by the United States Environmental Protection Agency and adopted by the states. Observing that Greenpoint suffers from a high asthma rate, Ms. Gottlieb suggested that this might be caused by heavy traffic in the area. After confirming that the air quality standards are health-based, Mr. Neiger added that traffic congestion is only one of several factors that might cause asthma. In response to Ms. Gottlieb’s expression of concern that air quality will worsen during construction, Mr. Neiger agreed that short-term increases in local particulate concentrations could occur. However, he assured the SAC that every effort will be made to minimize construction-related air quality impacts.

- Ms. Mihelic asked if background pollution levels would be measured in order to predict future air quality. Mr. Neiger replied that while representative background data will be gathered from existing monitors that are located throughout the city, including Brooklyn, these detectors are used to set context, not to predict future levels. He added that predictions of maximum future concentrations (worst-case scenarios) are based on background levels.

Noting that some of the monitors are far away, Ms. Gottlieb and Ms. Mihelic expressed their opinion that the monitors should be located in the community. In response, Mr. Neiger noted that background monitoring is intended to also measure pollutants that originate in other areas. He added that even if all Greenpoint-generated pollution were removed, the community’s air quality would still be influenced by that of surrounding neighborhoods. Mr. Neiger emphasized that the DEIS will model local traffic (and its emissions) and will add those predictions to the background data. Mr. Arcuri commented that representative modeling is more effective because it includes pollutants from a broader area in addition to local traffic.

In a follow-up comment, Ms. Gottlieb observed that placing an air monitor at Apollo Street and Meeker Avenue would yield accurate information about CO levels and other pollutants in the project area, especially during construction. Mr. Neiger reiterated that background monitoring is able to project the worst-case scenario for specific locations within the project area precisely because it uses an aggregate number to represent the broader region. He added that the project area will be monitored during construction, as per NYSDOT requirements, to ensure that highly localized particle concentrations do not exceed target levels.

- In response to a question from Mr. Ruzalski regarding air quality monitors that were previously located on Meeker Avenue and Monitor Street, Mr. Neiger indicated that their relocation may have resulted from budgetary constraints or because coverage was needed elsewhere. After Ms. Mihelic expressed her opposition to any decrease in monitoring for budgetary reasons, Mr. Neiger emphasized that no decisions are made without considering the impact on human health. In response to a follow-up question from Ms.
Gottlieb, Mr. Neiger indicated that he will provide the SAC with a map of existing air monitoring locations in the project study area. (See Attachment C.)

In response to a question from Mr. Amato, Mr. Neiger stated that an alternative must be modified or discarded if projections show that it would exceed air quality standards. Mr. Nunziato observed that this is one important reason to consider the Cross Harbor Freight Movement project, which will bring additional truck traffic into both Greenpoint and Maspeth. Mr. Neiger agreed that projections must include total emissions from all projects likely to be built at the time of Kosciuszko Bridge construction. He confirmed that this data will be incorporated into the traffic studies.

Coral Gee, Councilwoman Diana Reyna, asked how the DEIS assigns responsibility for air pollution caused by other projects. In response, Mr. Neiger explained that NYSDOT is only responsible for air quality changes caused by its own projects. However, it considers this impact in the context of a No Build condition that already includes other planned development.

Referring to construction-period impacts, Ms. Gottlieb noted that traffic in the area of the bridge is already heavy. In response, Mr. Neiger reiterated that mitigation measures will be implemented, including the maintenance of six lanes of traffic on the bridge in order to minimize diversion. Mr. Bennett added that potential construction problems will be addressed generally in the DEIS but more specifically during final design.

The SAC raised other potential construction-related issues, including noise and air pollution caused by construction vehicles; untidy staging areas; and the use of residential and commercial parking spaces by construction workers. Regarding the latter, Mr. Bennett suggested establishment of a resident-only parking permit system. Mr. Arcuri observed that on Riker’s Island, workers are bussed in from off-site parking lots. Several SAC members noted that enforcement of noise and parking regulations has been a problem on past projects in the area. In response to a question from Ms. Mihelic, Mr. Bennett indicated that incentives for respecting the local community will be included in the construction contract.

Ms. Mihelic asked about the procedures for monitoring the removal of lead and other heavy metals that might be present in the paint on the bridge if and when the bridge is torn down. Mr. Bennett replied that while the lead paint was removed during a recent repainting project, lead, along with asbestos and other hazardous materials, might be present at other locations. He noted that one of the biggest concerns is the ExxonMobil oil spill in Greenpoint, which has the potential to release vapors once the ground is disturbed. Mr. Bennett added that these issues will be examined in the Contaminated Materials Assessment section of the DEIS.

Mr. Neiger continued the presentation by addressing noise issues. He described noise as unwanted sound that is measured in decibels. He then explained that standards for total noise levels, known as Noise Abatement Criteria, have been set by FHWA. These standards establish the noise levels at which abatement must be considered. FHWA allows states to set their own
thresholds for “significant increases” in noise levels; NYSDOT has set its threshold at an increase of 6 or more decibels. This means that any future alternative where noise impacts exceed the existing noise levels by 6 or more decibels would trigger the need to consider noise abatement/mitigation measures.

Mr. Neiger identified several factors that raise noise levels, including increased traffic volumes (especially trucks); increased speeds; decreased distance between the roadway and receiver; and other factors, such as deteriorated roadway surfaces. Mr. Arcuri noted that hard surfaces at the edges of roadways create reverberations, which also result in increased noise.

As part of the noise analysis section of the DEIS, current land uses will be considered. This will include identification of outdoor activities and locations that would benefit from reduced noise levels, including stoops, playgrounds and cemeteries. Specific project elements that could increase noise will be reviewed and locations for analysis selected.

Mr. Neiger noted that although noise is likely to temporarily increase during construction, a number of mitigation measures could be implemented. These include ensuring that equipment meets specifications, erecting portable noise barriers, and limiting the hours of construction.

Before concluding his presentation, Mr. Neiger discussed SAC participation in the DEIS process. He specifically noted the SAC’s potential role in reviewing air and noise receptor sites; assisting the project team in identifying noise mitigation and other construction issues; and serving as a liaison between the project team and the broader community.

Questions and comments raised during the noise portion of the presentation are summarized below:

- Mr. Arcuri indicated that the state’s use of European-style concrete pavement on the recent Long Island Expressway project has resulted in significantly more noise. After responding that FHWA sets the standards, Mr. Bennett emphasized that the SAC will be asked to review and comment on the construction plans.

- In response to a question from Mr. Ruzalski, Mr. Bennett stated that night-time construction will be limited in residential neighborhoods. Construction operations will be discussed with the SAC.

- In response to a question from Mr. Arcuri, Mr. Bennett stated that water quality in Newtown Creek will be addressed in the Surface Waters/Wetlands section of the DEIS.

**Related Projects**

Ms. Toro announced that Brooklyn Community Board #1 will hold a meeting on the Franklin Street Reconstruction Project at the Board Office on June 22nd at 6:30 P.M. The New York City Department of Design and Construction will make a presentation.

After the meeting adjourned, the SAC celebrated the successful completion of the Alternatives Analysis process with a cake and sparkling cider.
The next SAC meeting is scheduled for **Wednesday, September 22nd, at 6:30 P.M. at Jennings Hall, 260 Powers Street, Brooklyn.**

**Follow-Up Items**

1. Follow-up with St. Cecilia’s Church regarding use of the Church for the Brooklyn Open House. Responsibility: HNA.
2. Notify Mary Gottlieb of the date of the Brooklyn Open House. Responsibility: HNA.
3. Provide SAC with locations of existing air quality monitors in project area. Responsibility: Parsons.
4. Add Grand Street/Grand Avenue Bridge project to map of planned developments (Vincent Arcuri). Responsibility: Parsons.
5. Revise map of planned developments to show Kosciuszko Bridge (Mary Gottlieb). Responsibility: Parsons.
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At the May 20, 2004 Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC) meeting, a map of planned developments in the area was presented, for the Committee’s review and comment. A number of additional projects planned for the study area were identified at that meeting and at the Inter-Agency Advisory Committee meeting on June 16, 2004. This memo and the attached map list all projects identified to date.

There are two basic reasons why these planned projects are being analyzed. The first is traffic. Changes in land use can change the traffic both in terms of the number of vehicles traveling to or from the site (traffic generation) and in terms of the routes that vehicles use (travel patterns). These changes apply to both the long-term condition once the project is complete (more or less people traveling to the site) and to the construction period (street closures, construction-related vehicles, etc.).

The other reason these projects are analyzed is for any potential physical impacts they might have on one or more of the alternatives. For example, if a new building is proposed adjacent to the existing Kosciuszko Bridge, it could interfere with an alternative that requires use of that space. Such conflicts do not prohibit the selection of that alternative, but impacts to the new use must be taken into consideration in the DEIS, just as impacts to existing uses will be. Additionally, with early identification of such projects and cooperation between NYSDOT and the owner/sponsoring agency, many conflicts and impacts can be avoided altogether.

All projects will continue to be monitored for any modifications (scale, scope, timeframe, etc.) that would change their effect on the Kosciuszko Bridge Project. Also, the Project Team will continue to coordinate with other agencies and organizations to ensure that they are aware of any new projects that are proposed.

The following projects have been identified to date and will be reviewed for their potential to affect the Kosciuszko Bridge Project:

- Greenpoint Waterfront Rezoning
- Queens West/Olympic Village
- Hunters Point Subdistrict Rezoning
- Greenpoint Converted Marine Transfer Station
- Newtown Creek Water Pollution Control Plant
- Cross Harbor Intermodal Yard
- Grand Avenue Bus Depot
- Sunnyside Yard Pedestrian Crossing
- MTA Revenue Handling Facility
- Kent Ave/Franklin Street Reconstruction
- Flushing Avenue Reconstruction
- MTA East Side Access Project
- NYCDOT Truck Route Study
- NYCDEP Sludge Force Main
- LIRR Main Line 3rd Track
- Long Island and JFK Airport Access Study
- Long Island Truck-Rail Inter-Modal Facility (Pilgrim)
Not Shown
NYCDEP Sludge Force Main
(Final Route Not Determined)
NYCDOT Truck Route Study
(Not Complete)
Long Island and JFK Airport Access Study
(Outside Study Area)
LIRR Main Line 3rd Track
(Outside Study Area)
Long Island Truck-Rail Inter-Modal Facility
(Outside Study Area)

Planned Developments
KOSCIUSZKO BRIDGE PROJECT
June 17, 2004
At the June 17, 2004 Stakeholders Advisory Committee meeting, there was a request for information about the location of existing air quality monitoring stations in the project area. The attached map shows the location of each existing air quality monitor in Brooklyn and Queens that monitors pollutants that will be studied as part of the Kosciuszko Bridge Project. This information is based on data from the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC). Monitoring stations throughout the country provide concentration data, as required by the US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), to determine if metropolitan regions are meeting air quality standards. In New York, these stations are run by the NYSDEC Bureau of Air Quality Surveillance.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) will use this data to present a thorough review of existing air quality in the project area for carbon monoxide, particulate matter, and ozone. However, predictions of potential impacts in a DEIS are modeled, not measured. For the purposes of predicting potential project impacts from carbon monoxide (CO), a reasonable worst-case estimate of emissions from local traffic will be generated using highly conservative inputs. A conservative estimate of “background” concentration will be added to the estimate of emissions from local traffic in order to obtain a total concentration.

\[ \text{Background CO} + \text{Modeled Local Traffic Emissions} = \text{Total Concentration} \]

The background concentration is based on an evaluation of monitoring data by NYSDEC and the New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP) and represents emissions from non-local sources. The total concentration will be compared to the Federal standard to determine the project’s impact.

For particulates (PM2.5 and PM10), the project increment (the extent to which this project would increase concentrations) will be compared to a threshold specified by NYSDEC. For both CO and particulates, since the predictions use highly conservative inputs, typical concentrations are generally well below these predicted levels.

For information about specific pollutant levels at any of the NYSDEC monitoring locations please see the following websites:

**NYSDEC Bureau of Air Quality Surveillance**
Website: www.dec.state.ny.us/website/dar/baqs/index.html
The website includes annual air quality reports dating back to 1996. Additionally, daily site-specific data can be obtained by clicking on one of the monitoring locations on the map at http://www.dec.state.ny.us/website/dar/bts/airmon/sitepage2.htm.

**U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Office of Air and Radiation**
Website: www.epa.gov/air/data/geosel.html
This website allows the user to find monitoring locations throughout the country and recent data for each criteria pollutant (carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, ozone, sulfur dioxide, PM2.5, PM10, and lead). The site can also be used to identify stationary source emitters.
Minutes
The 19th meeting of the New York State Department of Transportation’s (NYSDOT) Kosciuszko Bridge Project Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC) was held on Wednesday, September 22, 2004 at Jennings Hall, Brooklyn. (See Attachment A for Attendance List.) The meeting was scheduled to continue discussion of the studies to be conducted as part of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), in particular air quality, noise and community facilities.

Helen Neuhaus, Helen Neuhaus & Associates (HNA), opened the meeting by introducing Andrea Wong, a new staff member, and Naya Sou, an HNA summer intern. Ms. Neuhaus noted that Ms. Sou, a student at the Bard High School Early College program, was referred by Barbara Mihelic, Noble Street Block Association. Ms. Neuhaus then asked for comments on the Minutes of the June 17, 2004 meeting. There were no comments, and the Minutes were adopted unanimously.

Robert Adams, NYSDOT, reported that at the request of New York City Councilwoman Diana Reyna, the project team recently met with the Councilwoman and her staff; Alison Cordero and Katie Falgoust, OUTRAGE; Anthony Parra, East Williamsburg Valley Industrial Development Corporation; and Gerald Esposito and Vincent Abate, Brooklyn Community Board (CB) #1, to discuss the project. He stated that Minutes of that meeting would be distributed to the attendees shortly.

Recap of Air Quality and Noise Presentation
Using PowerPoint, Bruce Neiger, Parsons, provided a recap of the presentation given in June regarding the air quality and noise studies that will be conducted as part of the DEIS.

Air Quality
Mr. Neiger began by describing the pollutants to be analyzed. These include: carbon monoxide (CO); particulate matter (PM10 – inhalable particles and PM2.5 – fine particles); and ozone (smog). While CO and PM are generated by vehicles in the immediate area, ozone is a byproduct of vehicle emissions and is analyzed on a regional level.

Mr. Neiger explained that background air quality is measured by monitors that are required by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and operated by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. Monitors located throughout Brooklyn and Queens are used to determine regional compliance with federal air quality standards and enable NYSDOT to identify background concentrations of CO, PM and ozone. Data collected from these monitors, and from other sources, will be incorporated into the computer model to predict future air quality under each of the alternatives. Mr. Neiger emphasized that the modeling for the Kosciuszko Bridge project will be very conservative -- i.e., it will project worst-case weather conditions combined with worst-case traffic conditions. The results will be compared to federal standards, and the need for mitigation will be evaluated.
Mr. Neiger further explained that the air quality analysis will be conducted adjacent to the highway; along potential diversion routes; and at publicly accessible “worst case” locations including sidewalks, yards, open windows, open space, and along the route of any possible bikeway/walkway on the bridge. He reiterated that six lanes of traffic will be maintained on the highway throughout the construction period. Therefore, air quality impacts due to traffic diversions are not expected to be a major problem. Mr. Neiger noted that efforts to minimize PM include requiring the construction contractor to cover materials during transport, meet equipment specifications and water the construction site to reduce dust. He added that although potential construction problems will be discussed in the DEIS, these issues will be more specifically addressed in the contract specifications.

Comments and questions raised during the Air Quality discussion are summarized below:

- In response to several questions from Vincent Arcuri, Queens CB #5, regarding PM, Mr. Neiger provided the following information:
  - While PM is sub-classified based on the size of the particles, both PM 2.5 and PM 10 are basically dust.
  - PM 2.5 is very small and could almost be considered a regional issue (similar to ozone).
  - Dust comes from many sources, including engines, brake pads, fireplace fires and roadways.
  - Diesel train engines, which would likely generate both types of PM, are subject to restrictive federal standards.
  - Because the Kosciuszko Bridge project is transportation-related, the DEIS will examine the amounts of PM that will be added to the atmosphere as a result of this project and provide for mitigation measures, as needed.

- Gus Amato, United Forties Civic Association, expressed his concern regarding public notification of air quality findings and standards. Mr. Neiger stated that the DEIS, which will examine future impacts with and without the project, will be made available to the public. He explained that the document will include extensive information on air quality standards and will provide specific data to evaluate potential project impacts. If an alternative exceeds the allowable limits, it must be modified to meet the standards.

- Joseph Ruzalski, United Forties Civic Association, and Mr. Arcuri asked how the EIS will account for pollution dispersal. In particular, they noted that pollutants from “worst-case” sites in Brooklyn (i.e. the intersection of Varick Street and Meeker Avenue) might be carried over to Queens by prevailing winds, where they would add to air quality problems generated by the Long Island Expressway (LIE) interchange and the former Phelps-Dodge property. Mr. Neiger explained that the data collected from the monitors reflect average concentrations in the region and include transportation-related pollutants, such as CO and PM. These cannot be compared with organic pollutants from stationary sources. Steve Bennett, Parsons, suggested, and Mr. Neiger concurred, that southwest winds blowing toward Queens would tend to dilute any airborne contaminants. Mr. Neiger added that winds do not tend to be prevailing; rather, they change direction frequently.
In response to a question from Ms. Mihelic regarding the location of existing monitors, Mr. Neiger referenced a map that was distributed with the June 2004 SAC Minutes. In a follow-up question, Ms. Mihelic asked if additional fixed monitors would be used during construction. Although Mr. Neiger stated that there are currently no plans for additional air quality monitors, Mr. Bennett observed that once soil sampling is performed, vapors from the ExxonMobil oil spill may point to the need for additional monitoring. This would be done as part of the Hazardous Materials section of the DEIS. Mr. Neiger added that because dust is one of the biggest problems during construction, contract documents could require the contractor to water the area frequently.

Ms. Mihelic commented that contractors have been known to take “environmental shortcuts” in order to save money, even with mitigation measures in place. She emphasized the importance of enforcement and oversight during construction, stating that the contracts must include mechanisms for ensuring that health and safety regulations are followed. Mr. Bennett noted that while the DEIS will discuss these concerns, they will be addressed in detail during final design. Mr. Adams added that any contractor who does not meet the contract specifications will face financial penalties. Mr. Amato recommended that community residents take responsibility for helping to monitor construction activities.

In response to a question from Peter King, NYSDOT, regarding air quality analysis along diversion routes, Mr. Neiger explained that such analysis is done if specific conditions exist. However, he emphasized that NYSDOT is committed to minimizing the diversion of traffic to local streets. In a follow-up question, Michael Rossmy, Brooklyn Borough President’s Office, asked for further information regarding the criteria that would trigger analysis. Mr. Neiger noted that one critical criterion is a construction period of at least two years. He offered to provide Mr. Rossmy with more specific information in writing.

**Noise**

Mr. Neiger reminded the SAC that a noise impact is defined as either a substantial increase in noise levels or future noise levels that approach or exceed the Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC). These are standards set by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) that establish the noise levels at which abatement must be considered. FHWA allows states to set their own thresholds for “significant increases” in noise levels. For the Kosciuszko Bridge project, any alternative that results in noise impacts exceeding existing noise levels by 6 or more decibels would trigger the need to consider noise abatement/mitigation measures.

Mr. Neiger then described the process for analyzing noise impacts. It includes a review of existing land use; identification of outdoor activities or locations that could benefit from reduced noise levels (i.e. porches, patios, yards, playgrounds, cemeteries, etc.); a review of project factors that could impact noise; and the selection of locations for analysis. He explained that the analysis will involve two types of monitoring: 24-hour monitoring to identify peak hour(s) and to understand hourly variations; and short-term (15-minute) monitoring, which is used to set local context and validate the computer model.
Mr. Neiger then showed maps of proposed monitoring locations. Monitors will be placed on the roof of Mary Gottlieb’s home (Meeker Avenue/Apollo Street Association) in Brooklyn, and in the backyard of the Choudri family (community residents) in Queens for a 24-hour period at each location. In Brooklyn, short-term monitors will be placed in the following locations: an alleyway off Meeker Avenue, between Van Dam and Apollo Streets; Sergeant Dougherty Park; Vandervoort Avenue at Lombardy Street; and Meeker Avenue at Apollo Street. In Queens, short-term monitors are proposed for Calvary Cemetery; the Choudri family front yard; 54th Road and 44th Street; and 53rd Avenue and 44th Street. Following discussions with SAC members, it was agreed that a fifth monitoring location would be added in Brooklyn in the Tiniski family’s backyard. Mr. Neiger added that the data collected from the monitored sites will be modeled to project future noise levels. Additional sites will be modeled based on traffic analysis, further site surveys and SAC input.

In a final comment, Mr. Neiger noted that construction noise can be minimized by ensuring that equipment meets specifications, erecting temporary noise barriers, and limiting the hours of construction. He added that coordination with the community will play an important role in noise mitigation.

Comments and questions raised during the discussion on Noise Studies are summarized below:

- Mr. Arcuri observed that during a reconstruction project on the LIE, the highest level of sound was found on the second floor of a nearby residence. He questioned why the long-term monitor on the Choudri property is planned for the backyard rather than the second floor. This prompted a lengthy discussion regarding the most effective locations for monitoring, during which Ms. Mihelic and Ms. Gottlieb echoed Mr. Arcuri’s concerns regarding the lack of monitors planned for rooftops or second floor windows. Mr. Arcuri also noted that if the DEIS documents lower sound levels than expected, the public perception will be that NYSDOT did not monitor appropriate locations.

After Mr. Neiger explained that NYSDOT policy focuses on outdoor, ground level monitoring, Mr. Bennett added that a noise problem on the second floor would also be an issue at ground level. He explained that the purpose of monitoring is to establish base levels of noise conditions throughout the neighborhood for use in computer modeling projections. Mr. Neiger also explained that modeling will not be limited to the monitored locations; instead, it will allow NYSDOT to predict noise levels at different locations at different times. Ms. Mihelic ended the discussion by suggesting that the SAC forward recommendations for additional monitoring sites, including second floor or rooftop locations, to the project team.

- In response to Ms. Gottlieb’s question regarding the difference between monitoring and modeling, Mr. Bennett explained that monitoring is the physical measurement of conditions in the field. Modeling uses a computer program to predict how loud the same location would be with changes in traffic.

- In response to a question from Mr. Ruzalski regarding the size of the monitors, Mr. Neiger stated that they are roughly the size of a tripod with a camera.
Reiterating his previously expressed preference for asphalt pavement, Mr. Arcuri asked if the modeling will assume asphalt or European-style concrete pavement for the new roadway. The project team indicated that it will request that modeling be based on asphalt pavement.

Mr. Neiger and Mr. Bennett concluded the presentation by encouraging the SAC to forward recommendations for additional noise monitoring sites to the project team by October 1st.

Discussion of Community Facilities

Dan Prevost, Parsons, began by describing the types of community facilities that will be considered in the DEIS. He observed that some of these facilities (i.e. libraries, parks and playgrounds) enhance quality of life for the community, while others (i.e. hospitals, police and fire stations) provide necessary services. He referred to a preliminary map and list of facilities within the project study area (See Attachment B.)

Mr. Prevost noted that although large private health centers with many practices under one roof may be considered community facilities for DEIS purposes, individual doctors’ offices are generally not. Private clubs and government facilities with no walk-in public service function are also not considered community facilities.

In response to a question raised by Ms. Mihelic, Mr. Prevost stated that restaurants and food distribution facilities are not included because they are private businesses that do not provide public services to the entire community. However, the effects of project construction on restaurants and food distribution warehouses will be taken into consideration in the same way that effects on other private businesses will be analyzed. In response to a follow-up concern raised by Ms. Mihelic regarding the effect of construction dust on outdoor food markets, Mr. Bennett remarked that due to its potential health effects, airborne construction dust will need to be addressed immediately. He noted that this issue may be of greater concern to the community than dusty produce, which can be washed.

Mr. Prevost stated that impacts on community facilities can be categorized into three types: 1) physical impacts that include physical changes to or acquisition of the facility, as well as environmental impacts on the facility and surrounding area; 2) accessibility changes involving long-term interference with residents’ ability to access the facility via sidewalks, roads, etc.; and 3) population changes, which are unlikely to occur as a result of Kosciuszko Bridge project construction, but would skew the demand for public services and must therefore be assessed as well.

Referring to the community facilities map, Mr. Prevost noted that while the entire traffic study area will be analyzed, the DEIS will focus primarily on community facilities in the area bordered by McGuiness Boulevard, Grand Avenue, 58th Street, 58th Avenue and Greenpoint Avenue, where impacts are most likely to occur. If it is determined that the project could impact facilities outside this area, these will be analyzed as well. Referring to a second map showing emergency service facilities within the traffic study area, Mr. Prevost explained that emergency services (fire, police and hospitals) will be given special attention because they are particularly sensitive
to traffic changes. Emergency service facilities located within the broader traffic study area that serve residents in the area will be considered as well.

Mr. Bennett encouraged SAC members to provide additional input on community facilities that should be included in the DEIS, but are not shown on the current maps. Recommendations offered by the SAC included the: 108th Precinct (547 50th Avenue, Long Island City); New York Fire Department (FDNY) EMS Service Facility (58th Street south of Laurel Hill Boulevard); FDNY Engine 259/Ladder 128 Station (33-51 Greenpoint Avenue); Brooklyn Public Library-Greenpoint Branch (107 Norman Avenue); and Salvation Army Veterans Shelter (Queens). Other suggestions, including the Metropolitan Transportation Authority Finance Center, a new bus depot, a local hotel and the Arthur Creek sanitation headquarters, are not recognized as community facilities, but their impact on traffic during the construction period will be taken into consideration. In response to Mr. Arcuri’s comment regarding the lack of post offices on the community facilities map, Mr. Prevost replied that there are no post offices located in the area of focus. In response to a follow-up question from Mr. Arcuri, Mr. Prevost confirmed that consideration of Calvary Cemetery will include all structures on the property, including the chapel.

Ms. Mihelic expressed concern that streets outside the area of focus would not receive adequate consideration in the DEIS. As an example, she cited Gordon Avenue, which she believes will be over-saturated during project construction as a result of drivers taking detours to avoid delays on the bridge. Mr. Prevost informed her that a full traffic analysis will be performed to determine the project’s impact on locations within the entire traffic study area. If the traffic analysis suggests that locations outside the study area will be significantly impacted, these areas will be investigated as well.

At the end of the presentation, Mr. Prevost reiterated that SAC members should forward the names and locations of any additional community facilities to the project team by October 15th, as there will not be another SAC meeting until November.

Discussion of Open Houses
Ms. Neuhaus reminded SAC members that the Public Open Houses will take place on Tuesday, October 19th, at Martin Luther High School in Maspeth, and on Wednesday, October 27th, at St. Cecilia’s Church in Brooklyn. Both events will run from 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.

The agenda of the Open Houses will include: discussion of the two-step alternatives analysis process, description of the remaining alternatives to be covered in the EIS, and a review of the EIS process and technical studies. Mr. Nunziato will speak on behalf of the SAC at the Open House in Queens, while Ms. Mihelic and Mr. Parra will represent the SAC in Brooklyn.

Ms. Neuhaus also reported that a SAC subcommittee met in July to discuss publicity and other matters relating to the Open Houses. Anthony Nunziato, Maspeth Chamber of Commerce, Mike Hofmann, GWAPP, and Ms. Mihelic met with HNA to brainstorm ideas on how to expand public notification beyond the scope of last year’s outreach. Ms. Gottlieb and Christine Holowacz, Greenpoint Property Owners, were unable to attend the subcommittee meeting but were consulted afterwards.
The subcommittee agreed that, as it has done in the past, the project team should publicize the Open Houses through dissemination of newsletters and letters of invitation to the mailing list, and publication of display advertisements in local and foreign language newspapers. In addition, the group suggested distributing flyers that would pique the interest of local residents by referencing the rich cultural history of the bridge and surrounding community. Accordingly, the project team prepared full-color flyers in English, Polish and Spanish that include pictures of both the bridge and General Thaddeus Kosciuszko. The reverse side of the flyer includes a synopsis of the project and directions to the Open Houses. Black and white copies of the flyer are being distributed in the monthly mailings of Brooklyn CB #1 and Queens CBs #2 and #5. In addition, announcements regarding the Open Houses have been submitted to public access channels NY1, Queens Public Television and Brooklyn Community Access Television, as well as to the community calendars of local newspapers and Newsday.

Ms. Mihelic asked whether local churches had been provided with flyers to include in their weekly bulletins. Noting that newsletters were sent to several churches, Ms. Neuhaus invited SAC members to take additional flyers for distribution and asked them to inform the team of other churches and organizations that should be contacted. Ms. Neuhaus also agreed to follow up on Ms. Mihelic’s suggestion that special efforts be made to encourage elected officials representing the project area to attend the Open Houses.

Referring to the subcommittee’s suggestion to display large posters in the community, Ms. Neuhaus reported that the project team ran into difficulty trying to scale the original flyer (8½” by 11”) to poster size (19” by 27”). She added that the production of posters is expensive and would not be cost-effective if smaller storefronts were unable to display them in their windows. Instead, she proposed posting the flyers in store windows as an alternative. SAC members agreed, noting that the flyers are attractive and colorful enough to garner attention.

In a final comment on subcommittee recommendations, Ms. Neuhaus announced that crudités, cheese, crackers, cookies and beverages will be served at the Open Houses.

Other Business

Discussion at the Open House subcommittee meeting included several issues in addition to the upcoming public forums. Principal among them was strong support for educating local students and scouts about the cultural history of the bridge through events such as a model bridge building project. It was noted that this activity would facilitate passing knowledge of the bridge’s rich history down to the next generation of potential engineers and would provide recognition to participating students by displaying their model bridges at public meetings and in community facilities. While the project team agreed to pursue the subcommittee’s suggestion, it decided that this activity might be more appropriate as the project approaches the design stage. This would also give the project team and SAC more time to plan a large-scale event with maximum media coverage and community participation.

Commenting on the bridge building project, Mr. Arcuri suggested contacting the Architecture, Construction and Engineering (ACE) Mentor Program, which sponsors model
bridge building programs for students. Mr. Bennett noted that several of his colleagues are currently involved with this program, and confirmed that ACE previously sponsored a bridge building contest during Engineers Week.

- Ms. Neuhaus informed the SAC that during preparation of the newsletter, the project team contacted Thomas Pniewski, Director of Cultural Affairs at the Kosciuszko Foundation, a philanthropic organization dedicated to the preservation of Thaddeus Kosciusko’s legacy as well as Polish history and culture. She noted that Mr. Pniewski expressed interest in learning more about the Kosciuszko Bridge Project and was invited to the Open Houses. The project team hopes that the Kosciuszko Foundation will become more involved in the future, particularly with community events such as the student bridge building project.

- Ms. Mihelic requested that SAC members receive a calendar of all meeting dates for next year to assist them in avoiding schedule conflicts. The project team agreed that this was a good idea, noting that, in most cases, SAC meetings are held on the third Thursday of the month.

The next SAC meeting is scheduled for **Thursday, November 18th at 6:30 P.M. at Jennings Hall, 260 Powers Street, Brooklyn.** Although several SAC members noted that they are unable to attend the meeting on this date, the project team could not identify another appropriate date, due to November holidays and other scheduling conflicts.

**Follow-Up Items**

1. **Provide Mr. Rossmy with information regarding the criteria for analyzing air quality as it relates to traffic diversion (Michael Rossmy).** Responsibility: Parsons

2. **Consider adding the following community facilities, recommended by the SAC, to the community facilities map: 108th Precinct (5-47 50th Avenue, Long Island City); New York Fire Department (FDNY) EMS Service Facility (58th Street south of Laurel Hill Boulevard); FDNY Engine 259/Ladder 128 Station (33-51 Greenpoint Avenue); Brooklyn Public Library-Greenpoint Branch (107 Norman Avenue); Salvation Army Veterans Shelter (Queens). Additional SAC recommendations will be accepted until October 15th.** Responsibility: Parsons and SAC

3. **Consider contacting ACE (Architecture, Construction and Engineering) Mentor Program, specifically regarding its model bridge building contest for students (Vincent Arcuri).** Responsibility: Parsons

4. **Provide SAC with a schedule of Kosciuszko Bridge meetings for the 2005 calendar year (Barbara Mihelic).** Responsibility: HNA

5. **Provide information regarding the Open Houses to local churches for inclusion in weekly bulletins (Barbara Mihelic).** Responsibility: HNA and SAC

6. **Encourage elected officials to attend October Open Houses through special outreach (Barbara Mihelic).** Responsibility: HNA
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PRELIMINARY LIST OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES

The purpose of this memo is to present to the Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC) a preliminary list of community facilities that will be considered in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).

Community facilities are analyzed in the DEIS because they provide services or amenities to the community that enhance the quality of life of residents. Major projects, such as this one, have the potential to affect these facilities and therefore diminish the quality of life for some segment of the community. There are three primary ways in which a community facility could be negatively impacted:

- Physical impacts – the project physically acquires or otherwise affects the facility directly. This can also include environmental impacts, such as air pollution or noise.
- Accessibility changes – the project interferes with the ability of people to access the facility, such as cutting off pedestrian access, closing streets, or reducing parking.
- Change in population – the project encourages a growth in population, thereby increasing the number of people served by a facility. The Kosciuszko Bridge Project is not expected to cause any changes in population and therefore would not affect facilities in this way.

The types of community facilities included in the DEIS will include:

- Parks/playgrounds
- Community Centers
- Schools (Public and Private)
- Police Stations
- Fire Stations
- Libraries
- Hospitals/Health Care Facilities
- Places of Worship
- US Post Offices
- Daycare Centers
- Public Housing
- Senior Centers

Facilities such as private clubs, doctors’ offices and government facilities with no walk-in public service function (e.g. government office buildings) are not considered as community facilities in the DEIS.

Impacts will be analyzed for community facilities in the entire traffic study area. However, the project will focus on the facilities shown in the attached map, where impacts related to the alternatives are most likely to occur. If it is determined that the project has an impact outside the
immediate area (such as significantly affecting traffic patterns), the impact that this would have on any community facilities will be analyzed.

The attached map and table show community facilities identified in an area roughly bounded by McGuiness Boulevard, Grand Avenue, 58th Street, 50th Avenue, and Greenpoint Avenue. Because they are particularly sensitive to changes in traffic patterns, we will be giving special attention to how emergency services might be affected by the project. Also attached is a second map and table showing emergency service facilities (police, fire, and hospitals) located within the Primary Traffic Study Area.

We would appreciate the help of the SAC in ensuring that all community facilities are considered. Please review the maps and tables and provide any comments to the Project Team by October 15, 2004.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>FACILITY NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CALVARY CEMETARY VETERANS PARK</td>
<td>First Calvary, Greenpoint Ave, Gale St.</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NEW CALVARY CEMETARY</td>
<td>55th Ave, 58th St, Queens Blvd, 49th St</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ST. NICHOLAS NEIGHBORHOOD PRESERVATION CORP</td>
<td>11-29 Catherine St.</td>
<td>Community Resource Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>AHRC@FRANCIS OF PAOLA</td>
<td>206 Skillman Ave</td>
<td>Daycare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ENGINE 206</td>
<td>1201 Grand St</td>
<td>Fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ENGINE 238 LADDER 106</td>
<td>205 Greenpoint Ave</td>
<td>Fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>BROOKLYN PSYCH WILLIAMSBURG-GREENPOINT MH CLINIC</td>
<td>819 Grand St</td>
<td>Health Care Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>COOPER GORE</td>
<td>Metropolitan &amp; Orient Aves</td>
<td>Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>COOPER HOUSES PLGD</td>
<td>Frost St, Kingsland &amp; Morgan Aves</td>
<td>Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>COOPER PARK</td>
<td>Sharon, Olive Sts, Maspeth &amp; Morgan Aves</td>
<td>Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>FIDELITY MEMORIAL PARK</td>
<td>Meeker, Engert Aves, Monitor St</td>
<td>Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>GREENSTREET</td>
<td>Bayard St, McGuiness Blvd, Meeker Ave</td>
<td>Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>GREENSTREET</td>
<td>Greenpoint Ave, Review Ave</td>
<td>Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>GREENSTREET</td>
<td>Hunters Point Ave, LIE Service Rd, 37th St</td>
<td>Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>GREENSTREET</td>
<td>54th Ave, 54th Rd, 48th St</td>
<td>Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>KEYSSPAN/GREENPOINT LITTLE LEAGUE PARK</td>
<td>Vandervoort Ave, Division Pl, Richardson St</td>
<td>Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>MEMORIAL GORE</td>
<td>Bushwick, Maspeth, Metropolitan Aves</td>
<td>Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>MONSIGNOR MCGOLRICK PARK</td>
<td>Driggs to Nassau Aves, Russell to Monitor Sts</td>
<td>Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>SGT WILLIAM DOUGHERTY PARK</td>
<td>Anthony St, Vandervoort Ave, Cherry St</td>
<td>Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ST NICHOLAS-POWERS ST GARDEN</td>
<td>Powers St, Between Judge St &amp; Olive St</td>
<td>Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>BKNYN NORTH NARCO/ESU</td>
<td>43 Herbert St</td>
<td>Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>FIRST POLISH BAPTIST CHURCH</td>
<td>55 Sutton Street</td>
<td>Religious Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>LUTHERAN CHURCH OF THE MESSIAH</td>
<td>129 Russell Street</td>
<td>Religious Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>SHIA ITIHA-ASHERI JAMAAT OF NY</td>
<td>48-87 58th Street</td>
<td>Religious Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>ST CECILIA’S ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH</td>
<td>84 Herbert Street</td>
<td>Religious Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>ST FRANCIS OF PAOLA ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH</td>
<td>206 Skillman Ave</td>
<td>Religious Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>ST RAPHAEL'S R C CHUR C</td>
<td>3520 Greenpoint Ave</td>
<td>Religious Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>ST SAVIOR PROT EPIS CHURCH</td>
<td>5740 57th Road</td>
<td>Religious Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>ST STANISLAUS KOSTKA</td>
<td>189 Driggs Avenue</td>
<td>Religious Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>ST. TERESA'S ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH</td>
<td>5001 44th Street</td>
<td>Religious Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>THE CHURCH OF CHRIST AT GREENPOINT</td>
<td>199 North Henry Street</td>
<td>Religious Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>P.S. 34 OLIVER H. PERRY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL</td>
<td>131 Norman Ave</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>P.S. 110 MONITOR SCHOOL</td>
<td>124 Monitor St</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>ST CECILIA’S ELEMENTARY SCHOOL</td>
<td>1-15 Monitor St</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>ST NICHOLAS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL</td>
<td>287 Powers St</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>ST STANISLAUS KOSTKA SCHOOL</td>
<td>12 Newel St</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>ST. FRANCIS OF PAOLA SCHOOL</td>
<td>201 Conselyea St</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>BARBARA KLEIMAN RESIDENCE</td>
<td>300 Skillman Ave</td>
<td>Supervised Residential Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>BROOKLYN DDSO</td>
<td>105-107 Kingsland Ave</td>
<td>Supervised Residential Facility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Emergency Services within Primary Traffic Study Area
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Emergency Services within the Primary Traffic Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ENGINE 221 LADDER 104</td>
<td>161 South 2nd St</td>
<td>NYC Fire House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ENGINE 238 LADDER 106</td>
<td>205 Greenpoint Ave</td>
<td>NYC Fire House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ENGINE 229 LADDER 146</td>
<td>75 Richardson St</td>
<td>NYC Fire House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ENGINE 206</td>
<td>1201 Grand St</td>
<td>NYC Fire House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ENGINE 288 HAZARDOUS MATERIAL 1</td>
<td>56-29 68th St</td>
<td>NYC Fire House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>94TH PRECINCT</td>
<td>100 Meserole Ave</td>
<td>NYC Police Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>BKLYN NORTH NARCO/ESU</td>
<td>43 Herbert St</td>
<td>Other NYPD Facility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: No hospitals are located within the Primary Traffic Study Area.
Minutes

The 20th meeting of the New York State Department of Transportation’s (NYSDOT) Kosciuszko Bridge Project Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC) was held on Thursday, November 18, 2004 at Jennings Hall, Brooklyn. (See Attachment A for Attendance List.) The meeting was scheduled to provide a recap of the Open Houses, an introduction to bridge types and potential construction-related impacts, and an overview of the Visual Resource Assessment (VRA) portion of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

Helen Neuhaus, Helen Neuhaus & Associates (HNA), opened the meeting by introducing Madeline Donach, a Greenpoint resident who will serve as the SAC alternate for Mary Gottlieb, Meeker Avenue/Apollo Street Association. Ms. Donach had contacted NYSDOT following the Brooklyn Open House, and accepted the Department’s offer to meet at her home to discuss concerns about the project. The meeting was held on November 12th and included members of the project team, Ms. Donach and her husband, and several of their neighbors.

Ms. Neuhaus then asked for comments on the Minutes of the September 22, 2004 meeting. There were no comments, and the Minutes were adopted unanimously. Referring to a follow-up item from that meeting, she noted that a 2005 calendar of SAC meetings was available at the sign-in desk. (See Attachment B.)

Recap of Open Houses

Ms. Neuhaus opened the discussion on the Queens and Brooklyn Open Houses by thanking Tony Nunziato, Maspeth Chamber of Commerce; Barbara Mihelic, Noble Street Block Association; and Anthony Parra, East Williamsburg Valley Industrial Development Corporation, for speaking at the meetings.

She remarked that both events were highly successful and achieved the primary goal of bringing new people into the process. Approximately 70 people attended the meeting in Queens, and 100 attended the meeting in Brooklyn, marking the highest attendance ever for Kosciuszko Bridge Project Open Houses. Ms. Neuhaus credited the unprecedented turnout to the SAC and its Open House subcommittee, which played a large role in publicizing the meetings. She noted that the distribution of flyers announcing the Open Houses was particularly effective. Ms. Neuhaus added that the events garnered significant media coverage for the project, including a feature on NBC’s local news. The Open Houses also resulted in four project briefings with commercial and residential property owners, including the previously mentioned meeting with Mr. and Ms. Donach and their neighbors.

Ms. Neuhaus then asked for the SAC’s impressions. Christine Holowacz, Greenpoint Property Owners, concurred that there were many newcomers at the Brooklyn Open House, particularly from the Greenpoint area. She noted that the meeting location was a factor in drawing these residents due to its proximity to the area of impact. Joe Ruzalski, United Forties Civic Association, remarked that the Queens meeting was run in a very orderly fashion. Laura Hofmann, Greenpoint Waterfront Association for Parks and Planning/Barge Park Pals,
commented that the meetings were beneficial as the community is rarely given the chance to speak so openly with agencies and consultants. Ms. Donach added that she was pleasantly surprised at the project team’s willingness to meet with her and her neighbors.

Following the discussion, the NBC news story about the project was shown. Ms. Neuhaus noted that copies (in either DVD or VHS format) would be available for any interested SAC member.

Bridge Types and Construction Impacts
Using a PowerPoint presentation, and referring to the Bridge Primer handout, Steve Bennett, Parsons, provided an introduction to bridge types and terms. He began by noting that all of the build alternatives, including the rehabilitation options, involve construction of a new bridge. Therefore, the EIS will include detailed information regarding possible bridge design, construction methods and operations. Mr. Bennett then explained the following basic bridge terms:

- The superstructure is the part of the bridge that supports and carries the roadway. It is supported by the substructure, which consists of the vertical elements (i.e. the piers) and the foundation. The Kosciuszko Bridge is a truss bridge, consisting of an assembly of triangles made up of straight steel bars. The through truss is the section of the bridge that crosses Newtown Creek; the name refers to the fact that vehicles travel through the truss. A deck truss (used for the Kosciuszko Bridge’s approach spans leading up to the creek) supports the roadway from underneath.
- The main, or channel, span carries traffic over Newtown Creek. The approach spans are the sections of the bridge on either side of the main span.
- The “Brooklyn Connector” is a low-level, concrete, enclosed viaduct just south of the Brooklyn approach span.

After discussing the basic considerations for selecting a bridge type (span length, constructability, cost, aesthetics, construction duration and community impacts), Mr. Bennett described the following bridge types:

- The Beam Bridge, a simple, very common type of bridge, is economical for spans of 200-600 feet. Because the Kosciuszko Bridge’s main span is approximately 300 feet long, a Beam Bridge would be appropriate for this setting. A local example of this bridge type is the approach to the Williamsburg Bridge.
- The Truss Bridge, although not the most economical, would be an appropriate choice to replace or supplement the Kosciuszko Bridge. In addition to the Kosciuszko Bridge, the Queensboro Bridge is another local example of a Truss Bridge.
- The Concrete Segmental Bridge is built by joining concrete segments with tension rods. It is cost-efficient for spans of 200-600 feet and would therefore be appropriate for this project. The JFK AirTrain viaduct is a local example of this bridge type.
- The Extradosed Bridge uses a combination of Cable-Stayed and Segmental elements. Economical for spans of 300-900 feet, the Extradosed Bridge would be possible at this site. While there are no local examples of this bridge type, it was noted that one is currently being constructed in Connecticut.
- The other bridge types that were described—Arch, Cable-Stayed and Suspension—are not appropriate for the Kosciuszko Bridge Project for various reasons that relate to the specific context of the bridge site (i.e. span length, alignment, etc.).
Mr. Bennett noted that traffic will be maintained during construction through the use of temporary bridges and ramps. One commonly used type of temporary bridge is the Bailey Bridge, which is a prefabricated structure developed during World War II. Although the Bailey Bridge would be economical in certain situations (i.e. BR-2), it would not work in the area of the Brooklyn Connector. A custom-made structure would be required at that location.

Mr. Bennett observed that nighttime construction, while appropriate in industrial areas, would be objectionable in residential areas. He noted that much of the noise associated with construction comes from pile driving, which he described as a giant hammer pounding piles into the ground. However, pile driving is increasingly being replaced by the drill shaft method, which keeps the noise more localized. Drilled shafts are constructed by drilling a hole in the ground, inserting a steel shaft, and then filling it with concrete.

Mr. Bennett remarked that when the existing bridge was constructed, deep piles were required near Newtown Creek because of soft soil. Further away from the creek (nearer the residences), the ground is firmer and piles were not required. Speculating that soil conditions have not changed, he noted that pile driving near the creek would still produce noise that would be heard in the residential neighborhoods. Therefore, the drilled shaft method will be considered in order to minimize noise impacts on the surrounding residential community.

Referring to a photograph of cranes lifting large beams into place, Mr. Bennett indicated that this construction technique might be problematic for the Kosciuszko Bridge Project given the density of the neighborhood surrounding the bridge. He suggested that using a “gantry” to construct the bridge from above might be a promising technique. The impacts of both methods, particularly on nearby businesses, will be examined in detail in the Draft EIS (DEIS). The transportation of materials will also be considered. Mr. Bennett specifically noted that there are environmental advantages to bringing in materials by barge.

Lastly, Mr. Bennett emphasized that an important element of reducing construction impacts is constant communication with stakeholders. The project team will continue to work with the SAC throughout final design and construction. This will include continuous dialogue with the community and the presence of an on-site office.

Questions and comments raised during Mr. Bennett’s presentation are summarized below:

- Referring to the enclosure around the Brooklyn Connector, Ms. Gottlieb expressed her opposition to removing the walls. After stating that the brick is more aesthetically pleasing than the view of the underpass, she also noted that it muffles sound from the highway. Ms. Gottlieb added that there is also a problem with homeless encampments under the viaduct in areas that are open and accessible. Stating that no plans have been finalized, Mr. Bennett commented that the need for public parking under the viaduct must be balanced against consideration for residents of the immediate area.

- In response to Ms. Hofmann’s question regarding alternative methods for reducing noise, Mr. Bennett replied that sound is generally reduced by blocking or absorbing it; this almost always involves a wall. In the case of the Brooklyn Connector, the enclosed room under the viaduct muffles the sound.

- Ed Michaleski, Oak Street Block Association, asked if the area under the approach spans would be enclosed in the final build condition. Mr. Bennett indicated that the Brooklyn Connector would likely remain enclosed, as it is now, and the area under the approach
spans, from Varick Street to the creek, would remain open. Mr. Michaleski noted that he is aware of complaints from residents of Meeker Avenue, Vandervoort Avenue and Sutton Street regarding dumping under the bridge. Dorothy Swick, Newtown Creek Monitoring Committee, noted that this area—between Kingsland and Morgan Avenues—is also the staging area for a current NYSDOT project to install Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) signage on the BQE. In response to Ms. Gottlieb’s comment that the ITS project team is not responsive to the community, Mr. Adams stated that he would identify the project manager on that job.

- Ms. Gottlieb recommended that trees be planted under the bridge at Stewart and Gardner Avenues in order to absorb carbon monoxide and beautify the area. In response to follow-up questions from Ms. Holowacz and Dolores Rizzotto, Queens Community Board #2, regarding ownership of this property, Mr. Adams replied that the State owns all of the land directly under the viaduct.

- Ms. Donach suggested that NYSDOT consider relocating the Meeker Avenue exit ramp one block north to an area that is more industrial and less residential. Stating that this will be examined in the DEIS, Mr. Adams added that the new bridge alternatives will allow greater flexibility for considering new ramp locations.

- In response to a question from Ms. Gottlieb regarding the length of the Kosciuszko Bridge’s main and approach spans, Mr. Bennett stated that the main span is 300 feet. The main span of any new bridge would likely be approximately 400 feet in order to place the piers on land (rather than in the creek). Currently, the length of the approach spans on either side of the main span is 230 feet; the spans become shorter (160 feet) as they move away from the main span. In response to another question, Mr. Bennett clarified that the span lengths of the different bridge types in the Primer refer to the main span.

- In response to a question from Mr. Ruzalski regarding Concrete Segmental bridges, Mr. Bennett indicated that this type of bridge is very durable if built correctly. He added that the minimum design life (the amount of time before major rehabilitation is required) of any bridge constructed in New York City is 50 years. However, bridges with heavy traffic, such as the Kosciuszko, would be built with a minimum design life of 75 years.

- During a discussion of the pile driving versus drilled shaft methods of construction, the following comments and questions were raised:
  - In response to questions from Ms. Gottlieb, Mr. Bennett and Mr. Adams explained that the drilled shaft method uses a large drill (approximately 8 feet in diameter) to create a shaft. Each shaft would take three to four days to drill; two shafts would probably be needed for each pier. Test borings of the soil and bedrock would be taken before any work begins.
  - In response to a question from Ms. Donach, Mr. Bennett stated that the drilled shaft method would not affect the foundations of nearby homes.
  - Ms. Holowacz and Ms. Gottlieb observed that pile driving for a project on Greenpoint Avenue resulted in noise that was audible for several blocks. In response to Mr. Ruzalski’s comment that the noise resulted from the pile drivers hitting granite, Ms. Holowacz noted that much of Greenpoint lies on bedrock, causing sound and vibrations to travel great distances.
  - Ms. Rizzotto remarked that, in order to reduce noise on a reconstruction project in Woodside, a special “quiet” pile driver was used. Following Ms. Gottlieb’s request to investigate this type of equipment, Mr. Bennett agreed to do so, but cautioned that it is not very strong and does not work well in difficult soil conditions. He added that its use is probably not feasible for major construction projects and could increase the duration of
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the project. Ms. Gottlieb noted that she would not mind a longer construction period if her home was protected from vibrations. Mr. Adams responded that all of these issues will be studied in the DEIS.

- In response to a question from Ms. Gottlieb, Mr. Bennett indicated that the shafts for a new bridge would be approximately five feet in diameter.

- Observing that Newtown Creek is shallow and would require dredging for the transport of materials, Ms. Holowacz asked if dredging is a practical option given the level of contamination in the sediment. Mr. Bennett acknowledged that the dredge spoils would need to be taken to a secure landfill, which would be costly. He added that all of the environmental impacts would be assessed in the DEIS.

- As a follow-up question, Ms. Holowacz asked about the process for weighing the costs and benefits of various construction methods. Mr. Bennett explained that cost-benefit analyses will be conducted by using established economic standards to assign a price to each factor (i.e. energy use, pollution, traffic delays, etc.). He assured the SAC that they will be involved in this process.

- In response to a question from Ms. Holowacz, Mr. Bennett and Mr. Adams stated that air quality monitoring will be performed during construction.

Visual Resource Assessment (VRA)

Using a PowerPoint presentation, Pat Monte, Vollmer Associates, explained that a VRA involves documentation of the existing visual environment and evaluation of how it will be affected by each alternative. The process begins with a review of the existing environment, including its visual districts, viewer groups, and the views themselves. This is followed by “before and after” photo simulations to analyze the visual impacts of each alternative, which are measured by viewer responses to the changes. If there are any negative visual impacts, mitigation plans must be proposed.

Referring to a map, Mr. Monte pointed out that visual districts for the Kosciuszko Bridge Project include: Calvary Cemetery; the Newtown Creek industrial area; the Newtown Creek waterway; nearby commercial and residential areas in Brooklyn and Queens; and roadways, including the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway (BQE), Long Island Expressway (LIE) and local streets.

Mr. Monte listed motorists, local residents, pedestrians, bicyclists and workers as possible viewer groups, and explained that each group experiences different levels of sensitivity. For example, motorists are the least sensitive because they view their surroundings only momentarily. Residents and pedestrians are more sensitive as they have the opportunity to observe their surroundings for longer periods of time.

Photos of existing views to and from the visual districts were shown to illustrate some of the visual resources that will be reviewed and documented in the VRA. Mr. Bennett and Mr. Adams noted that these photos will also be used to develop simulations of the “after” views under each alternative. Mr. Monte invited the SAC to recommend additional locations for views by marking them on a map of the project area.

After recording the existing visual conditions, the project team will evaluate the changes in visual environment caused by each alternative. The visual impacts of each alternative, to be judged as positive or negative, will be analyzed from the perspective of each visual district and viewer group, and in the context of each view. Should the analysis show any negative impacts,
the alternative can be modified or the impacts mitigated. In addition, amenities may be incorporated, such as architectural treatments or special lighting on the bridge, or at-grade enhancements to sidewalks, sitting areas, street intersections, crosswalks, spaces under the viaduct and parking areas.

For the Kosciuszko Bridge Project, the community has already suggested several on-structure and at-grade amenities. These include a bicycle/pedestrian path on the bridge, street trees planted along detour routes during construction, the improvement of Sergeant Dougherty Park, and increased access to the Newtown Creek waterfront.

A summary of the issues raised during the discussion is provided below:

- The project team agreed to Ms. Hofmann’s request that boaters be added to the list of viewer groups. She also asked that photos taken from Newtown Creek be added to the VRA; the project team noted that one photo has been included.
- Several SAC members suggested the documentation of additional locations. Ms. Rizzotto mentioned the view facing south on 43rd Street toward Laurel Hill Boulevard, as well as the view facing northwest from the south corner of 48th Street and 53rd Avenue. Ms. Hofmann recommended the view from Review Avenue near the Phelps Dodge site; the project team noted that this has already been included. Ms. Gottlieb suggested views from Meeker and Morgan Avenues, as well as smaller side streets such as Hausman and Sutton Streets.
- During the discussion of at-grade amenities, several SAC members commented about the current situation regarding the space under the viaduct. Ms. Holowacz stated that the existing parking area should not be reduced as it is needed for patrons of nearby restaurants. Ms. Gottlieb agreed, but reiterated that the areas under the viaduct that are currently enclosed should remain so in order to prevent homeless encampments, maintain a visual barrier and help muffle sound from the highway.
- Ms. Hofmann mentioned that the Pratt Institute Center for Community and Environmental Development (PICCED) has conducted studies on Newtown Creek’s public access and water quality. She offered to forward PICCED’s contact information to the project team.
- Ms. Gottlieb suggested that Alternative BR-5 might consider moving Sergeant Dougherty Park from its current location to a new location in the vicinity of the Meeker Avenue exit. She requested that the project team include this idea in one of the photo simulations for the VRA.

Other Business

- Ms. Gottlieb inquired about the project team’s recent meeting with members of the Queens family whose homes would likely be taken under Alternative BR-5. The project team remarked that the meeting went well. They discussed the timeline of when the homes might be taken, and brought in a real estate specialist from NYSDOT to explain the family’s options. Mr. Adams noted that the project team has been in contact with the family several times over the past few months. In response to follow-up questions from the SAC, Mr. Adams and Denise Woodin, HNA, noted that the family, while concerned about the possible loss of their homes, understands the need for the project and is appreciative of the early notice.
- In response to an inquiry from Ms. Holowacz regarding the coordination of the Kosciuszko Bridge Project with sewer system issues in Greenpoint, Mr. Adams replied that the project team has had an initial meeting with representatives of the New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP). Unfortunately, progress is moving slowly because a
new sewer system is not in the City’s budget at this time. It was noted that Brooklyn CB #1 sent a letter to former NYCDEP Commissioner Christopher Ward several months ago regarding this issue. Ms. Gottlieb requested a copy of the letter, which Ms. Neuhaus agreed to provide. She also indicated that another meeting would be scheduled with NYCDEP.

- Mr. Ruzalski asked if NYCDEP representatives would inspect the areas under and around the bridge before construction, due to its proximity to the contaminated Phelps Dodge site. Ms. Neuhaus noted that a Contaminated Materials Assessment, which will cover such issues as hazardous spills and vapors, will be included in the DEIS. Ms. Holowacz added that rodent control should be addressed as well.

- Mr. Parra reported that in early October, EWVIDCO’s executive committee met to discuss the organization’s position regarding the alternatives being studied in the DEIS. While a preference was not expressed, the committee did have some comments to share with the project team and SAC. He noted that one committee member suggested the installation of a “zipper lane” in the middle of the bridge that could switch direction as needed to alleviate rush hour traffic. Additionally, EWVIDCO’s executive committee stressed the importance of being attentive to the needs of Acme Steel, whose loading dock will likely be relocated under every Build alternative. Mr. Adams acknowledged these comments and promised that the project team would look into them. Ms. Gottlieb reiterated the importance of collaborating with Acme Steel as many local residents work there.

- Ms. Holowacz asked if the project team has any plans to meet with representatives of Waste Management, which is located under the bridge in Brooklyn. Noting that Martha Holstein, Strategic Urban Solutions, represents Waste Management as a client, Mr. Adams stated that he has spoken with her about arranging a meeting. Mr. Parra indicated that EWVIDCO has made repeated unsuccessful attempts to contact Waste Management. Ms. Holowacz and Ms. Hofmann agreed to help the project team arrange a meeting with this business.

- Commenting that the November 12th neighborhood meeting at Ms. Donach’s residence was very productive, Ms. Gottlieb proposed hosting a meeting in January for residents of Apollo Street and Meeker Avenue. Ms. Neuhaus agreed to follow up with Ms. Gottlieb to arrange such a meeting.

- Mr. Ruzalski asked if a new project update would be distributed soon. Ms. Neuhaus noted that newsletters will be produced at important project milestones. Because the current stage of the project involves mostly data collection, a newsletter will not be distributed until that data is analyzed.

- Ms. Neuhaus thanked Ms. Gottlieb and the Tiniski family for allowing the project team to place noise monitors on their property.

- Ms. Rizzotto asked if the project team has been in touch with Philip Galasso, Sagres Partners, LLC. Ms. Neuhaus commented that he contacted her before the Open Houses, and requested newsletters for distribution. It was also noted that Mr. Galasso is a member of the SAC and has attended previous meetings.

Since the next SAC meeting is scheduled for the week before Christmas, Ms. Neuhaus suggested that the December meeting be cancelled. There were no objections.

The next SAC meeting will be held on **Thursday, January 20, 2005 at 6:30 P.M. at Jennings Hall, 260 Powers Street, Brooklyn.**
Follow-Up Items

1. Provide VHS and/or DVD copies of the NBC Kosciuszko news clip to SAC members who requested them. Responsibility: Parsons, HNA.

2. Obtain and share information on quieter pile-driving technology with the SAC (Ms. Gottlieb). Responsibility: Parsons.

3. Provide Ms. Gottlieb with a copy of the letter from Community Board #1 to former NYCDEP Commissioner Christopher Ward regarding the coordination of sewer system issues with the Kosciuszko Bridge project. Responsibility: HNA.

4. Coordinate with Ms. Gottlieb to arrange for a project meeting in January with residents from Apollo Street and Meeker Avenue. Responsibility: HNA.

5. Schedule meeting with Waste Management. Responsibility: NYSDOT, Parsons, HNA.

6. Obtain PICCED contact information from Ms. Hofmann. Responsibility: HNA.

7. Identify NYSDOT project manager for the ITS project on the BQE. Responsibility: NYSDOT.
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Helen Neuhaus & Associates Inc.

RE: Stakeholders Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes – January 20, 2005/Upcoming Meetings

Attached, please find draft Minutes of the January 20th Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC) meeting, along with the attendance list.

At the January meeting, several persons requested more detailed data to enable them to provide informed input on traffic and transportation design issues. While we had hoped that the studies being conducted to generate this data would be completed by the March meeting, it appears that we were overly optimistic in this goal. Therefore, we are canceling the March 17th SAC meeting with the expectation that we will be able to bring the data to the table this spring.

As you know, the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is an extremely detailed document that involves extensive data collection and analysis. Inevitably, this time-consuming process has many variables, resulting in slow periods alternating with more active periods. Although the project team is working on a broad range of technical studies, none of them are at a point where they would generate meaningful discussion. Among the activities currently underway:

- traffic modeling for major roadways in the project area, along with additional data collection for local streets in the vicinity of Cherry Street, Vandervoort Avenue and Lombardy Street
- assessment of noise, air quality, hazardous materials, cultural and historic resources and water quality
- evaluation of property and economic impacts, including continued outreach to local businesses in both Brooklyn and Queens
- initiation of the Section 4(f) application process, which relates to the acquisition of parkland.
Please be assured that the SAC will be asked to review and comment on all aspects of the DEIS well before its publication. Since there are likely to be times when a substantial amount of data becomes available, there may be a need for the SAC to meet more frequently, or to form subcommittees later in the process. We look forward to lively, detailed discussions at that time.

We will, of course, keep you posted on plans for the next meeting. In the meantime, if you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact Bob Adams (718-482-4683 or kosciuszko@dot.state.ny.us) or me (212-532-4175 or helen@hna1977.com).
The 21st meeting of the New York State Department of Transportation’s (NYSDOT) Kosciuszko Bridge Project Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC) was held on Thursday, January 20, 2005 at Jennings Hall, Brooklyn. (See Attachment A for Attendance List.) The meeting was scheduled to discuss drainage concerns in the area of the bridge as well as transportation design issues.

Helen Neuhaus, Helen Neuhaus & Associates (HNA), opened the meeting by welcoming Doug Greeley, Deputy Commissioner, Bureau of Water and Sewer Operations, New York City Department of Environmental Protection (DEP). She also congratulated Mary Gottlieb, Meeker Avenue/Apollo Street Association, for her recent graduation from Columbia Law School and introduced Matthew Shockley, a new HNA intern. Lastly, Ms. Neuhaus noted that a feature article on the Kosciuszko Bridge Project ran in today’s issue of Newsday (Queens edition), and copies of the article were available at the sign-in table.

Ms. Neuhaus then asked for comments on the Minutes of the November 18, 2004 meeting. There were no comments, and the Minutes were adopted unanimously. Referencing open items from the November meeting, she facilitated a discussion of the following:

- Noting that copies of the NBC news clip on the Kosciuszko Bridge were provided to SAC members who requested them, Ms. Neuhaus asked if anyone else would like a copy.
- Michael Rossmy, Brooklyn Borough President’s Office, and Vincent Arcuri, Queens Community Board (CB) #5, each requested one.

- Ms. Neuhaus announced that a project team meeting with residents from Apollo Street and Meeker Avenue is scheduled for January 24th at 7 p.m. at Ms. Gottlieb’s home.1 Ms. Gottlieb indicated that approximately 20 people are expected to attend.

- In response to Ms. Gottlieb’s request for contact information for NYSDOT’s Intelligent Transportation Systems project on the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway (BQE), a list of names and telephone numbers was provided.

- Robert Adams, NYSDOT, reported that the project team met with Tara Hemmer, Waste Management, on December 7th. In response to a question from Joseph Ruzalski, United Forties Civic Association (UFCA), Mr. Adams noted that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss possible impacts to the business in light of its proximity to the bridge. He added that the project team plans to schedule a follow-up meeting with Ms. Hemmer and representatives from the New York City Department of Sanitation (DSNY).

Madeline Donach, Meeker Avenue/Apollo Street Association, asked if there are plans to relocate Waste Management’s facility. Steve Bennett, Parsons, noted that DSNY is considering several sites for marine transfer stations, including Waste Management’s

---

1 This meeting was later moved to February 2nd due to inclement weather.
Greenpoint facility. If the Waste Management site is not selected, the company will continue its recycling program at that location.

- As a follow-up item from the October 27th Open House in Brooklyn, NYSDOT sent letters to over 1700 Greenpoint residents to inform them about the project and ask if they wish to be placed on the project mailing list. A discussion regarding outreach and the community’s level of awareness and perspectives on the project followed.

- Following up on a request from Ms. Gottlieb, Mr. Bennett gave a detailed explanation of silent pile-driving technology. He remarked that although this method could be used for some components of the project (i.e. excavation around the drilled shafts), it is not appropriate for construction of a new foundation or other structural elements. The drilled shaft method, which uses a large rotary drill that is 6 feet in diameter, is appropriate for the structural work and quieter than conventional pile driving.

**Drainage Issues**

Mr. Adams stated that there will be two discussions on drainage—the first concerning runoff from the Kosciuszko Bridge and the second concerning general sewer issues in neighborhoods adjacent to the bridge. He reiterated the project team’s appreciation for Commissioner Greeley’s attendance.

Mr. Bennett explained that the original bridge included scuppers (openings at roadway level) to channel the surface runoff into an underground drainage system before releasing it to Newtown Creek. When the bridge was widened in the 1970’s, the drainage system was eliminated, and the water now falls directly onto the roadways below. Mr. Bennett noted that new federal regulations require bridges to have proper drainage systems for runoff. He indicated that the old drainage system under the Kosciuszko Bridge will be replaced with one that can handle the additional flow. Furthermore, runoff will undergo primary treatment before its release into Newtown Creek. Mr. Bennett mentioned that, in a previous coordination meeting, DEP representatives indicated that channeling runoff from the bridge to the sewer system is not a viable option.

The following is a summary of issues raised during the discussion:

- In response to a question from Mr. Ruzalski, Mr. Bennett confirmed that the sides of the bridge will have splash guards and catch basins to prevent runoff from falling onto the properties below, particularly Calvary Cemetery.

Commissioner Greeley suggested that the project team consider installing catch basins that are equipped to collect oil and particulate matter, as well as to control the velocity of filtered runoff. These catch basins treat runoff as per the discharge codes specified by state environmental regulations.

- Christine Holowacz, Greenpoint Property Owners/St. Cecilia’s Church, suggested that the primary treatment proposed for the new drainage system would not be adequate to prevent the pollution of Newtown Creek.
In response to an inquiry from Gus Amato, UFCA, Mr. Bennett confirmed that runoff from both the Queens and Brooklyn sides of the bridge will undergo treatment before being discharged into Newtown Creek.

Commissioner Greeley reintroduced himself, noting that his responsibilities include planning, operation and maintenance of the city’s sewer system. Providing a brief history of sewer issues in Greenpoint, he reported that, in the late 1990s, DEP and the New York City Department of Transportation (NYCDOT) were planning a project that included sewer, water main, and highway construction (DEP Project No. PDSK3584) in the Brooklyn industrial area near the bridge. When NYCDOT shelved the project in Fall 2001 due to budget constraints, DEP also suspended activity on the project. After Mr. Adams and Ms. Neuhaus approached Commissioner Greeley regarding Greenpoint’s stormwater drainage problems in Spring 2004, he asked his planning staff to resume work on the storm sewer portion of the project. Following an inspection of the area, he determined that construction of a sanitary sewer system would also be needed.

Commissioner Greeley noted that while the appropriate pipe sizes for a new storm sewer system have been determined, DEP has asked the New York City Department of Design and Construction (DDC) to provide elevation data needed for design. He also remarked that construction of the storm sewer system (which is gravity-fed) would be less complicated than construction of the sanitary system, which will require flows to be pumped to the sewage treatment plant. Commissioner Greeley estimated that the total cost for storm sewer, sanitary sewer and water main construction would be approximately $25 million. Additional costs would be involved for DEP’s design and construction of the new pump station.

Commissioner Greeley commented that thanks to the recent increase in public attention to New York City water issues, business improvement districts have been fairly effective in persuading city officials to address water and sewer problems. Anthony Parra, East Williamsburg Valley Industrial Development Corporation (EWVIDCO), noted that his group has been lobbying on these issues for many years. Commissioner Greeley encouraged this effort, given the lack of storm and sanitary sewers in the area and the neighborhood’s proximity to Newtown Creek.

The following is a summary of issues raised during the discussion:

- Mr. Parra reported that area catch basins have been clogged for some time. He observed that despite previous communication with DEP, the catch basins have not yet been cleaned. Commissioner Greeley explained that catch basins are cleaned on a three-year cycle based on community board districts. He also noted that sewer issues reported to the Non-Emergency New York City Services hotline (311) are usually addressed within two weeks.

- Mr. Arcuri expressed concern that the new catch basins proposed by Commissioner Greeley would be cleaned even less frequently than the existing catch basins due to the additional work required to properly maintain them. Commissioner Greeley acknowledged that DEP would need a budget enhancement to properly maintain the new catch basins.

- Mr. Arcuri asked whether DEP would consider building a large storage tank in the area of the bridge (similar to the combined sewer overflow tank that was built in Flushing) to
prevent overflow at the sewage treatment plant. Commissioner Greeley replied that the combined sanitary and storm sewer system in Queens requires large storage tanks, particularly during rainstorms. By building separate sanitary and storm sewer systems in Brooklyn, street litter will enter the storm sewer and not clog the sanitary system during rainfall. He added that separate systems will help flush Newtown Creek by increasing the flow.

- In response to concerns raised by Ms. Gottlieb, Commissioner Greeley noted that DDC will work with the community to limit construction hours and noise levels. He also remarked that any work taking place in residential areas would probably not occur during nighttime hours.

- After commenting that “there is no finer public official than Commissioner Greeley,” Martha Holstein, Strategic Urban Solutions, asked how long it would take to implement plans for the new sewer system. Commissioner Greeley estimated that the survey and design work would take at least another year, followed by a two-year administrative process which includes project bidding and registration. Construction of the system will take approximately 8 months to a year, although this timeframe could change depending on the status of the new pump station. Commissioner Greeley also noted that although DEP funds are almost fully committed, he will include this project in the ten-year capital plan that he is submitting in September 2005.

In a final comment, Commissioner Greeley mentioned plans to upgrade the sewage treatment plant at Newtown Creek and revitalize the waterfront along 10th Avenue. He expressed hope that local elected officials and community groups will help move these plans forward by advocating for sewer and waterfront improvements.

- Barbara Mihelic, Noble Street Block Association, asked whether the existing sanitary sewer system could handle the additional flow from a new sewer system. Commissioner Greeley confirmed that both the sewage treatment plant and the current sanitary system have capacity for additional flow but added that a sewer trunk main may need to be integrated into the current system.

Following up, Ms. Mihelic expressed concern that additional flow from a new sewer system would increase residential basement flooding resulting from sewer backups during periods of rain. Commissioner Greeley acknowledged that the current configuration of building connections and sewer pipes in the area is a problem and offered to schedule a separate meeting on this topic.

- Ms. Holowacz expressed her appreciation for Commissioner Greeley’s presence at tonight’s meeting.

Highway and Transportation Design Issues

Prior to Mr. Bennett’s presentation, a handout of the design issues to be covered was distributed. Mr. Bennett began by observing that many of the issues covered in the handout involve local
streets, which are under the jurisdiction of NYCDOT. NYSDOT will meet with NYCDOT on January 26th to discuss the ramifications of each design option on local roadways and traffic operations. He also noted that the project team is preparing to collect data on local streets, which will be followed by traffic analysis. (Previous data collection focused on highways in the project area.) Lastly, Mr. Bennett stated that the purpose of tonight’s discussion is to receive SAC input on the design options early in the process.

- **Issue #1: Maintenance of Traffic on Cherry Street**

Four of the five build alternatives—Rehabilitation with Auxiliary Lanes (RA)-5, New Bridge (BR)-2, BR-3 and BR-5—require the permanent use of Cherry Street between Vandervoort Avenue and approximately Stewart Avenue to accommodate a two lane entrance ramp to the highway. There are two general approaches to dealing with this issue: 1) close Cherry Street, and reroute traffic or 2) realign and maintain Cherry Street as a through street by acquiring additional property (including parkland) adjacent to the ramp.

Using PowerPoint slides of aerial photographs, Mr. Bennett showed the impact of each of these options. Maintaining Cherry Street under Alternatives RA-5, BR-2, and BR-3 would require the permanent acquisition of approximately 8,000 square feet of Sergeant Dougherty Park, as well as additional property along Cherry Street. Most of the affected businesses would be acquired regardless of whether Cherry Street is maintained because construction activities will eliminate access to their property. However, maintaining Cherry Street would reduce the amount of land that could be used for other purposes at the end of construction.

Under BR-5, maintaining Cherry Street would likely utilize the same property that would be used for the temporary bridge. During construction, Cherry Street could be maintained underneath the temporary bridge. This would minimize the amount of additional property that would be required during construction but would still require use of parkland and other property that would otherwise be returned to productive use at the end of construction.

Mr. Bennett also showed a slide of the streets likely to be affected by rerouted traffic if Cherry Street is closed. Vehicles traveling eastbound on Meeker Avenue would presumably use either Kingsland Avenue and Lombardy Street or Morgan Avenue and Anthony Street. This could cause traffic problems at several intersections, potentially requiring traffic signals where none exist today.

The following questions and comments were raised regarding Design Issue #1:

- In response to a question from Ms. Mihelic, Mr. Bennett stated that the traffic study for Cherry Street has not yet been conducted. Ms. Mihelic commented that without this information, she does not feel comfortable about providing input regarding street closure.

- Mr. Parra indicated that because of significant truck traffic on Cherry and Lombardy Streets, EWVIDCO is concerned about the impact of closing Cherry Street on access to commercial buildings. Mr. Bennett stated that all of the alternatives except RA-6 would require the relocation of business entrances from Cherry Street. While it might be possible to move the entrances to another side of the building, the project team is assuming that the businesses will want to relocate. In that case, the buildings could be re-used for...
commercial or other purposes following construction. Ms. Mihelic recommended that these properties be used for parkland, especially if the project encroaches on Sergeant Dougherty Park. Ms. Gottlieb added that the park is underutilized and that crossing the street to reach it is dangerous for children. She suggested that a park be constructed on the north side of the highway, closer to the residential area.

Steven Tiniski, Meeker Avenue/Apollo Street Association, reported that Acme Steel will move from its 513 Porter Avenue building to 251 Lombardy Street in the Spring of 2005.

**Issue #2: Design of Westbound Exit/Meeker Avenue/Van Dam Street Intersection under BR-5**

Alternative BR-5 moves the highway approximately 50 feet further from the residences on Meeker Avenue, between Apollo and Van Dam Streets. This realignment shifts the Apollo Street/Meeker Avenue intersection slightly to the south. In order to maintain a connection to both Van Dam Street and eastbound Meeker Avenue, several design approaches are being considered.

Option 1 would generally maintain the configuration that exists today. Vehicles traveling westbound on Meeker Avenue would merge with ramp traffic prior to reaching the Apollo Street intersection. As is the case today, westbound Meeker Avenue traffic wishing to turn left onto Vandervoort Avenue would be required to cross over a lane of ramp traffic, which is frequently queued waiting for the light.

Under Option 2, westbound Meeker Avenue traffic would continue to the intersection, without merging with ramp traffic. To allow these vehicles to turn left onto Vandervoort Avenue without interfering with ramp traffic continuing straight on Meeker Avenue, the traffic signal would be modified to provide a dedicated green light for vehicles from Meeker Avenue.

Option 3 maintains the existing location of the westbound off-ramp (rather than shifting it to the south along with the elevated highway). By doing so, it roughly maintains the location of the Apollo Street/Meeker Avenue intersection. However, with the shift of the Vandervoort/Meeker Avenue intersection to the south, this option would increase the length of Vandervoort Avenue under the viaduct, thereby increasing the number of vehicles that could safely queue while waiting for a signal change. Today, these vehicles frequently back up into the adjacent intersections, blocking cross traffic. A drawback of this option is that by keeping traffic from the ramp and Meeker Avenue close to the residences along Meeker Avenue, it eliminates one of the advantages of BR-5.

The following questions and comments were raised regarding Design Issue #2:

- In response to a question from Ms. Gottlieb, Mr. Bennett stated that driving conditions on the curved deceleration lane just west of the bridge will be somewhat improved once this section is straightened.

- In response to a question from Mr. Bennett, SAC members confirmed that trucks exiting the westbound BQE have difficulty making the U-turn onto Meeker Avenue. Van Dam Street is frequently used as an alternate route, especially late at night. In response to a
question from Mr. Adams, Ms. Donach indicated that she is not aware of any signs prohibiting truck traffic on Van Dam Street.

**Issue #3: Closure of Varick Street/Varick Avenue under the Kosciuszko Bridge**
Varick Street/Varick Avenue is one of three streets that are open to through traffic under the bridge near the Brooklyn ramps. While closing this street would likely result in heavier traffic on some local streets, it would allow for improvements in other areas. There are two scenarios under which NYSDOT might consider closing this underpass because it would no longer provide sufficient clearance:

1) Reducing the grade of the eastbound on-ramp to facilitate the ability of trucks to access the highway and accelerate to highway speed.

2) Modifying the westbound off-ramp (as discussed in Issue #5), so that it starts further east and touches down before Varick Street/Varick Avenue.

The following questions and comments were raised regarding Design Issue #3:

- In response to a question from Mr. Parra, Mr. Bennett confirmed that lowering the ramp would require the closure of Varick Street/Varick Avenue. After noting that NYCDOT was not likely to allow construction of a new roadway with insufficient clearance, Ms. Holowacz observed that closing this street would not make sense in an industrial area with heavy truck traffic.

- Mr. Arcuri stated that closing Varick Street/Varick Avenue would not be feasible if done in conjunction with closing Cherry Street. Mr. Bennett replied that while it would be possible to close both Cherry Street and Varick Street/Varick Avenue under certain scenarios, the combination of these two closings would have a much greater impact on traffic.

- Commenting that she is unable to provide informed input about the closure of streets in industrial areas, Ms. Holowacz recommended that the project team meet with the affected businesses. Mr. Adams concurred, suggesting that such a meeting be coordinated with EWVIDCO.

- Ms. Holowacz noted that over the past year, heavy truck traffic has worsened during after-school hours. She recommended that traffic studies be conducted during this time period. In response, Mr. Parra indicated that the increase in traffic is due to the expansion of businesses in the East Williamsburg Industrial Park. Gerald Esposito, Brooklyn CB #1, suggested that the project team invite Lori Ardito, Borough Commissioner, NYCDOT, to attend a SAC meeting to address traffic enforcement issues.

- Mr. Esposito asked if NYSDOT has met with Mark Buller, Marjam Supply Company, which is in the process of purchasing property that will be directly impacted by the project. Mr. Adams replied that the project team spoke with representatives of Marjam early in the project. In response to Mr. Esposito’s suggestion that NYSDOT renew its relationship with Marjam, Mr. Adams stated that the project team will do so. Mr. Parra added that he is
continuing to reach out to businesses in the vicinity of the bridge to inform them of potential impacts to their properties.

- **Issue #4: Location of Bikeway/Walkway Connections**
  Consistent with NYSDOT policy, requests from the community, and the project’s Goals and Objectives, the project team confirmed that it is considering inclusion of a bikeway/walkway for each build alternative. Because a bikeway/walkway could add 10 to 15 feet to the width of the bridge, it is being considered for only one side of the bridge. Mr. Bennett reported that initial evaluation indicates that a bikeway/walkway is feasible, except on the westbound side under alternatives RA-6 and BR-3. Because these alternatives require permanent construction of a new bridge up to the edge of the cemetery, a bikeway/walkway on the westbound side would extend over the cemetery, an option that is likely to engender significant opposition.

Referencing the New York City Cycling Map, Mr. Bennett noted that the only existing bicycle route within the project limits is an on-street route along Review Avenue/56th Road in Queens. He then showed the general location of the new bikeway/walkway and where it would connect to local streets. In Brooklyn, it would touch down in the same general area as the existing ramps. In Queens, the west side route would touch down near the existing pedestrian bridge and connect to the sidewalk on Laurel Hill Boulevard. The east side route would connect with 53rd Avenue. Mr. Bennett observed that construction of a sidewalk on 53rd Avenue would be required, since no sidewalk currently exists. He added that the project team will coordinate with appropriate city agencies to ensure that the bikeway/walkway connects to local streets at appropriate locations and that it meets all accessibility requirements for persons with disabilities.

The following questions and comments were raised regarding Design Issue #4:

- Theresa Cianciotta, Office of Assemblyman Joseph Lentol, asked about security measures on the bikeway/walkway, specifically the installation of security cameras. Noting that terrorism is a particular concern, she asked if money might be available through the United States Department of Homeland Security. Lastly, she indicated that crime has been a problem on the Williamsburg Bridge bikeway/walkway. Mr. Bennett replied that since security is an enforcement and operational issue, it falls under the jurisdiction of NYCDOT.

- Mr. Bennett commented that the west side route might appeal to more people because it would offer views of Manhattan and connections to places where “people might want to go.” Ms. Gottlieb observed that many years ago, when the Kosciuszko Bridge had a bikeway/walkway on both sides, the west side was more popular because of the Manhattan views. Ms. Holowacz remarked that if the Greenpoint Re-zoning Plan is implemented, the resulting tall buildings will block views of Manhattan.

- **Issue #5: Location and Design of Westbound Exit Ramp at Van Dam Street**
  At a meeting with local residents and at the November 2004 SAC meeting, it was suggested that NYSDOT consider moving the westbound exit ramp that currently connects to Meeker Avenue at Van Dam Street so that it touches down before Varick Street/Varick Avenue. This would allow vehicles (particularly trucks) to access the industrial area without passing homes on Meeker Avenue and Van Dam Street. Initial analysis suggests that the ramp cannot be designed to connect
to Varick Street/Varick Avenue without compromising safety (the slope of the ramp would be too
great). However, the team has begun evaluation of several options that would accomplish the
same objective by connecting the ramp to Meeker Avenue between Van Dam Street and Varick
Street via a T-intersection. Each of these alternatives would require closing Varick Street/Varick
Avenue under the BQE (see Issue #3 above).

As currently envisioned, the general design of the westbound exit ramp for RA-5, RA-6, BR-2,
and BR-3 involves constructing a temporary ramp adjacent to the permanent ramp. This would
require acquisition of several properties between Varick and Van Dam Streets. However, very
little, if any, of this property would be required for the permanent structure.

A possible alternative to the current ramp design provides a second ramp connecting to Meeker
Avenue between Van Dam and Varick Streets. This would allow vehicles accessing the industrial
area to the east to do so without making the ‘almost u-turn’ at the bottom of the ramp (which is
also adjacent to several residences). The second ramp would cross through properties that are
already earmarked for acquisition under these alternatives. However, under BR-5, the second
ramp would require the acquisition of an additional property.

Noting that any new bridge would be lower than the existing one, Ms. Gottlieb asked if the ramp
could be shortened from its current length. Mr. Bennett replied that this design issue presents
several challenges, including the unsafe slope (8%) that would result from moving the ramp back
from its current location.

● Issue #6: Conversion of Vandervoort Avenue and Morgan Avenue to One-Way Pair
In response to a request from Mr. Esposito, the project team will investigate converting
Vandervoort and Morgan Avenues from two-way to one-way streets. As previously noted, this
issue will require thorough coordination with NYCDOT, which has jurisdiction over traffic
operations. Mr. Bennett also explained that since this change in traffic patterns would impact
traffic flow in a wider area, it will require careful evaluation of potential effects on sensitive areas
(e.g., residential areas north of the BQE along Apollo Street and Morgan Avenue, the Cooper
Houses complex, and both Cooper Park and Sergeant Dougherty Park). The impact on
intersections at Meeker Avenue, McGuinness Boulevard, and Metropolitan Avenue/Grand Street
will also be analyzed.

Mr. Arcuri offered his view that it is important to keep Vandervoort Avenue a two-way street,
because of turning and stacking problems on Metropolitan Avenue between Vandervoort and
Morgan Avenues. In response to a question from Mr. Tiniski, Mr. Bennett explained that
changing Vandervoort Avenue into a one-way street would not make Apollo Street a truck route.

General comments raised during the meeting included the following:
■ In response to Mr. Ruzalski’s question regarding Brooklyn CB #1’s opinion on the overall
project, Teresa Toro, Tri-State Transportation Campaign and CB #1, replied that there is
general consensus that there are problems with the bridge that must be addressed. Echoing
this thought, Mr. Esposito stated that the Board would like to review the traffic studies. He
added that CB #1 is concerned about impacts on both residents and businesses.
Vincent Abate, Chairperson, CB #1, expressed his opinion that traffic is the primary issue for the Kosciuszko Bridge Project. Mr. Adams concurred, observing that Meeker Avenue, Vandervoort Avenue and Cherry Street seem to be the epicenter of traffic for the local street system in the project. This prompted a discussion regarding overall traffic problems in the area.

In response to a question from Ms. Toro, Mr. Bennett indicated that traffic studies for the local roadways will soon begin. Analysis of the data is expected to take a couple of months. Ms. Neuhaus suggested that SAC members take the handout home to review and forward any additional comments to the project team before the next meeting. Calling the design options “very abstract,” Ms. Holowacz indicated that she cannot comment without more specific information. Ms. Toro added that she has been waiting to bring quantitative information back to the community so that the Community Board can hold public hearings. Noting that data collection involves a significant effort, Mr. Adams confirmed that this is an ongoing task. He added that the SAC’s input at tonight’s meeting, including its request for specific data, will be an important consideration in planning future SAC meetings.

Other Business

In response to Ms. Donach’s concern regarding the seepage of gasoline beneath residences, Commissioner Greeley replied that he does not know much about this situation. However he noted that a DEP study that is investigating the use of groundwater from the Brooklyn-Queens Aquifer has encountered similar problems with groundwater contamination in southeast Queens.

Katie Falgoust, OUTRAGE, announced that the New York City Council will hold day-long hearings on the City’s Solid Waste Management Plan on February 1st, 2nd and 4th.

Mr. Arcuri reported that budget consultations for Queens will be held shortly. He asked Mr. Adams to contact him if NYSDOT has any funding requests for projects related to the Kosciuszko Bridge Project.

Follow-Up Items

1. Provide VHS and/or DVD copies of the NBC Kosciuszko news clip to Michael Rossmy and Vincent Arcuri. Responsibility: Parsons, HNA
2. Adapt Greenpoint residents’ letter for distribution to Queens residents. Mail 350 copies each to Dolores Rizzotto and Mr. Arcuri for inclusion in Community Board #2 and Community Board #5’s monthly mailings. Responsibility: HNA
3. Arrange meeting between Doug Greeley, DEP; Barbara Mihelic; Christine Holowacz; and Mary Gottlieb regarding Brooklyn sewer issues. Responsibility: HNA
4. Contact Marjam Supply to re-establish dialogue and provide update on the project (Gerald Esposito). Responsibility: Parsons
5. Coordinate with Anthony Parra to arrange meeting with businesses identified as being potentially impacted by various design options (Ms. Holowacz). Responsibility: HNA, Parsons
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Minutes
The 22nd meeting of the New York State Department of Transportation’s (NYSDOT) Kosciuszko Bridge Project Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC) was held on Thursday, April 21, 2005 at Jennings Hall, Brooklyn. (See Attachment A for Attendance List.) The meeting was scheduled to present the results of a detailed traffic analysis in Brooklyn related to the highway and transportation design issues presented at the January 2005 SAC meeting.

Helen Neuhaus, Helen Neuhaus & Associates (HNA), opened the meeting by welcoming Moshe Strum, New York City Department of Transportation (NYCDOT), Office of Construction Mitigation and Coordination. Mr. Strum is joining Muhammed Afzal in representing NYCDOT on the SAC. Ms. Neuhaus then asked for comments on the Minutes of the January 20, 2005 meeting. There were no comments, and the Minutes were adopted unanimously. Referencing open items from the January meeting, she facilitated a brief discussion of the following:

- Ms. Neuhaus reported that Deputy Commissioner Doug Greeley, New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP), has informed her that his agency is preparing plans for storm and sanitary sewers in the Greenpoint-Williamsburg industrial area using in-house personnel. Plans will be forwarded to the SAC when available. In a related follow-up item, Mary Gottlieb, Apollo Street/Meeker Avenue Block Association, indicated that she will arrange a meeting between Commissioner Greeley and interested SAC members when she returns from vacation in mid May. Ms. Neuhaus reminded the SAC that the aforementioned storm and sanitary sewers are separate from drainage plans being developed for the Kosciuszko Bridge Project.

- Robert Adams, NYSDOT, announced that the project team is preparing a comprehensive business outreach plan. In response to a request from Gerald Esposito, Brooklyn Community Board (CB) #1, the team recently met with Marjam Supply Company. Because Marjam and several other businesses along Cherry Street are potentially facing similar impacts, the meeting was expanded, with the assistance of Anthony Parra, East Williamsburg Valley Industrial Development Corporation, to include representatives from Haley Trucking, Acme Architectural and Lee’s Stone Supply.

- Mr. Adams also reported that NYSDOT continues to coordinate with other agencies. Since the January SAC meeting, the Department has held two meetings with NYCDOT and one meeting each with the New York City Department of Sanitation and the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation.

Highway and Transportation Design Issues: Summary of Traffic Data Collection and Recap
Steve Bennett, Parsons, began with the following recap of issues presented at the January SAC meeting, noting that the results of studies to address these issues will be presented later this evening. Because the traffic analysis effort was not applicable to the bikeway/walkway issue, this issue will be discussed at a future meeting.
1) **Maintenance of traffic on Cherry Street**

   All of the Build Alternatives would require the permanent use of Cherry Street between Vandervoort and Stewart Avenues to accommodate a two-lane entrance ramp to the highway. At the January meeting, the project team presented two general approaches to this issue: (1) close Cherry Street and reroute traffic; or (2) realign and maintain Cherry Street as a through street by acquiring additional property (including parkland) adjacent to the bridge.

2) **Design of westbound exit/Meeker Avenue/Van Dam Street intersection**

   Alternative BR-5 moves the highway approximately 50 feet further from the residences on Meeker Avenue, between Apollo and Van Dam Streets. This realignment of the highway allows redesign of the intersection of Apollo Street and Meeker Avenue, which could improve traffic operations.

3) **Location and design of westbound exit ramp at Van Dam Street**

   At the request of local residents, NYSDOT agreed to consider moving the existing westbound exit ramp that currently touches down at Van Dam Street back so that it would touch down before Varick Street/Varick Avenue. This would allow vehicles (particularly trucks) to access the industrial area without passing homes on Meeker Avenue and Van Dam Street. Initial analysis, discussed at the January SAC meeting, showed that the ramp cannot be designed to connect to Varick Street/Varick Avenue without compromising safety (the slope of the ramp would be too great). The team then evaluated several options that would accomplish the same goal by connecting the ramp to Meeker Avenue between Van Dam and Varick Streets through the use of a T-intersection.

4) **Closure of Varick Street/Varick Avenue under the Kosciuszko Bridge**

   Varick Street/Varick Avenue is one of three streets open to through traffic under the bridge east of the Brooklyn ramps and is the street closest to the ramps. There are two scenarios under which this underpass could be closed: 1) if the grade of the eastbound on-ramp is reduced; or 2) if the westbound off-ramp is modified, as described in Issue #3.

5) **Conversion of Vandervoort and Morgan Avenues to one-way pair**

   At Mr. Esposito’s request, NYSDOT evaluated converting Vandervoort and Morgan Avenues from their existing bi-directional flow to one-way northbound and one-way southbound.

Using a PowerPoint presentation, Dan Prevost, Parsons, described the methodology used for data collection on local streets. He explained that automatic traffic recorders (ATRs) use a rubber tube laid across the road to count the number of vehicles passing a particular stretch of roadway. For this data collection effort, ATRs were installed at 19 locations in Brooklyn and used 24 hours/day from March 15 – March 22, 2005. Mr. Prevost commented that data collection was delayed by one week to avoid recording irregular traffic patterns caused by a recent snowstorm. In addition, turning movement counts (TMCs) were taken in mid March on two weekdays during

---

1 This data and other results of the traffic data collection effort are included in an updated Highway and Transportation Design Issues handout that was distributed at the meeting. Due to the bulk of the document, this handout is not being included with the Minutes. Anyone wishing to obtain a copy may contact Ms. Neuhaus at (212) 532-4175.
the morning and evening peak periods, as well as midday and on one Saturday. TMCs are collected manually by survey crews who document the left, right and through movements on each approach or leg of an intersection. Eight intersections along Meeker and Vandervoort Avenues were included in this study; the results of one representative intersection were shown and discussed.

To estimate traffic volumes in 2045, the data was increased by an annual growth factor of 0.5%. The analysis also considered estimated traffic for several major projects, including: Greenpoint-Williamsburg Rezoning, Cross Harbor Freight Movement, Newtown Creek Water Pollution Control Plant, Greenpoint Converted Marine Transfer Station, and Grand Avenue Depot and Central Maintenance Facility.

The following questions and comments were raised during this presentation:

- In response to a question from Peter King, NYSDOT, Mr. Prevost stated that the ATRs performed well during the data collection effort. Mr. Adams added that the weather was ideal and that no damage to the equipment was reported.

- In response to a question from Laura Hofmann, Greenpoint Waterfront Association for Parks and Planning, Mr. Prevost indicated that the project team received information from the New York City Department of City Planning regarding traffic projections for the Greenpoint-Williamsburg Rezoning Plan.

- In response to a question from Barbara Mihelic, Noble Street Block Association, regarding the types of vehicles counted, Mr. Prevost replied that the counts are broken down into three categories: automobiles, trucks and buses.

- Joe Reemmer, OUTRAGE/Beadle Street, suggested that TMC data underestimates the number of vehicles at the intersection of Lombardy Street and Vandervoort Avenue, since numerous vehicles use Division Place and Porter Avenue to access the industrial area.

Highway and Transportation Design Issues: Results of Data Collection & Analysis
Mr. Prevost then presented the results of the traffic analysis for each of the Highway and Transportation Design issues.

1) Maintenance of traffic on Cherry Street
Mr. Prevost noted that the movement of vehicles in this area is complicated by two street segments (Anthony Street between Varick and Stewart Avenues, and Stewart Avenue between Cherry and Anthony Streets) that are currently closed to traffic. Both of these are mapped as city streets, but are being used by private businesses.

Ms. Mihelic asked whether the closed segments of Anthony Street and Stewart Avenue have been demapped or are being used unofficially. Mr. Prevost noted that half the width of Anthony Street is demapped, while all of Stewart Avenue is mapped. Mr. Parra remarked that businesses using these street segments may be leasing the property; once the lease has expired, the City can
reclaim the property. In a follow-up comment, Ms. Miheic remarked that local residents rely on the availability of side streets when there is heavy congestion on the main roads.

For each of the options below, NYSDOT will coordinate with NYCDOT to determine if it is appropriate to open these street segments to traffic.

**Option 1**
Option 1 would close Cherry Street and divert traffic to alternate routes, including Anthony or Lombardy Street, to access the area east of Vandervoort Avenue.

The number of vehicles using Cherry Street beyond the eastbound on-ramp is small. Based on traffic projections for 2045, this street would be used by approximately 70 vehicles in the a.m. peak hour and 33 vehicles in the p.m. peak hour. (By comparison, the traffic data shows only 57 vehicles and 27 vehicles currently using Cherry Street beyond the eastbound on-ramp in the a.m. and p.m. peak hours, respectively.) Traffic volumes on adjacent streets (Varick Avenue, Lombardy and Anthony Streets) are also low. Based on those projected volumes, the local street network would function adequately if Cherry Street were closed.

However, both NYCDOT and the New York City Fire Department (FDNY) have expressed opposition to the closure of Cherry Street, since this would eliminate access routes in the area. Also, Option 1 would require vehicles entering the industrial area--trucks in particular--to turn right on Vandervoort Avenue and make an immediate left on either Anthony or Lombardy Street. While the volumes are low, the likelihood of operational difficulties and delays increases if trucks are required to make additional maneuvers. Therefore, it has been determined that Option 1 is not acceptable.

**Option 2**
Based on further analysis and coordination with NYCDOT, the second option, to maintain Cherry Street, was examined using three different scenarios.

**Option 2a** would maintain Cherry Street to Porter Avenue, forcing vehicles to make a right turn to connect to Anthony or Lombardy Street. This would provide slightly improved access to the industrial area, but would require circuitous routes to most other locations. It would also require minor additional takings of Sgt. Dougherty Playground but would not require additional business impacts beyond those caused by the alternatives.

**Option 2b** would maintain Cherry Street one block further to Varick Avenue, where vehicles could make a right or left turn. This option would provide a connection to Varick Avenue, a much more direct route than Option 2a. However, vehicles accessing areas close to Newtown Creek would have to either turn right on Varick Avenue and use Lombardy Street or turn left on Varick Avenue and use Meeker Avenue. Similar to Option 2a, this alternative would require minor additional takings of Sgt. Dougherty Playground but would not require additional business impacts beyond those caused by the alternatives.
Option 2c would maintain Cherry Street to Gardner Avenue, providing all of the access that is available today. However, under every alternative except RA-6, this option would result in additional business impacts beyond those caused by the alternatives.

Option 2b is the recommended option, because it provides the most access without creating any additional business impacts.

The following questions and comments were raised regarding this issue:

- In response to a question from Vincent Arcuri, Queens CB #5, Mr. Bennett confirmed that utilities along Cherry Street would need to be relocated. Mr. Arcuri observed that since the relocation of utilities would impact businesses between Varick and Gardner Avenues, perhaps resulting in the acquisition of these properties, NYSDOT would be able to maintain this segment of Cherry Street as a through street. Mr. Bennett replied that this will be investigated.

- In response to an inquiry from Ms. Gottlieb, Mr. Prevost reiterated that while Option 2c would maintain Cherry Street to Gardner Avenue, it would result in additional impacts to local businesses. Specifically, he cited effects on Marjam Supply, which recently purchased property on Cherry Street to build a new 150-employee facility.

- In response to a question from Mr. Parra, Mr. Prevost clarified that Option 2b would only impact those businesses that would already be impacted under any alternative, while Option 2c would impact additional businesses as well.

- Ms. Mihelic asked if the project team has a list of utilities that would require relocation. Mr. Bennett replied that a detailed survey of utilities in the area has been prepared. In response to a follow-up question from Ms. Mihelic, Mr. Bennett noted that the Buckeye Pipeline is not among the utilities to be relocated.

2) Design of westbound exit/Meeker Avenue/Van Dam Street intersection

As noted above, the realignment of the highway under BR-5 presents unique challenges, requiring the analysis of three design options for this alternative. Mr. Prevost explained that the project team first looked at the operation of the existing intersection configuration. Field observations indicated that while the Meeker Avenue approach to Apollo Street is striped as two lanes, vehicles are using the bus stop area at the intersection as a third lane. Therefore, for analysis purposes, this area was considered a three lane approach.

Traffic modeling was used to project the Level of Service (LOS) in 2045 for the No Build alternative and three design options. Using PowerPoint slides, Mr. Prevost explained that LOS refers to the quality of traffic flow using six ratings—A through F. “A” represents the best LOS or free-flow condition and “F” represents the worst LOS or stop-and-go condition. He noted that while the slides illustrate LOS on a highway, LOS can be determined for intersections as well.

Animated traffic simulations for the existing condition, No Build, and three design options were shown. The chart below, included in the presentation, shows the existing and projected LOS for each.
The analysis showed that under the No Build alternative, traffic would back up significantly on both Meeker Avenue and the westbound exit ramp, with significant delays to get through the Apollo Street intersection.

Option 1 would significantly improve operations at both intersections. Improvements at the Meeker Avenue/Apollo Street intersection would result from changes in signal timing and the addition of a second lane at the base of the westbound off-ramp. Operations at the Meeker/Vandervoort Avenue intersection would improve due to the addition of a second lane on the eastbound on-ramp.

Option 2 would create operational problems for the intersection due to the introduction of an additional phase in the traffic signal, which would reduce the “green time” for the other phases.

Operationally, Option 3 is identical to Option 1, except for the small amount of additional space under the viaduct provided in Option 3. This would provide negligible improvements to the operation of this intersection. However, this option would eliminate a significant benefit of Alternative BR-5 (i.e. moving the roadway away from the residences).

During analysis of these options for BR-5, the project team determined that Option 1 would provide similar operational benefits under all of the alternatives. While this configuration would require the relocation of an existing bus stop and the elimination of 3-5 parking spaces between Apollo and Hausman Streets, these drawbacks would be offset by the anticipated reduction in delay and congestion.

Based on the benefits described above, Option 1 is recommended for all alternatives.

The following questions and comments were raised regarding this issue:

- Regarding Option 1, Ms. Gottlieb inquired about the use of additional space that would be created between her house and the new street. The project team clarified that vehicles would not be permitted in this space. While its use is still undecided, options may include a small park or another community space.

- It was noted that trailer trucks making left-hand turns from Meeker Avenue onto Vandervoort Avenue block the intersection by occupying most of the space under the bridge. Mr. Bennett and Mr. Prevost commented that improvements in roadway geometry and signal timing would reduce operational problems in this area. Ms. Gottlieb recommended approaching local businesses individually to encourage them to avoid using Apollo Street as a truck route.
Ms. Gottlieb observed that the existing bus stop is used by many local residents who would be adversely affected by its relocation. Mr. Prevost noted that the project team is still working out details of the plan and will be consulting with NYCDOT and the Metropolitan Transportation Authority.

3) **Location and design of westbound exit ramp at Van Dam Street**

After determining that the westbound exit ramp could not be constructed to safely connect to Varick Street/Varick Avenue, the project team analyzed various options for connecting the ramp to Meeker Avenue between Van Dam and Varick Streets. During the analysis, the following issues were raised:

- In order to connect with Meeker Avenue between Van Dam and Varick Streets, the ramp must begin further east on the bridge. This creates several concerns:
  - The weaving distance between the westbound on-ramps and the exit is reduced, forcing cars to change lanes more quickly.
  - The grade of the exit ramp, which is currently 3.5%, would be increased to 7%. While this is within the project’s design standards, steep grades increase the likelihood of accidents.
  - Because the ramp must descend at a different grade than the rest of the highway, it must be built on a separate structure. Once the ramp leaves the main bridge structure, it must be supported by its own columns, potentially causing additional disruption on the ground and increasing the project’s cost.
  - Lowering this ramp would require closing Varick Street/Varick Avenue under the bridge. This has raised considerable objection from NYCDOT and FDNY, in terms of maintaining emergency and general access.

- Moving the ramp back creates problems for a connection to Van Dam Street. Vehicles wishing to use Van Dam Street would need to make a left turn at the base of the ramp and then an immediate right turn onto Van Dam Street.

- Projections for 2045 traffic volumes show that fewer than 200 vehicles per hour are expected to use this ramp during the peak period. This volume of traffic is not sufficient to justify building a new ramp.

Based on these findings, it is recommended that this alternate ramp configuration receive no further consideration.

The following questions and comments were raised regarding this issue:

- Commenting that residents of Van Dam Street will be disappointed with the elimination of the alternate ramp option, Ms. Gottlieb suggested that the part of the ramp connecting to Meeker Avenue between Van Dam and Varick Streets be restricted to cars only. Frank Catalanotto, Parsons, stated that cars-only exits are illegal on interstate highways.

- In response to a question from Mr. Parra, Mr. Prevost noted that the alternate ramp under Alternative BR-5 would impact businesses that are not otherwise impacted by that alternative, including Marly Building Supply and Starcross Roofing.
4) **Closure of Varick Street/Varick Avenue under the Kosciuszko Bridge**

As noted above, there are two scenarios under which Varick Street/Varick Avenue would be closed: 1) if the westbound exit ramp is relocated; or 2) if the grade is reduced on the eastbound on-ramp. As discussed in Issue #3, given the physical constraints, it does not appear appropriate to connect the westbound off-ramp to Meeker Avenue between Van Dam and Varick Streets.

Lowering the grade on the eastbound ramp would reduce the amount of weaving distance between the ramp and the Long Island Expressway interchange. This would not improve operational or safety conditions, a principal project objective. The proposed eastbound on-ramp would have a grade of approximately 3%, well within the design criteria of 7% and approximately equal to the grade that exists today. In addition, widening of this ramp to two lanes, combined with an extended merge distance, would significantly improve the operations of the ramp over today’s conditions.

Finally, closing Varick Street/Varick Avenue under the bridge would create dead-end streets, which are typically opposed by FDNY, since they impede maximum access during emergency situations. Therefore, the closure of Varick Street/Varick Avenue under the bridge is not recommended.

5) **Conversion of Vandervoort and Morgan Avenues to one-way pair**

Mr. Prevost noted that converting these streets to one-way raises concerns about impacts on sensitive areas (residential areas north of the BQE along Apollo Street and Morgan Avenue, the Cooper Houses complex, Cooper Park and Sgt. Dougherty Playground) and the ability of Morgan Avenue to accommodate any additional traffic.

Traffic data was collected along both Morgan and Vandervoort Avenues to assess the potential impacts of such a change. The analysis examined the number of cars and trucks using each street during the peak hour in each direction (2045) and the number of vehicles that would use each if converted to a one-way pair.

Vandervoort Avenue is projected to carry significantly more total volume than Morgan Avenue and four times as many trucks. If these streets were converted to a one-way pair, regardless of which street carried which direction, the number of vehicles on Morgan Avenue would increase by at least 14%. More importantly, the number of trucks and buses using Morgan Avenue would increase by at least 75%. Additionally, Morgan Avenue is only one lane in each direction and is not designated as a truck route. Although some sections of the roadway are fairly wide, much of it is narrow with a significant number of business entrances.

Finally, the benefits of such a change are uncertain. Typically, one-way streets improve operations at intersections and tend to speed up traffic. However, speeding up traffic in areas with residences and parks is generally discouraged.

Based on the expected traffic impacts on Morgan Avenue and the uncertain benefits, it is recommended that this proposal receive no further consideration.
Other Comments

- In response to a question from Joe Ruzalski, United Forties Civic Association, Mr. Bennett indicated that clearance under the bridge must be at least 14’ 6”.

- Mr. Reemmer commented that reopening Varick Avenue between Lombardy Street and Maspeth Avenue, located within the Keyspan property, would relieve local traffic congestion. Mr. Adams replied that the project team will look into this possibility.

- Mr. Arcuri noted that the Greenpoint waterfront greenbelt improvement project along Franklin Street and Kent Avenue may affect area traffic patterns.

- As discussed at prior meetings, Ms. Mihelic reiterated the importance of hiring a community engineer to assist the SAC. Theresa Cianciotta, Assemblyman Joseph Lentol, added that the Assemblyman strongly advocated for a community engineer in the past, but there was not enough funding to hire one. Ms. Neuhaus remarked that in previous SAC discussions, it was noted that the need for a community engineer is likely to be greater after the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, during design and construction of the bridge. In a follow-up comment, Ms. Mihelic also suggested bringing a community liaison into the project.

- In response to an inquiry from Christine Holowacz, Greenpoint Property Owners/St. Cecilia’s Church, Mr. Adams confirmed that the project team met with Waste Management. He noted that Alternatives BR-5 and RA-5 will have no direct impact on the business. Impacts of the other three alternatives are not yet determined and depend on location of the bridge columns. Detailed designs of the alternatives will be available in several months, at which time the project team will again meet with Tara Hemmer, Waste Management, to discuss any property impacts. Mr. Bennett commented that because the business occupies a large site, it will most likely be able to continue operations even if some property is acquired. Mr. Ruzalski added that he recently received notice of Waste Management’s plans to build along Newtown Creek.

- Mr. Arcuri announced that he will be receiving information on tentative routes for buses going to and from the proposed Grand Avenue Depot and Central Maintenance Facility. He promised to share that information with the project team when available.

- In response to a question from Gus Amato, United Forties Civic Association, Mr. Bennett noted that the project team has done an initial study regarding possible bridge types but has not yet made a decision.

- Expressing concern about project impacts on Sgt. Dougherty Playground, Ms. Cianciotta asked if representatives from the New York City Department of Parks and Recreation (NYCDPR) have attended any SAC meetings. Mr. Adams responded that while the project team has met with NYCDPR representatives, no-one from that agency has attended any SAC meetings. He commented that more specific designs for the alternatives are needed in order to understand how parks will be affected; at that time the
project team may invite NYCDPR representatives to attend a SAC meeting. He added that the Section 4(f) process, which relates to the acquisition of parkland, has just been initiated.

Ms. Hofmann inquired whether accidents on the bridge have recently increased. Mr. Bennett replied that the project team does not have that information, but the local police precinct is likely to have daily records of traffic incidents. Mr. Adams added that the poor condition of the riding surface on the bridge may have contributed to any increase in accidents.

New Business: Interim Bridge Deck Repair Project
Remarking on the deterioration of roadway and ramp surfaces, Mr. Adams reported that NYSDOT is currently inspecting the bridge’s condition beneath the top layer in preparation for an Interim Deck Repair Project, which may begin as early as late May or early June. The work, which is expected to take 3-4 months to complete, will require closing exit ramps and detouring traffic during overnight and weekend hours. Mr. Adams explained that the interim repairs will improve the riding surface and are expected to hold until the permanent reconstruction of the Kosciuszko Bridge.

Noting that the interim project may provide information regarding traffic diversion that could be useful for the full-scale project, Mr. Arcuri suggested placing traffic counters throughout the neighborhood. Mr. Adams agreed that the deck repair project might provide information regarding traffic patterns. However, he noted that while two lanes will be closed during interim deck repair, NYSDOT has made a commitment to maintain all six lanes of traffic during the rehabilitation or replacement of the bridge, thereby minimizing the number of vehicles diverted to local streets.

Commenting that any disruption on the bridge will cause traffic congestion in the surrounding neighborhood, Mr. Reemmer emphasized the need for traffic enforcement agents in the area between Vandervoort Avenue and McGuiness Boulevard during the interim deck repair project. Mr. Adams noted that NYSDOT will work with the local Community Boards on this issue.

Christopher McBride, American Automobile Association (AAA), requested information on the deck repair project for inclusion on the AAA website.

Predicting that local residents will mistake interim deck repair activities for full-scale bridge construction or rehabilitation, Ms. Mihelic suggested that flyers regarding the interim project be distributed throughout the community. Ms. Neuhaus promised that information will be provided to the SAC, with extra copies going to the Community Boards and elected officials. Mr. Adams invited anyone with questions or concerns about the interim project to contact him directly.

Looking Ahead
Ms. Neuhaus remarked that over the next two months, project activity will mainly involve field studies related to the EIS process, as well as agency and business outreach. Because of the timeframe of these activities, the next SAC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, June 16, 2005 at 6:30 P.M. at Jennings Hall, 260 Powers Street, Brooklyn. Possible topics for this meeting
include studies on natural ecosystems (water quality, wildlife, wetlands, aquatic ecology, rare and endangered species), contaminated materials, and cultural resources (historic, archeological, etc). Ms. Neuhaus encouraged SAC members to contact the project team to discuss any issues that arise prior to the next meeting.

Follow-up Items
1. Obtain further information regarding sewer project for Greenpoint-Williamsburg industrial area from Deputy Commissioner Doug Greeley, NYCDEP. Responsibility: HNA.


3. Provide SAC with list of utilities that will require relocation during project. Responsibility: Parsons

4. Notify SAC of start of Interim Bridge Deck Repair Project. Provide information on work hours, overall timeframe, lane closures, contact information, etc. Responsibility: HNA.

5. Send press release regarding Interim Bridge Deck Repair Project to Christopher McBride. Responsibility: HNA.

6. Erect sign near work site with contact information and information regarding the Interim Bridge Deck Repair Project (Barbara Mihelic). Responsibility: NYSDOT.
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NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
KOSCIUSZKO BRIDGE PROJECT
STAKEHOLDERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE: JUNE 16, 2005

Minutes
The 23rd meeting of the New York State Department of Transportation’s (NYSDOT) Kosciuszko Bridge Project Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC) was held on Thursday, June 16, 2005 at Jennings Hall, Brooklyn. (See Attachment A for Attendance List.) The meeting was scheduled to present the Water/Ecology and Historic and Cultural Resources studies that are being conducted as part of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).

Helen Neuhaus, Helen Neuhaus & Associates (HNA), opened the meeting by asking for comments on the Minutes of the April 21, 2005 meeting. Following adoption of the Minutes without comments, Ms. Neuhaus facilitated a discussion of follow-up items from that meeting.

■ In response to remarks from Joe Reemmer, OUTRAGE, additional Turning Movement Counts (TMC) were taken at the intersections of Vandervoort Avenue and Division Place and Lombardy Street and Porter Avenue. A handout showing the results was distributed.¹ Steve Bennett, Parsons, reported that the results were comparable to the data collected during TMC studies conducted in March 2005.

■ In response to an inquiry from Barbara Mihelic, Noble Street Block Association, a list of utilities located within the Kosciuszko Bridge Project limits was distributed. (See Attachment B.)

■ Ms. Neuhaus reported that she has received additional information from Deputy Commissioner Doug Greeley, New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP) regarding NYCDEP’s sewer project for Greenpoint’s industrial area (discussed at the January 2005 SAC meeting). Deputy Commissioner Greeley’s staff is doing preliminary work on the sanitary sewer system, which is more complicated than the storm sewer system because of the need for a pump station. NYCDEP is currently surveying the area to determine elevations. There is no funding in the capital budget for the project at this time.

■ As a follow-up to the discussion regarding the Kosciuszko Bridge Interim Deck Repair Project, which is scheduled to begin this summer, notification flyers were mailed to the SAC. Packets of extra flyers were mailed to elected officials and community boards (CB) on the SAC, with a cover memo requesting their assistance in distributing the information. Robert Adams, NYSDOT, reported that work will begin on the ramps in Brooklyn.

In response to several questions regarding this project, the following additional information was provided:

¹ For a copy of this document, contact Ms. Neuhaus at (212) 532-4175.
- There will be no staging area in the immediate vicinity of the bridge; all equipment and materials will be stored at the contractor’s yard and brought to and from the site on a daily basis.
- Work hours will be restricted to nighttime and weekend mornings. Noting that the exact hours have not yet been finalized, Moshe Strum, New York City Department of Transportation (NYCDOT) added that weekday work would create a “traffic nightmare.”
- The work for this project will be performed by one of the following contractors: Persico Contracting, Grace Industries, Burtis or El Sol Contracting.
- Multiple crews are expected to work on the project.
- Workers will park on Cherry Street in order to avoid displacing residential parking.
- The project will cost approximately $4 million, which will come from NYSDOT’s maintenance budget.

Anthony Nunziato, Maspeth Chamber of Commerce, expressed his strong opposition to any detours that would result in increased truck traffic on Grand Avenue. He asked Mr. Strum for a commitment that there will be no truck diversions onto Grand Avenue, adding that he would lead a protest in the street if this commitment is not met. Mr. Strum stated that NYCDOT will “do its best” to control traffic during the interim repair project.

- Vincent Arcuri, Queens CB #5, reported that he does not yet have information regarding routes related to the new bus depot in Queens. He will report back to the SAC following his meeting with the Metropolitan Transportation Authority.
- In response to a question from Joseph Ruzalski, United Forties Civic Association, Mr. Bennett indicated that he is attempting to reach the appropriate person at KeySpan to discuss the possibility of re-opening the segment of Varick Street between Maspeth Avenue and Lombardy Street, which is located on KeySpan property.

Announcements
Ms. Neuhaus and Mr. Adams made the following announcements:
- Ms. Neuhaus welcomed Neal Kronley, who will represent Councilman David Yassky, chair of the New York City Council Waterfronts Committee, on the SAC. She noted that Mr. Kronley is also coordinating the activities of the Newtown Creek Alliance.
- Ms. Neuhaus reported that since the last SAC meeting, the project team has been working on technical studies associated with the DEIS. She stated that the team has also held several meetings with businesses, including IESI Corporation, Marly Building Supply, Upgrade Contracting, Milgo/Bufkin, Conch Umbrella, Dry Ice Corporation, American Compressed Gases and Mobil Gas Station. The project team also met with the environmental organization, Riverkeeper, which is working with the Newtown Creek Alliance to protect that waterway.
- Mr. Adams reported that meetings have also been held with several agencies, including the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and U.S. Coast Guard (USCG). A meeting is scheduled
with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). In response to a question from Mr. Nunziato, Mr. Adams stated that these agency meetings are separate from the Inter-Agency Advisory Committee in that they involve discussions with agency staff who have specific expertise in the technical areas being studied in the DEIS.

Presentation: Historic and Cultural Resources
Using a PowerPoint presentation, Elizabeth Federico, Parsons, began with an overview of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. Section 106 requires federal agencies to consider the effects of their projects on historic properties, and provides for input from the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) and members of the public. She explained that the Section 106 process involves the following four steps:

■ **Step 1: Initiate the Section 106 Process.** The agency must first determine if the project has the potential to affect historic properties directly or indirectly. Consultations must be held with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and other parties, including the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission and the public.

■ **Step 2: Identify Historic Properties.** Ms. Federico explained that this step begins with definition of the Area of Potential Effect (APE) for both archeological and architectural resources. She noted that the APE for architecture is generally a larger area than for archeology. Background research is then conducted, including identification of properties within the APE that are listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). A property is considered historic if it is 50 years of age or older and meets at least one of the four NRHP criteria:
  - Criterion A: Association with significant events
  - Criterion B: Association with significant persons
  - Criterion C: Distinctive design or construction
  - Criterion D: Likely to yield important prehistoric or historic information or data.

  The property must also have integrity. Ms. Federico explained that this means that the structure has not been compromised in terms of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling or association.

■ **Step 3: Assess Adverse Effects.** Ms. Federico explained that effects are considered adverse when the characteristics that qualified the property for the NRHP are altered in some way. She noted that Section 106 requires the identification of both positive and negative effects.

■ **Step 4: Resolve Adverse Effects.** This involves notifying the ACHP about the impacts and inviting its participation in this stage of the project. In addition, the project team would meet with the SHPO and other interested parties to discuss possible mitigation measures.

Reiterating that the project must comply with the New York State Historic Preservation Act and New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission regulations, she noted that there are no New York City-designated landmarks within the Kosciuszko Bridge Project’s APE.
Ms. Federico then discussed the results of the Historic and Cultural Resources survey conducted as part of the DEIS. First, an APE was established for archeology (the area likely to be directly disturbed by any of the alternatives) and architecture (500’ on either side of the center line of the Brooklyn Queens Expressway between the Long Island Expressway interchange and approximately North Henry Street, Brooklyn).

In order to identify historic properties, the project team considered public input; met with agencies and locally knowledgeable individuals; reviewed historic literature and maps; reviewed NRHP and New York State Register nomination forms and local inventories; and conducted a windshield survey (a visual inspection from a car).

No historic architectural resources were identified within the APE. However, the windshield survey conducted in March 2005 identified potential historic architectural resources that are older than 50 years and are currently unrecorded. Of these, the project team investigated 15 properties that would be directly affected by one or more of the project alternatives: 8 commercial structures in Brooklyn, 3 commercial structures in Queens, 3 residential properties in Queens and the Kosciuszko Bridge itself. None of these meet the criteria for NRHP eligibility. Noting that members of the SAC have expressed interest in preserving the plaque on the Kosciuszko Bridge, Ms. Federico stated that while the sign is not considered historic for the same reasons that the bridge is not, it could still be saved and incorporated into any new structure. Because none of the 15 properties surveyed was determined to be historic, there are no direct adverse effects to historic architectural resources.

The second phase of the survey will look at properties within the APE that might experience indirect visual or noise impacts. If any of these are determined to be historic, the indirect effects will be assessed.

Ms. Federico informed the SAC that no archeological sites were identified within the APE. However, 12 blocks within the APE were found to have a moderate or high potential for intact archeological resources such as Native American sites or artifacts related to historic building foundations. The project team will consult with the SHPO to decide whether to conduct a Phase I archeological survey, which involves digging test pits to determine the presence of artifacts, or develop a plan for monitoring these locations during construction.

The following questions and comments were raised:

- Ms. Mihelic asked if St. Cecilia’s Roman Catholic Church or St. Stanislaus Kostka Church would be eligible for listing in the NRHP. Ms. Federico replied that if the churches are within the APE, they would be among the properties studied during the second phase of the survey to determine NRHP eligibility. In response to a follow-up question, Ms. Federico indicated that the project team has developed a map for the indirect study area. Laura Hofmann, Greenpoint Waterfront Association for Parks and Planning, noted that St. Stanislaus is associated with the late Pope John Paul II.

- Referring to the 15 properties that were surveyed and found not eligible, Mr. Nunziato asked if the project team possibly overlooked some elements that would qualify any of the structures for historic designation. Ms. Federico responded that the recommendations
made by the project team will be submitted to the SHPO for final determination as to their eligibility.

- Ms. Neuhaus asked the SAC to provide names of any local historic preservation or cultural organizations with whom the project team should coordinate. She noted that tonight’s presentation is just the beginning of a dialogue regarding historic and cultural properties in the area.

- Mr. Nunziato inquired about the eligibility of Newtown Creek for the NRHP. Laurie Paonessa, Parsons, indicated that the creek would not qualify because it is a natural body of water, rather than a manmade structure. She added that it might qualify for protection under environmental programs unrelated to Section 106, state, or local historic preservation regulations.

- In response to Mr. Nunziato’s observation that the first Dutch settlement on Long Island was at Newtown Creek, Ms. Federico explained that the DEIS will include a detailed farm-by-farm history of the area. Responding to a follow-up question from Ms. Mihelic, she indicated that this information will probably not be available prior to publication of the DEIS.

- In response to a question from Mr. Ruzalski, Mr. Bennett confirmed that there will be no direct impacts on Calvary Cemetery. Ms. Paonessa added that the project team has discussed the project with representatives of the cemetery.

Presentation: Water and Ecology
Using a PowerPoint presentation, Steve Cronkite, Parsons, led a discussion of water and ecology issues that are being examined in the DEIS. These include surface water, wetlands, groundwater, wildlife and floodplains, as summarized below.

Surface water
Mr. Cronkite began by explaining that surface water, including rivers, lakes, oceans and coastal tidal waters, is classified by NYCDEP and NYSDEC according to its best usage. Newtown Creek is classified “SD”, indicating that its best usage is fish survival.

Factors contributing to Newtown Creek’s current condition include industrial land uses, run-off from impervious (solid) surfaces, the ExxonMobil oil spill, the Newtown Creek Water Pollution Control Plant (NCWPCP), combined sewer overflows (at 20 locations) and the lack of any sanitary sewers in certain areas. Water quality is also impacted by turbidity, oil, floating substances and low dissolved oxygen.

Mr. Cronkite noted that several agencies and organizations are working to improve the creek, including NYCDEP, NYSDEC, USEPA, USACE, Riverkeeper, the Newtown Creek Alliance and the Newtown Creek Monitoring Committee. Mr. Cronkite then turned the floor over to Mr. Kronley and Ms. Mihelic to speak about the efforts of their organizations.
Mr. Kronley stated that the Newtown Creek Alliance was formed in 2002 by New York City Councilmen David Yassky and Eric Gioia in order to raise awareness of the issues facing the creek. These include the ExxonMobil oil spill, the largest oil spill in the country, and access to the shoreline. Mr. Kronley noted that the Alliance has been assisted by Riverkeeper, which patrols Newtown Creek in its boat, monitoring water quality and pursuing polluters. He also announced that the next meeting of the Newtown Creek Alliance will be held on June 22nd at LaGuardia Community College. Dolores Rizzotto, Queens CB #2, remarked that CB #2’s Environmental Committee would be interested in hearing more about the Alliance’s work.

Noting that NCWPCP is the largest water treatment facility on the eastern seaboard and one of the polluters of the creek, Ms. Mihelic stated that the Newtown Creek Monitoring Committee was formed approximately seven years ago to oversee operations at the plant. The committee, which Ms. Mihelic co-chairs, is working with NYCDEP to improve water quality. Among the measures being considered is an aeration system to improve dissolved oxygen levels in the creek. Committee meetings are held on the second Thursday of each month and are open to the public. Ms. Mihelic stated that once upgrades to the plant are complete, NYCDEP will establish a permanent community monitoring committee.

Mr. Cronkite then reviewed surface water issues that will require attention. The use of Best Management Practices (BMPs) during construction will prevent silt run-off into the creek. BMP options might include a silt curtain, to separate silty water adjacent to the disturbance from other waters; an anti-tracking pad to prevent mud or soils from being tracked onto nearby roadways; or a silt fence, to prevent soils in disturbed areas from spilling onto adjacent areas. Long-term stormwater handling might include the creation of settling tanks or ponds to filter stormwater run-off before it enters the creek. He added that any dredging and construction in the creek (i.e. temporary platforms) would also require measures to avoid negative impacts.

Mr. Cronkite indicated that several approvals and permits must be obtained prior to construction. These include:
- USEPA Section 401 Water Quality Certificate stating that the project must be designed to prevent water pollution. This permit is administered by NYSDEC.
- USACE Section 404 permit for dredging or filling, and Section 10 permit for work in or over navigable waters.
- USCG Section 9 permit to construct a bridge over navigable waters.
- NYSDEC State Pollution Discharge Elimination System permits.

The following questions and comments were raised during the discussion on surface water:
- Mr. Ruzalski commented that run-off from the bridge currently flows through a pipe onto Laurel Hill Boulevard that is often clogged with garbage and other debris. Noting that he recently contacted Peter King, NYSDOT, regarding this issue, Mr. Ruzalski thanked Mr. King for his prompt response. Acknowledging that run-off from the bridge is a problem, Mr. Bennett noted that although downspouts were installed on the bridge when it was built in the late 1930’s, they were not properly maintained. When the bridge was reconstructed in the 1960’s, the drainage system was removed, resulting in water “free-falling” off the bridge. The proposed project will include a drainage system that meets all current environmental standards.
Citing a demonstration project on the Upper West Side of Manhattan that is using run-off for gardening and maintenance in Riverside Park, Mr. Kronley asked if stormwater run-off from the bridge could be re-used in a similar manner. Mr. Cronkite indicated that although the project team could investigate stormwater re-use, roadway run-off contains oil and other contaminants that would require treatment before re-use. Mr. Kronley commented that the goal of re-using run-off would be reduction of the combined sewer overflow load. Mr. Bennett clarified that bridge run-off would not go to the sewage treatment plant but into the creek after receiving primary treatment.

In response to two unrelated questions from Mr. Ruzalski, Mr. Bennett provided the following information: construction materials will be unloaded at staging areas on both the Brooklyn and Queens sides of the bridge. Dredge spoils will be shipped to an upland site designated for disposal of hazardous materials. He added that the project team expects that only a limited amount of dredging will be required.

Noting that foul odors emanate from Newtown Creek on a regular basis, Ms. Hofmann expressed her concern that dredging could worsen the situation. She asked about the type of air quality monitoring that will be conducted and how the project team intends to minimize odors. Mr. Bennett replied that contaminants in the creek bed include polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), which could be extracted if fumes are created, and heavy metals, which are stable compounds that would not emit fumes. Ms. Neuhaus added that a Community Air Monitoring Plan, developed by the New York State Department of Health and used by NYSDEC, will be implemented. In response to a question from Madeline Donach, Meeker Avenue/Apollo Street Association, Mr. Bennett assured the SAC that residents will be alerted if there is an air quality problem.

Wetlands
Mr. Cronkite noted that while there are no mapped freshwater wetlands in Newtown Creek, NYSDEC has designated portions of the creek that are less than 6’ deep as tidal wetlands. He explained that wetlands are areas that are saturated or submerged with surface or groundwater for prolonged periods. They are important for water quality, wildlife, flood attenuation and erosion control. He added that the banks of the creek are lined with concrete bulkheads with pockets of phragmites (reeds).

Mr. Cronkite stated that the project’s potential negative impacts include shading from the barge and offloading platform and impacts to the littoral zone (shoreline and near-shore waters) from dredging. Positive impacts might include an upgraded stormwater drainage system, a less hardened shoreline, additional habitat due to the removal of the bridge’s concrete foundations from the creek, and dredging of contaminated soils.

Finally, he noted that prior to any construction in designated wetlands, NYSDOT must obtain a Section 404 permit from USACE and an NYSDEC Tidal Wetlands Permit.

The following questions and comments were raised during the discussion on wetlands:
Ms. Mihelic remarked that a project is being developed at the end of Greenpoint Avenue that will include an esplanade, waterfront park and wetlands. She asked if wetlands could be created as part of the Kosciuszko Bridge Project. In response, Mr. Cronkite noted that NYSDEC has recommended a stormwater retention basin and wetlands to filter run-off. These will be considered if there is sufficient space. Ms. Hofmann emphasized that the community strongly supports wetland restoration.

Ms. Mihelic suggested that the temporary barges remain in the water permanently to create public access along the shoreline. She noted that there is a nature walk at the NCWPCP. In response to Mr. Cronkite’s observation that even temporary structures in the creek would be considered a negative impact, Ms. Mihelic commented that the negative could become a positive if a community amenity is developed.

Ms. Hofmann asked if any effort is being made to develop a shoreline that would attract specific types of wildlife. Mr. Bennett replied that while habitat will be created that attracts wildlife in general, NYSDOT is not trying to attract specific species.

Ms. Rizzotto noted that a few years ago, the New York City Department of City Planning (NYCDCP) investigated the possibility of a new connection across Newtown Creek between Long Island City, Queens and Greenpoint, Brooklyn. She suggested that the project team contact Penny Lee, NYCDCP, to determine if there is any interest in pursuing this idea.

In response to a question from Ms. Mihelic, Mr. Cronkite stated that the project team discussed the issue of potential shading impacts from a lower bridge with NYSDEC. Since any proposed new bridge would still be about 90’ above the creek, shading impacts would not be likely.

**Groundwater**

Mr. Cronkite opened the discussion by defining the following terms: groundwater (water found within saturated soils or rock); aquifer (an underground layer of water-bearing permeable rock or soil) and sole source aquifer (a designation that indicates that the aquifer is the sole or principal source of drinking water). The Brooklyn-Queens Aquifer (BQA), which underlies both boroughs and Long Island, is a federal sole source aquifer. Because aquifers are protected by law in order to prevent their contamination, he noted that USEPA must review and approve all activities within a sole source aquifer.

Mr. Cronkite remarked that NYCDEP is currently conducting a study to explore the feasibility of using groundwater from the BQA for drinking water in southeast Queens. This water would not be used in any of the communities represented on the SAC. He added that the BQA groundwater wells are approximately five miles from the Kosciuszko Bridge Project study area and would not be affected by the project because the groundwater flows toward Newtown Creek.

Mr. Cronkite also explained that the groundwater in the Kosciuszko project area has been classified by NYSDEC as “GSA”, which indicates that its best use is potable mineral water,
conversion to potable freshwater and salt manufacturing. He indicated that existing groundwater conditions include contamination and saltwater intrusion.

In response to several questions from Ms. Mihelic, the following information was provided:

- Dredging in Newtown Creek would not affect the aquifer.
- Because the project is close to the ExxonMobil oil plume, special care will be used during excavation and dewatering for the bridge footings. Mr. Bennett clarified that most of the dewatering will take place near the creek; the plume is located further west, near the “Brooklyn connector” portion of the highway. In addition, the project team plans to minimize the amount of dewatering, in part due to the expense of treating and disposing the contaminated fluids.
- Dewatered fluids drawn from contaminated areas will be monitored throughout construction.

**Wildlife**

Mr. Cronkite reviewed a list of species—including plants, fish/shellfish, animals, and birds—known to exist in the project area. He explained that the DEIS must document rare, threatened or endangered species and essential fish habitats. As part of this documentation effort, the project team has consulted with NYSDEC’s Heritage Program, which reported no state-listed species with ½ mile of the project; the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFW), which reported no protected species; and NOAA Fisheries, which indicated that essential fish habitats and endangered or threatened species “may be present.” The project team will continue its coordination with NOAA Fisheries to identify the types of species and habitats existing in the project area.

As described during the surface water discussion, BMPs will be used during construction to minimize impacts on wildlife. While dredging and in-water construction (e.g. the use of a barge or offloading platform) might create negative impacts such as turbidity and shading, positive impacts might include a net gain in habitat.

Mr. Cronkite concluded by noting that required agency reviews and approvals include the consultations with USFW, NOAA Fisheries, and NYSDEC that were previously mentioned.

The following questions and comments were raised during the discussion on wildlife:

- Ms. Mihelic stated that NYSDEC has reported the presence of horseshoe crabs in Newtown Creek. Ms. Hofmann remarked that swans, egrets and blue claw crabs also inhabit the creek where it empties into the East River. Mr. Cronkite indicated that the list provided this evening represents a sampling of the species present in the project area; a complete listing will be included in the DEIS.

- In response to Ms. Mihelic’s observation that the DEIS process requires extensive coordination with agencies, Mr. Cronkite noted that all permits must be in place prior to the start of construction.

- Ms. Mihelic commented that certain environmental enhancements (e.g. using temporary barges for a permanent public esplanade) will require advance planning as they might
influence construction timing and methodology. Expressing her view that a SAC subcommittee should be formed to investigate possible enhancements, Ms. Mihelic emphasized the importance of community involvement at this stage of the process. Mr. Bennett indicated that the ideal time for a subcommittee to start exploring possible amenities is after construction-related issues are resolved and available land identified. He added that because the creation of an esplanade using barges might result in shading impacts on the creek, this would require inter-agency consultation. In a final comment, Ms. Neuhaus noted that in the coming months, the DEIS process will increasingly involve the balancing of positive and negative impacts of options under consideration.

In response to a question from Ms. Mihelic regarding the New York City Percent for Art program, it was noted that as a federal/state project, the Kosciuszko Bridge is not eligible for Percent for Art funding.

**Floodplains**

Mr. Cronkite explained that a floodplain is any area that is submerged during flooding. The land along Newtown Creek is considered a “100-year floodplain,” meaning that it is generally submerged every 100 years. The floodplain width at the Kosciuszko Bridge ranges from 0’-200’ in Queens and 40’- 100’ in Brooklyn. He noted that there is no floodway—a corridor where water moves very quickly during flooding—associated with Newtown Creek.

Mr. Cronkite stated that while the existing bridge piers are located in the floodplain, any new piers will be placed outside the floodplain. He indicated that the removal of piers under certain alternatives will result in a net gain to the flood storage area. Mr. Cronkite further noted that there will be no floodway impacts associated with this project.

Required agency reviews and approvals include a determination from the Federal Highway Administration that the project complies with Executive Order 11988 (Floodplain Management), and coordination with the Federal Emergency Management Administration.

**Other Business**

- Mr. Nunziato asked if funding will be available for the construction phase of the project. Mr. King replied that although no funds have been committed, NYSDOT recently held several meetings to discuss this issue. He emphasized that the Department considers the Kosciuszko Bridge a high priority project.

- Ms. Donach asked why the alternatives call for the ramps to stay in the same location if the bridge is going to be lowered. Mr. Adams explained that only the main span of the bridge will be lowered. Mr. Bennett added that the ramp must be high enough to provide adequate clearance on Varick Street.

- Mr. Kronley suggested that it might be possible to restore structural elements of the bridge (i.e. foundations that are removed) in a different part of the creek as a community enhancement. Noting that NYCDCP has supported this approach at Hudson River Park in Manhattan and other locations, he offered to work with the project team and NYCDCP to explore restoration possibilities for this project.
Indicating that he has difficulty hearing portions of the discussion, Mr. Ruzalski asked if microphones could be used at future SAC meetings. Ms. Neuhaus agreed to follow up on this request.

Looking Ahead

After suggesting that the SAC adjourn for the summer, Ms. Neuhaus noted that the format of SAC meetings is likely to change in the fall. At that time, the project team will begin providing updates on DEIS studies previously presented, along with presentations on new DEIS issues. She added that this might require more frequent meetings.

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, September 15th, 6:30 p.m. at Jennings Hall, 260 Powers Street, Brooklyn.

Follow-up Items

1. Investigate eligibility of St. Cecilia’s Roman Catholic Church and St. Stanislaus Kostka Church for listing in the NRHP (Barbara Mihelic). Responsibility: Parsons

2. Provide a map of architectural resources within the APE that might be indirectly affected by the project (Barbara Mihelic). Responsibility: Parsons

3. Provide names of any local historic preservation or cultural organizations with whom the project team should coordinate. Responsibility: SAC

4. Determine whether there is an applicable federal or state designation for the protection of Newtown Creek. Responsibility: Parsons

5. Establish SAC subcommittee to discuss possible environmental enhancements related to Newtown Creek, including wetland creation/restoration and public access (Barbara Mihelic). Responsibility: Project Team

6. Consider use of microphones for future SAC meetings (Joe Ruzalski). Responsibility: HNA

7. Coordinate with NYCDCP (Penny Lee) concerning previous plan for an esplanade connecting Brooklyn and Queens (Dolores Rizzotto). Responsibility: NYSDOT
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Utilities on the Bridge
- Street Lighting (NYCDOT)
- Police Emergency Telephone System (NYSDOT/NYCDOT/NYPD)
- Communication and Power for Variable Message Systems (NYSDOT/NYCDOT/NYPD)

City Owned Utilities (At-grade Streets)
- Storm Sewers (NYCDEP)
- Sanitary Sewers (NYCDEP)
- Water Mains (NYCDEP)
- Street Lighting (NYCDOT)
- Traffic Signals (NYCDOT)

Privately Owned Utilities (At-grade Streets)
- Gas (Brooklyn Union Gas/Keyspan)
- Electric (Consolidated Edison)
- Telephone (N.Y. Telephone/Verizon)
- Cable (Cablevision)
- Buckeye Pipeline (Buckeye Pipeline)
NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
KOSCIUSZKO BRIDGE PROJECT
STAKEHOLDERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE: SEPTEMBER 22, 2005

Minutes

The 24th meeting of the New York State Department of Transportation’s (NYSDOT) Kosciuszko Bridge Project Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC) was held on Thursday, September 22, 2005 at Jennings Hall, Brooklyn. (See Attachment A for Attendance List.) The meeting was scheduled to present the alignments of the five build alternatives currently being studied in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).

Helen Neuhaus, Helen Neuhaus & Associates (HNA), opened the meeting by welcoming everyone back after the summer break and by introducing three new SAC representatives: Zoe Epstein, Office of New York City Councilman Eric Gioia; Philip Caponegro, Brooklyn Community Board (CB) #1; and Alison Cordero, OUTRAGE. Ms. Neuhaus noted that the project team has been busy this summer working on the DEIS and meeting with agencies and businesses. Following up on a request made by Joseph Ruzalski, United Forties Civic Association, Ms. Neuhaus asked SAC members to speak loudly so that everyone in the room is able to hear. Lastly, Ms. Neuhaus asked for comments on the Minutes of the June 16th meeting. There were no comments, and the Minutes were adopted unanimously. She then facilitated a discussion of follow-up items from that meeting.

- In response to questions regarding the eligibility of St. Cecilia’s Roman Catholic Church and St. Stanislaus Kostka Church for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), Dan Prevost, Parsons, explained that these buildings are located outside the project’s Area of Potential Effect for historic architecture and will therefore not be included in the survey of architectural resources for the DEIS. He acknowledged an observation by Mary Gottlieb, Meeker Avenue/Apollo Street Association, that St. Cecilia’s Church is only two blocks outside the study area. Mr. Prevost noted that any individual may nominate a property for listing in the NRHP and referred SAC members to a handout that outlines the procedures for doing so. (See Attachment B.) This handout also addresses the issue of federal or state designation for Newtown Creek. Barbara Mihelic, Noble Street Block Association, remarked that the reason for seeking protection for Newtown Creek is to ensure that project activities do not impact the wildlife that is starting to return to the area. Mr. Prevost confirmed that the DEIS will address this issue.

- Ms. Neuhaus reported that, in response to comments from Dolores Rizzotto, Queens CB #2, Robert Adams, NYSDOT, contacted Penny Lee, New York City Department of City Planning (NYCDCP) regarding an earlier plan for an esplanade in Queens. A meeting with Ms. Lee will be scheduled in the near future to discuss this issue.

- Following up on Ms. Mihelic’s suggestion to form an Environmental Enhancements Subcommittee, Ms. Neuhaus reported that the project team is recommending the formation of two subcommittees: 1) Waterfront and Environmental Enhancements and 2) Parks and Streetscape. Noting that these subcommittees will be formed at the October meeting, she
encouraged SAC members to consider joining one or both and to think about topics for discussion. Ms. Neuhaus added that the project team would also like to form an Open House Planning Subcommittee, which will assist in planning the Fall 2005 Public Open Houses. This was discussed in more depth later in the meeting.

**Update on DEIS Studies**

Mr. Prevost provided the following update:

- The project team continues to coordinate with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) and New York State Department of Environmental Conservation regarding dredging in Newtown Creek. NYSDOT has also held discussions with USCG regarding the height of any new structure.

- Soil and groundwater sampling has been conducted as part of the hazardous materials study. Water samples have also been collected from ExxonMobil’s existing monitoring wells. With this data in hand, the project team will have a better understanding of what to expect during excavation operations.

- Through inter-agency coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service, the project team has confirmed that there are no threatened or endangered species in the project area.

- Traffic and noise will be discussed at the October and November SAC meetings, respectively.

- With input from the Parks and Streetscape Subcommittee, the project team will start to explore mitigation measures for impacts to Sgt. William Dougherty Playground.

**DEIS Alternatives: Part I**

Using a PowerPoint presentation, Steve Bennett, Parsons, provided a recap of the six alternatives currently being studied in the DEIS. He noted that the descriptions of the alternatives were recently revised to better reflect the differentiation between them.

- No Build;
- RA-5: Rehabilitation with New Parallel Bridge on Eastbound Side;
- RA-6: Rehabilitation with New Parallel Bridge on Westbound Side;
- BR-2: Bridge Replacement with Permanent Eastbound Bridge and Temporary Westbound Bridge;
- BR-3: Bridge Replacement with Permanent Bridges on Both Eastbound and Westbound sides; and,
- BR-5: Bridge Replacement with Permanent Bridge on Eastbound Side.

Mr. Bennett then elaborated on the features of the build alternatives. All of the alternatives would add auxiliary lanes and allow rehabilitation or replacement without diverting traffic. All new bridges would have standard shoulders and sight distance and reduced grades. Non-standard shoulders and sight distance, along with steep grades, would remain on the existing bridge.

Mr. Bennett explained that the lane configurations are based on an examination of current merging and weaving conditions, existing and projected (2045) traffic volumes, and the results of an origin-
destination study. All of the build alternatives include a two-lane entrance ramp at Vandervoort Avenue. He then reviewed the lane configurations, including the existing and projected traffic volumes for each alternative. Mr. Bennett noted that, in general, adequate travel speed can be maintained with as many as 1,500 to 1,700 vehicles per hour in each lane. Higher traffic volumes result in congestion.

Discussing the configuration of a bikeway/walkway, Mr. Bennett indicated that this amenity would be located on the eastbound side of the new bridge under RA-5 and on the westbound side under BR-2, BR-3 and BR-5. The construction of a bikeway/walkway is unlikely under RA-6 because it would impact Calvary Cemetery on the westbound side and require an addition to the existing bridge on the eastbound side. Neither of these is practical.

Finally, Mr. Bennett explained that during the Alternatives Analysis process, the project team used the following assumptions when evaluating property acquisition and impacts: where the bridge is low, businesses would be displaced; where the bridge is higher, businesses would be disrupted. Based on these assumptions, the project team and SAC were able to differentiate between the alternatives. Because the alternatives lacked detail at that point, specific impacts could not be assessed. However, the locations of column foundations, and the resulting physical impacts, are now known.

Questions and comments raised during this portion of the meeting are summarized below:

■ In response to a question from Ms. Mihelic regarding feedback from area businesses, Mr. Bennett indicated that the project team has met with most of the impacted businesses.

■ Referring to RA-6, Gerald Esposito, Brooklyn CB #1, asked if the proposed configuration would prevent drivers entering at Meeker Avenue from accessing the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway (BQE). Mr. Bennett replied that it would not. In response to a second question from Mr. Esposito, it was noted that, in a few minutes, display boards would be presented that clearly show the point at which drivers could merge into BQE through lanes.

■ In response to a question from Mr. Ruzalski regarding the location of the westbound bikeway/walkway connection in Queens, Mr. Bennett suggested that it might connect to the existing pedestrian bridge over Laurel Hill Boulevard.

During the next portion of the meeting, SAC members informally reviewed the display boards, which show the highway alignment and property impacts of each alternative. A “DEIS Alternatives” booklet, which includes the alignments and information about property impacts, was distributed at this time.¹

DEIS Alternatives: Part II
After the SAC reconvened, Mr. Bennett continued the discussion of property impacts. Explaining that NYSDOT will only purchase the properties needed for the project, he added that in some cases, only a portion of the property will be acquired; this would allow the business to continue its

¹ Due to the bulk of the document, the full handout is not being included with the Minutes. Anyone wishing to obtain a copy of the full document may contact Ms. Neuhaus at (212) 532-4175.
operations. NYSDOT will also obtain easements, which will allow the Department to access certain properties for future maintenance (permanent easement) or construction (temporary easement). Mr. Bennett added that some businesses may face short-term disruption during construction.

He then reviewed the circumstances under which a property would be purchased: 1) superstructure interference with the building; 2) column foundation interference with the building; 3) realignment of local streets; or 4) inability of the business to operate due to the location of the permanent or temporary bridge. Mr. Bennett explained that NYSDOT will make every effort to minimize property acquisition. This will include overhead construction to reduce ground level interference and adjustment of column locations to avoid impacts, where possible. He added that it may be possible to further minimize impacts during final design.

Mr. Bennett stated that all of the build alternatives require the acquisition of a portion of Sgt. Dougherty Playground: RA-5 (21% of the playground); RA-6 (12%); BR-2 (16%); BR-3 (16%) and BR-5 (44%). All of the build alternatives also require relocation of the following businesses: Acme Steel Door & Hardware; Lee’s Stone Supply; Premier Poultry, Inc.; Karp Associates, Inc.; A. Haupt, Inc.; and Maharaja Foods. The acquisition of properties owned by John Brennan and Vivian Andruk would also be required. Additional businesses would be relocated under specific alternatives.

Mr. Bennett then explained NYSDOT’s acquisition policies and procedures:

- If a building (business or residence) is physically impacted, the property is purchased at fair market value, as determined by an independent appraiser.
- All property owners have the right to appeal the appraised value.
- NYSDOT is required to determine that there are suitable replacement properties available for businesses that must be relocated, and to identify suitable properties for residents who are displaced. Homeowners are reimbursed for moving costs and are not required to move until and unless comparable housing is identified. Businesses are reimbursed for moving and reestablishment costs.
- The owner of a commercial or industrial property may be able to retain the unaffected portion of his or her building. As an example, Mr. Bennett noted that the building currently occupied by Conch Umbrella was partially acquired for the original Kosciuszko Bridge construction.
- Property acquired under the bridge may be available for rental after construction.

Mr. Bennett stated that NYSDOT will obtain maintenance easements for 15’ on either side of the new bridge. The value of the easement will be determined by an independent appraiser; the owner has the right to appeal the assessed value of the easement. The property owner also has the right to continue using the property, with some restrictions. In a final comment, Mr. Bennett noted that impacts to Sgt. Dougherty Playground will be mitigated through the construction of comparable parkland.

Following the presentation, SAC members initiated a discussion regarding impacts to the three residential properties in Maspeth, Queens. In response to questions from Mr. Ruzalski and Anthony Nunziato, Maspeth Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Bennett stated that one residence would be acquired...
under Alternative BR-5. He confirmed that during Alternatives Analysis, the project team used a conservative “worst-case” approach when evaluating property impacts. At that time, it appeared that all three houses, which are owned by one family, would be taken. Now that the highway alignments are known, it has been determined that NYSDOT would only need to acquire the home closest to the bridge.

In response to further questions from Mr. Nunziato, Mr. Adams stated that the highway would move from 100' to within 20'-25' of the other two homes under BR-5. He noted that air quality and noise impacts will be studied in the DEIS. Mr. Nunziato asked if quality of life would also be considered. Mr. Bennett replied that there is no discretion in NYSDOT policy that would allow the Department to purchase property solely because of quality of life concerns. He added that the project team has met with the family and has maintained ongoing contact. Mr. Bennett indicated that if the environmental studies show a rationale for acquiring all three homes, full acquisition could be considered. Mr. Nunziato and Ms. Mihelic expressed their serious concern regarding the impacts on the remaining homes. Mr. Nunziato requested a copy of NYSDOT’s policy that prohibits the acquisition of property not physically impacted, suggesting that he would alert local elected officials to this policy.

Ms. Mihelic asked about the amount of encroachment allowed on a property before acquisition of the entire property (including the building) is required. Roy White, NYSDOT Real Estate Group, explained that a building would not be taken if the size of the remaining property is large enough to satisfy zoning laws. If the remaining lot is not large enough, NYSDOT would purchase the entire property.

Vincent Arcuri, Queens CB #5, observed that during certain condemnation proceedings, the city or state is able to declare an area blighted and compensate the property owners at a lower price. He expressed his concern that this might be the case with the residential properties in Queens. Mr. White reiterated that NYSDOT pays fair market value for all acquired properties. He added that if the value of the remaining property is significantly diminished by the project, it would be considered an “uneconomic remainder,” and NYSDOT would acquire the entire property.

Mr. White added that the issue of taking only one of the homes is not yet resolved. Ms. Neuhaus reiterated that discussions with the family are ongoing. She noted that the project team understands the family’s concerns and is trying to find a solution.

The following additional questions and comments were raised during the discussion period:

- In response to a question from Mr. Esposito, Mr. White explained that if only part of a building is needed, NYSDOT would pay for both the portion acquired and any resulting alterations to the building.

- Michael Vecchio, Emil Realty, asked what would happen if the market value offered by NYSDOT is not adequate to purchase a comparable property. Mr. White replied that a comparable property in the same area would most likely cost less than the Department’s compensation package.

- In response to questions from Mr. Vecchio, Mr. White explained that once NYSDOT acquires property it becomes the owner of that property. If there is property that is no longer needed
following project completion, it would be sold to the general public at auction. Because the original owner has already been fully compensated for the property, he or she would not be given the right of first refusal. Mr. White noted that the situation would be slightly different for property owners (such as the Queens family) who have lost a portion of their property; in that case the original owner would be given the opportunity to re-purchase the land. In response to a follow-up question from Mr. Arcuri, Mr. White stated that there might be a situation where NYSDOT would obtain a temporary easement for the use of an entire property, including demolition of the building. Following project completion, the property would revert to the owner, who could rebuild using the compensation paid for the easement.

Gus Amato, United Forties Civic Association, asked if an alternative has been selected. Mr. Bennett replied that the recommended alternative will be identified once all the DEIS studies have been completed.

Other Business
The following additional questions and comments were raised:

- Noting that the BQE, especially the westbound side, is in serious need of re-paving, Mr. Nunziato asked when this work might be done. Mr. Adams stated that NYSDOT’s Interim Deck Repair Project is currently underway. Work on the ramps has been completed. Work on the eastbound side of the highway is currently being done; the westbound side of the highway will be the last section to be re-paved. Ms. Gottlieb observed that NYSDOT’s crews did a good job on the ramps.

- Michael Lydon, business owner, asked if a barrier could be placed between Cherry Street and the eastbound entrance lanes to the BQE. Mr. Adams replied that because this relates to city streets, the project team would need to speak with a representative of the New York City Department of Transportation (NYCDOT).

- SAC members raised a number of issues related to other projects and local initiatives:
  - Mr. Nunziato asked if NYSDOT has discussed the issue of truck routes with NYCDOT. Noting that he is scheduled to meet with NYCDOT Commissioner Iris Weinshall next week, Mr. Nunziato urged NYSDOT to write a letter or call Commissioner Weinshall to urge adoption of the Maspeth Bypass Plan.
  
  - Ms. Cordero commented that the New York City Department of Sanitation’s Solid Waste Management Plan is moving forward and that the city is about to select alternatives for the siting of waste facilities in the area.

  - Mr. Nunziato expressed his view that the development of design plans for the Cross Harbor Freight Movement Project is a waste of money. Asserting that this project will have a major impact on the Kosciuszko Bridge Project, he asked why Queens and Brooklyn congressmembers have not attended SAC meetings and taken a stand against the Cross Harbor Project.
Anthony Parra, East Williamsburg Valley Industrial Development Corporation (EWVIDCO) reported that EWVIDCO is working with NYCDCP on a traffic study in Brooklyn’s industrial area and the surrounding neighborhoods.

Ms. Mihelic expressed concern that plans developed for the community often “sit on a shelf” and are not implemented. Ms. Cordero concurred, adding that local plans and studies are often developed without appropriate inter-agency coordination.

Laura Hofmann, Greenpoint Waterfront Association for Parks and Planning/Barge Park Pals, asked if any studies have been completed regarding the location of new parks. Mr. Adams replied that the first step in examining this issue was determining the highway alignments in order to identify land that might become available. Future steps will include discussions with the New York City Department of Parks and Recreation and the proposed SAC Parks and Streetscape Subcommittee. Mr. Arcuri encouraged SAC members to review the Alternatives handout and identify potential locations for new parks.

In response to a question from Mr. Nunziato, Mr. Adams indicated that property directly under the bridge in Queens is owned by NYSDOT and leased to the New York City Police Department for its impound lot. Mr. Nunziato expressed his interest in use of this area for a park.

In response to a question from Mr. Ruzalski, Mr. Bennett stated that American Compressed Gasses, located adjacent to the bridge in Queens, would not be affected by the project. Mr. Arcuri observed that this business should be relocated in light of homeland security concerns.

Fall 2005 Open Houses
Ms. Neuhaus noted that much information has been developed since the Fall 2004 Open Houses, including specific information on the alternatives and DEIS studies. She therefore suggested that two In-Progress Reviews (one each in Brooklyn and Queens) be scheduled to bring the community up-to-date. In response to a question from Ms. Mihelic, she stated that the project team would like an Open House Planning Subcommittee to assist it in finalizing plans for these forums. SAC members Mary Gottlieb, Laura and Mike Hofmann and Anthony Nunziato volunteered to serve on this subcommittee.

In further comments, Ms. Neuhaus indicated the following:

One of the ideas under consideration is an informal Open House with “stations” for attendees to view display boards and other project materials, and speak one-on-one with project team members. There would be no formal presentation.

Tentative dates are Wednesday, November 30th (Brooklyn) and Monday, December 5th or Wednesday, December 7th (Queens). Each Open House would run from 3 p.m.- 8 p.m.

St. Cecilia’s Roman Catholic Church is available for the Brooklyn Open House and has been reserved, pending SAC approval of the date. DeVry Institute in Long Island City is being considered for the Queens meeting. Mr. Ruzalski, Mr. Nunziato and Mr. Arcuri raised concerns about parking in the vicinity of DeVry and holiday-related conflicts with the
proposed Queens dates. In response to a suggestion to consider Martin Luther High School, Ms. Neuhaus pointed out that it would be difficult to use any school because of the early start time of the Open Houses. Mr. Nunziato offered to investigate other meeting locations. (Subsequent to the SAC meeting, it was decided that the Queens Open House will be held on Monday, December 5th at Martin Luther High School.)

The next meeting is scheduled for **Thursday, October 20th, 6:30 p.m. at Jennings Hall, 260 Powers Street, Brooklyn.**

Follow-up Items


2) Investigate sites for Queens Open House. Responsibility: HNA.

3) Set meeting date for Open House Planning Subcommittee; notify subcommittee members. Responsibility: HNA.

4) Arrange meeting with Penny Lee, NYCDCP, regarding previous plan for a Brooklyn-Queens esplanade. Responsibility: NYSDOT.

5) Obtain copy of Maspeth Bypass Plan from Anthony Nunziato. Responsibility: NYSDOT.

6) Provide Anthony Nunziato with a copy of the NYSDOT policy related to acquisition of private property. Responsibility: NYSDOT.

7) Establish two subcommittees (Waterfront and Environmental Enhancements; Parks and Streetscape) at the October SAC meeting. Responsibility: Project Team.
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Introduction

At the June 2005 SAC Meeting, a question was raised about the eligibility of St. Cecilia’s Roman Catholic Church and St. Stanislaus Kostka Church for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Because of the distance of these facilities from the limits of the Kosciusko Bridge Project, there is no potential for direct or indirect impacts due to any of the alternatives under consideration. Therefore these sites will not be evaluated for their historic significance in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

While the churches are not currently on the NRHP, a group or individual may nominate a site for the National Register. The information below provides some guidance on the nomination requirements and process should members of the community wish to pursue designation of these churches, or any other site.

What Can Qualify for Listing in the National Register of Historic Places?

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to expand and maintain a NRHP, composed of districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture. Resources must be man-made or man-manipulated to be considered eligible.

Categories of NRHP-eligible resources have been defined by the National Park Service as follows:

- **District**: A district possesses a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of sites, buildings, structures, or objects united historically or aesthetically by plan or physical development. Examples: college campuses; central business districts; residential areas; commercial areas; large forts; industrial complexes; civic centers; rural villages; canal systems; collections of habitation and limited activity sites; irrigation systems; large farms, ranches, estates, or plantations; transportation networks; and large landscaped parks.

- **Site**: A site is the location of a significant event, occupation or activity, or a building or structure, whether standing, ruined, or vanished, where the location itself possesses historic, cultural, or archaeological value regardless of the value of any existing structure. Examples: habitation sites, funerary sites; rock shelters; village sites; hunting and fishing sites; ceremonial sites; petroglyphs (prehistoric drawings or rock carvings); gardens; battlefields; ruins of historic buildings and
structures; campsites; sites of treaty signing; trails; areas of land; shipwrecks; cemeteries; designed landscapes; and natural features, such as springs, rock formations, and land areas having cultural significance.

In order for a natural feature, such as Newtown Creek, to be eligible for the NRHP, there must be some cultural significance directly associated with that feature. For example, a rock formation where sacred Native American ceremonies were performed or where an important event like the signing of a treaty occurred could potentially be eligible. Without a direct, specific cultural connection, however, natural features do not qualify for listing in the NRHP. Neither Newtown Creek as a whole nor any specific location along the creek has this connection. The US Environmental Protection Agency does have a program called the American Heritage Rivers Initiative, which helps designated river communities that seek federal assistance and other resources to meet difficult challenges. However, the Hudson River is the only designated American Heritage River in New York State.

- **Building**: A building, such as a house, barn, church, hotel, or similar construction, is created principally to shelter any form of human activity. "Building" may also be used to refer to a historically and functionally related unit, such as a courthouse and a jail or a house and a barn. Examples: Houses; barns; stables; sheds; garages; courthouses; city halls; social halls; commercial buildings; libraries; factories; mills; train depots; stationary mobile homes; hotels; theaters; schools; stores; and churches. The National Register has a specific “criteria consideration” related to the listing of religious properties, namely that the property “[derive its] primary significance from architectural or artistic distinction or historical importance.”

- **Structure**: The term "structure" is used to distinguish those functional constructions made usually for purposes other than creating human shelter. Examples: bridges; tunnels; gold dredges; fire towers; canals; turbines; dams; power plants; corncribs; silos; roadways; shot tower; windmills; grain elevators; kilns; mounds; cairns; palisade fortifications; earthworks; railroad grades; systems of roadways and paths; boats and ships; railroad locomotives and cars; telescopes; carousels; bandstands; gazebos; and aircraft.

- **Object**: The term "object" is used to distinguish those constructions that are primarily artistic in nature or are relatively small in scale and simply constructed. Although it may be, by nature or design, movable, an object is associated with a specific setting or environment. Examples: sculpture; monuments; boundary markers; statuary; and foundations.

**What is the Process for Nominating a Property for the New York State Register and National Register of Historic Places?**

Anyone may nominate a property for the New York State and National Registers. Proposal of a property is a cooperative effort between the sponsor – most often the owner of the property – and the staff of the New York State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO).

A sponsor may initiate the nomination process by submitting a State and National Registers Program Applicant Form and a Historic Resource Inventory Form and/or other explanatory materials to the State Historic Preservation Office. These materials will be evaluated by the staff of the Survey and National Register Unit using the National Register of Historic Places Criteria for Evaluation and other guidelines published by the National Park Service.

Proposals that appear to meet the criteria for listing are assigned to staff for further development on the basis of current preservation priorities. In most instances, staff site inspections will be required in order to
develop a more in-depth understanding of the historic property and its documentation requirements prior
to the preparation of a National Register Nomination Form. Preparing this form and the required research,
maps, photographs, and other attachments is primarily the responsibility of the sponsor working closely
with a National Register staff member. In some cases, staff may be able to assist with portions of this
work, particularly for high priority projects in communities with limited resources. In other instances, it
may be appropriate to consider contracting with private historic preservation consultants to develop the
nomination information.

Upon receipt of the nomination, SHPO gathers comments from the owner(s) and local officials, and
schedules a review by the New York State Board for Historic Preservation. If recommended, the
nomination form is finalized and forwarded to the State Historic Preservation Officer for review and
signature. Once signed, the nomination is entered on the New York State Register of Historic Places and
transmitted to the National Park Service where it is nominated to the National Register of Historic Places.
If approved by the Keeper of the Register, the nomination is signed and listed on the National Register.
The National Park Service will not place an individual, privately owned property on the National Register
if its owner objects or if a majority of private property owners object to the proposed listing of a
nomination containing multiple owners.

For more information:

National Park Service. “Listing a Property: What is the Process?” Available online at

New York State Historic Preservation Office, online at: http://nysparks.state.ny.us/shpo/.


of the law is available online at: http://www.achp.gov/NHPA.pdf.

US Environmental Protection Agency’s American Heritage Rivers Initiative, online at
http://www.epa.gov/rivers/.
After extensive study, the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) is pleased to present to the Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC) this booklet describing the alternatives under evaluation in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The selection of these alternatives for study in the DEIS is the result of over three years of cooperation with the SAC throughout the project scoping and Alternatives Analysis process, through which a Long List of 26 alternatives was developed and narrowed to the following six alternatives:

- **No Build Alternative**
- **RA-5:** Rehabilitation with New Parallel Bridge on Eastbound Side
- **RA-6:** Rehabilitation with New Parallel Bridge on Westbound Side
- **BR-2:** Bridge Replacement with Permanent Eastbound Bridge and Temporary Westbound Bridge
- **BR-3:** Bridge Replacement with Permanent Bridges on Both Eastbound and Westbound Sides
- **BR-5:** Bridge Replacement with Permanent Bridge on Eastbound Side

This booklet contains, for each alternative a Striping Plan and a Business and Residential Relocation Plan. The Striping Plan shows how the alternative will operate from a vehicular perspective, such as the number of lanes and connections to local streets and the Long Island Expressway. The Business and Residential Relocation Plan shows the footprint of both the highway structure and the foundations necessary to support the structure. Both of these plans also indicate where modifications to the local street system will be necessary.

### Business and Residential Impacts

In Level 1 and Level 2 Screening, impacts were estimated using an approach that differentiated between alternatives that were not fully developed. In areas where the bridge was low (near the ramps in Brooklyn and Queens), anytime a structure crossed a property line, the entire property was assumed to be acquired. Where the bridge was higher, it was assumed that businesses would be temporarily impacted, requiring them to close their operations while certain activities were occurring overhead. Neither of the screening-level analyses attempted to estimate the location or size of column foundations. Instead, Level 2 Screening included a criterion that estimated the number of columns that would be required. The more columns an alternative required, the lower the score it received on that criterion.

With the more advanced engineering studies that have been conducted over the last year, the Project Team has been able to estimate the size and location of these column foundations as well as the vertical clearance under the proposed structures. This has allowed us to more accurately estimate the impacts of each alternative on private property. For the purposes of the DEIS, the following NYSDOT policies were applied to estimate impacts:

- Where a foundation physically impacted a building, the entire property was assumed to be acquired and the business or residents relocated.
- Where an elevated structure physically conflicted with the building (i.e. there was not enough clearance under the bridge for the building to remain) the entire property was assumed to be acquired and the business or residents relocated.
- Where a foundation or ramp structure required the use of undeveloped property (e.g. parking or storage areas) only the portion of the property necessary for construction was assumed to be acquired; that is, the business could continue to operate, except for the use of that area while the foundation was under construction. In the handful of cases where the acquisition of undeveloped land would make a property unusable by a business, the business was considered relocated.
- Areas where the bridge crosses over private property, but does not physically conflict with any buildings, and does not require any construction activities on the ground, NYSDOT would acquire the property, but the business may remain.

### NYSDOT would also acquire permanent and temporary easements where necessary for construction and for maintenance of the bridge in the future.

Based on these guidelines, the Project Team has estimated the impact of each of the alternatives on businesses and residences. The acquisition of undeveloped portions of property and both permanent and temporary easements can be discussed with the Project Team on an individual basis and will be described in detail in the DEIS. The table below presents the business and residential impacts of each alternative. The number of employees for each business is based on surveys conducted with each business, where available; where this information was not available, the Project Team used a combination of Dun & Bradstreet data and generic employment factors based on square footage and use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business/Residence</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th># Employees</th>
<th>RA-5</th>
<th>RA-6</th>
<th>BR-2</th>
<th>BR-3</th>
<th>BR-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Haupt Inc/Mahtaja Foods</td>
<td>54-30 43rd Street</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acme Steel Door &amp; Hardware</td>
<td>513 Porter Avenue</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astoria Carling</td>
<td>538-42 Stewart Avenue</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn Processing</td>
<td>30 Thomas Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Harbors Environmental Services</td>
<td>541 Gardner Avenue</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conch Umbrellas</td>
<td>810 Meeker Avenue</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Flowers / EZ Flowers</td>
<td>140 Cherry Street</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Sanitation (property owner)</td>
<td>116 Cherry Street</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IESI</td>
<td>Stewart Avenue @ Cherry Street</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Brennan (property owner)</td>
<td>54 Drive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karp Associates Inc.</td>
<td>54-54 43rd Street</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leed's Stone Supply</td>
<td>66 Cherry Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLI Transport</td>
<td>75 Thomas Street</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marty Building Supply</td>
<td>850 Meeker Avenue</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>814-36 Meeker Avenue</td>
<td>814-36 Meeker Avenue</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller Method LLC / Akiyama / Green Lake Produce and Seafood</td>
<td>54-14 43rd Street</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier Poultry Inc.</td>
<td>64 Cherry Street</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincertty Noodles / Sino Trading</td>
<td>27-35 Anthony Street</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade Contracting Company Inc. / Win Sing Trading</td>
<td>530-32 Gardner Avenue</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivian Andruk (property owner)</td>
<td>54 Avenue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Management</td>
<td>546 Gardner Avenue</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>42-21 54th Drive</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUSINESSES RELOCATED</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYEES AFFECTED</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| RESIDENCES RELOCATED | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
ALTERNATIVE RA-5

Rehabilitation with New Parallel Bridge on Eastbound Side

RA-5 STRIPING PLAN
ALTERNATIVE RA-5

Rehabilitation with New Parallel Bridge on Eastbound Side
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ALTERNATIVE RA-5
Rehabilitation with New Parallel Bridge on Eastbound Side
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TEMPORARY BRIDGE
ALTERNATIVE RA-5
Rehabilitation with New Parallel Bridge on Eastbound Side

Existing Bridge

Stage 1
- Construct new 3-lane bridge on EB side of existing bridge
- New bridge approximately 35 feet lower than existing bridge

Stage 2
- Shift traffic to new structure and rehabilitate EB section of existing bridge

Stage 3
- Rehabilitate WB section of existing bridge

Final Lane Configuration
- Restripe existing structure for 4WB/2-3EB lane configuration
- New bridge approximately 35 feet lower than existing bridge
ALTERNATIVE RA-6
Rehabilitation with New Parallel Bridge on Westbound Side
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Rehabilitation with New Parallel Bridge on Westbound Side

Queens
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**ALTERNATIVE RA-6**
Rehabilitation with New Parallel Bridge on Westbound Side

**Existing Bridge**

**Stage 1**
- Construct new 3-lane bridge on WB side of existing bridge
- New bridge approximately 35 feet lower than existing bridge

**Stage 2**
- Shift traffic to new structure and rehabilitate WB section of existing bridge

**Stage 3**
- Rehabilitate EB section of existing bridge

**Final Lane Configuration**
- Restripe existing structure for 3-2WB/4EB lane configuration
- New bridge approximately 35 feet lower than existing bridge
ALTERNATIVE BR-2
Bridge Replacement with Permanent Eastbound Bridge and Temporary Westbound Bridge
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ALTERNATIVE BR-2
Bridge Replacement with Permanent
Eastbound Bridge and Temporary Westbound Bridge

Queens
ALTERNATIVE BR-2

Bridge Replacement with Permanent Eastbound Bridge and Temporary Westbound Bridge

BR-2 BUSINESS AND RESIDENTIAL RELOCATION
ALTERNATIVE BR-2  Bridge Replacement with Permanent
Eastbound Bridge and Temporary Westbound Bridge

Queens
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ALTERNATIVE BR-2
Bridge Replacement with Permanent Eastbound Bridge and Temporary Westbound Bridge

Existing Bridge

Stage 1
- Construct two 3-lane bridges (WB temporary, EB permanent) to either side of existing bridge
- New bridges approximately 35 feet lower than existing bridge

Stage 2
- Shift traffic to new structures and demolish existing bridge

Stage 3
- Construct remaining portion of new permanent bridge

Stage 4
- Demolish temporary bridge
- Restripe for 4WB /2-3EB lane configuration

Stage 5
- Widen WB structure for bikeway/walkway

Final Lane Configuration
- 4WB /2-3EB lane configuration
- Approximately 35 feet lower than existing bridge
ALTERNATIVE BR-3
Bridge Replacement with Permanent
Bridge on Both Eastbound and Westbound Sides
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ALTERNATIVE BR-3
Bridge Replacement with Permanent Bridge on Both Eastbound and Westbound Sides
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ALTERNATIVE BR-3
Bridge Replacement with Permanent Bridge on Both Eastbound and Westbound Sides
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Haupt Inc. / Maharaja Foods
John Brennan
Karp Associates

RAMP FROM EB LIE

RAMP FROM 43RD ST.
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RAMP TO EB LIE
**ALTERNATIVE BR-3**  
Bridge Replacement with Permanent Bridges on Both Eastbound and Westbound Sides

### Existing Bridge

![Diagram of Existing Bridge]

### Stage 1
- Construct two new 3-lane bridges on EB and WB sides of existing bridge
- New bridges approximately 35 feet lower than existing bridge

![Diagram of Stage 1]

### Stage 2
- Shift traffic to new structures and demolish existing bridge

![Diagram of Stage 2]

### Stage 3
- Construct remaining portion of new permanent bridges

![Diagram of Stage 3]

### Final Lane Configuration
- 4WB /2-3EB lane configuration
- Approximately 35 feet lower than existing bridge

![Diagram of Final Lane Configuration]
ALTERNATIVE BR-5

Bridge Replacement with Permanent Bridge on Eastbound Side

BR-5 STRIPING PLAN
ALTERNATIVE BR-5
Bridge Replacement with Permanent Bridge on Eastbound Side

Queens

NEWTOWN CREEK

CAVALRY CEMETERY
ALTERNATIVE BR-5
Bridge Replacement with Permanent Bridge on Eastbound Side

Existing Bridge

Stage 1
- Construct two new bridges on EB side of existing bridge
- New bridges approximately 35 feet lower than existing bridge

Stage 2
- Shift traffic to new structures and demolish existing bridge

Stage 3
- Construct new bridge in footprint of existing bridge

Final Lane Configuration
- Restripe roadway for 4WB/2-3EB lane configuration
- Approximately 35 feet lower than existing bridge
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WORK AREA

WORK AREA

Existing Bridge Width

39.1'
NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
KOSCIUSZKO BRIDGE PROJECT
STAKEHOLDERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE: OCTOBER 20, 2005

Minutes

The 25th meeting of the New York State Department of Transportation’s (NYSDOT) Kosciuszko Bridge Project Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC) was held on Thursday, October 20, 2005 at Jennings Hall, Brooklyn. (See Attachment A for Attendance List.) The meeting was scheduled to present the results of the traffic studies prepared for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).

Helen Neuhaus, Helen Neuhaus & Associates (HNA), opened the meeting by introducing Chris Gatchell, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Lauren Shurtleff, a new staff member at HNA. Ms. Neuhaus then asked for comments on the Minutes of the September 22, 2005 meeting. Following adoption of the Minutes without comment, Ms. Neuhaus facilitated a discussion of Old Business items.

The first issue related to the upcoming Open Houses. Ms. Neuhaus reported that the Brooklyn Open House will be held on Wednesday, November 30, 2005 from 3:00 p.m to 8:00 p.m. at St. Cecilia’s Church. The Queens Open House will be held on Monday, December 5, 2005 from 3:00 p.m to 8:00 p.m. at Martin Luther High School. Michael Hofmann, Greenpoint Waterfront Association for Parks and Planning, then provided a brief synopsis of the Open Houses Subcommittee meeting that was held immediately before the SAC meeting.

Mr. Hofmann explained that the Open Houses will feature stations that will allow the public to view displays and speak with project team members. In addition to an area set aside for welcome, sign-in and background information, proposed stations will focus on the alternative alignments, results of the traffic analyses, visualizations of alternatives, the DEIS studies, and community, agency and business outreach. He emphasized the need for SAC members to be involved in staffing the stations and answering questions. Mr. Hofmann also noted the importance of making the Open Houses visually dynamic for the public. This will include showing traffic simulations, as well as visualizations of the alternatives from different perspectives. He suggested scheduling an additional SAC meeting prior to the first Open House, if the visualizations are not ready for the SAC’s review at its next regular meeting. Steve Bennett, Parsons, indicated that the simulations should be completed in time for the November meeting. If they are not ready, an additional SAC meeting may be scheduled for November 28th or 29th. In a final comment, Mr. Hofmann noted that SAC members will be provided with flyers to distribute throughout their neighborhoods, adding that a flyer request sheet is being circulated tonight.

Vincent Arcuri, Queens Community Board (CB) #5, asked if flythroughs of all five build alternatives will be presented as 3D visualizations at the Open Houses. After noting that all five may not be prepared by late November, Mr. Bennett emphasized that, from a visual standpoint, several of the alternatives are very similar.

Christine Holowacz, Greenpoint Property Owners Association/St. Cecilia’s Church, requested that next month’s SAC meeting be moved from Thursday, November 17th to Wednesday, November 16th, due to a scheduling conflict that would prevent many SAC members from attending. After determining that the change in date works for the majority of SAC members
present, Ms. Neuhaus indicated that HNA will reschedule the meeting and attempt to reserve Jennings Hall.

- Following up on a suggestion by Dolores Rizzotto, Queens CB #2, that NYSDOT contact the New York City Department of City Planning (NYCDCP) regarding the creation of an open space area or promenade along Newtown Creek, Robert Adams, NYSDOT, met with Penny Lee, NYCDCP. Mr. Adams indicated that NYCDCP is interested in creating such an area, but that the timeframes of the two projects make it unlikely that they can be coordinated.

- In response to a question from Barbara Mihelic, Noble Street Block Association, regarding the New York City Percent for Art program, it was noted that the Kosciuszko Bridge Project is not eligible for Percent for Art funding, since it is not a city project.

- Ms. Neuhaus announced that an Inter-Agency Advisory Committee meeting will be held on November 10th at 10:00 a.m. and that invitation letters were sent out earlier today.

Update on DEIS Studies

Dan Prevost, Parsons, reported that over the past month, the project team has been busy analyzing the results of the traffic studies in preparation for tonight’s presentation. Noise and air forecasting will be among the next activities; the results of noise analyses will be presented at the November SAC meeting.

Results of Traffic Analyses: Part I

Using a PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Prevost provided a recap of information presented to the SAC during the Alternatives Analysis phase. He noted that during Level 2 screening, the purpose of conducting traffic studies was to differentiate between the alternatives. Because the traffic analysis network and level of detail were limited, the studies only provided preliminary results. However, these results included data on average speed and number of potential diversions, which were the criteria used during Level 2 screening. Mr. Prevost reminded the SAC that the primary traffic study area boundaries are the Long Island Expressway (LIE), Grand Street/Grand Avenue and the East River. The secondary study area extends to Queens Boulevard and Flushing Avenue.

Mr. Prevost then emphasized that the purpose of the DEIS traffic analyses is to identify traffic congestion and operational problems and to improve the alternatives in order to mitigate the problems. He explained that, while the Level 2 analysis used an annual growth factor of 0.5% per year to forecast future traffic demand, the DEIS analysis used the Best Practice Model (BPM), the FHWA-approved regional model for downstate New York. For the Kosciuszko Bridge Project, the BPM was used to forecast traffic growth for 28 counties in New York, New Jersey and Connecticut. Mr. Prevost commented that because the BPM is regional rather than local, it does not look at specific operations on local roads. In order to provide local forecasting, a subarea model that focuses on a portion of the BPM was developed. The subarea traffic network included the roads shown in the BPM, along with all of the major streets in the Kosciuszko Bridge Project secondary traffic study area. This allowed the project team to examine anticipated traffic patterns in the study area.

Mr. Prevost also discussed another software program, VISSIM, which uses output from the BPM to examine traffic operations at the local level. VISSIM takes into account interactions between vehicles, vehicle classifications (i.e. car, bus, truck), driver behavior, and roadway characteristics (i.e. lane widths and grades). The data generated by VISSIM provides traffic engineers with the data they need
to analyze operations. It also produces realistic simulations that allow both engineers and the general public to visualize traffic operations. Noting that VISSIM was used during Level 2 screening, Mr. Prevost explained that additional streets were added for the DEIS analyses, including the LIE interchange, Vandervoort Avenue and other adjacent roadways. He then showed a chart comparing current traffic volume and future (2045) traffic volume under the No Build alternative in the morning and evening peak hours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUTURE NO BUILD CONDITIONS (2045)</th>
<th>BQE Traffic Volume (At the Main Span of the Bridge)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM Peak Hour</td>
<td>PM Peak Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>4660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>4990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commenting that the increase in traffic volume appears to be minor, Mr. Prevost explained that a highway can only carry a certain amount of traffic, which is known as capacity. At this time, and in the future, the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway (BQE) will be operating at capacity. Therefore, as demand for travel continues to grow, drivers will need to find another mode of transportation, another route, or travel at a different time of day.

Mr. Prevost also presented a chart showing average speed under existing conditions and under the future (2045) No Build condition. He observed that even though traffic volume does not significantly increase, traffic is projected to slow considerably by 2045. Mr. Prevost remarked that when a roadway is at or near capacity, even small increases in volume can have a significant impact on speed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUTURE (2045) NO BUILD CONDITIONS</th>
<th>Average Speed on BQE (MPH) (McGuiness Boulevard to LIE Interchange)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM Peak Hour</td>
<td>PM Peak Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Prevost then discussed several other findings from the traffic analyses:

- **Effect of roadway geometry on highway operations.** Not surprisingly, steep grades, nonstandard sight distance and shoulders, and insufficient acceleration lanes on the Kosciuszko Bridge affect traffic on the BQE.

- **Accidents and Safety.** A review of accident records in the project area between 1999 and 2001 showed the following:
  - On the eastbound BQE, nine of the 18 locations examined showed accident rates above the statewide average. Of these, three locations had accident rates of more than four times the statewide average; five locations showed accident rates at two to four times the statewide average.
- On the westbound BQE, 11 of the 17 locations showed accident rates above the statewide average. Of these, three locations had accident rates of more than four times the statewide average; one location showed accident rates at two to four times the statewide average.
- In both directions, the areas with the highest accident rates tended to be near the ramp merge areas and at the crest of the bridge where sight distance is non-standard.
- All of the ramp areas (both entrance and exit) had accident rates higher than the statewide average. Five of the seven locations showed accident rates of more than four times the average. This is presumably related to congestion and short merge areas.
- Almost every intersection along Meeker Avenue had accident rates above the statewide average. Of the 19 intersections studied, 10 showed rates four times the statewide average and five showed rates two to four times the average. This is primarily attributable to severe congestion, the number and nature of turning movements, and the high volume of truck traffic.

- **Projected changes in regional traffic patterns.** Mr. Prevost reported that the BPM model projected that some of the vehicles currently using the Williamsburg Bridge and the BQE to access the LIE interchange would shift to the Queens Midtown Tunnel. These projections take into account congestion on the BQE, as well as changes in trip patterns due to land use changes.

  The BPM model also projected that, at the Vandervoort Avenue entrance ramp, where one-third of drivers currently continue to the eastbound BQE, 2/3 of the vehicles will continue to the eastbound BQE in 2045. Land use changes are a factor in this projected shift. In response to the anticipated changes in traffic patterns, the configuration of the build alternatives has been altered slightly in the area of the LIE interchange. In the existing configuration, the loop on-ramp from the LIE becomes the third BQE lane when it meets the traffic coming from the Kosciuszko Bridge. In the proposed configuration, the Kosciuszko Bridge traffic will have three lanes and traffic on the loop on-ramp will have an acceleration lane and merge into the three BQE lanes.

- **Severely congested segments of the BQE.** Under existing conditions during the morning peak hour (6:45 a.m.–7:45 a.m.), there is severe congestion in the eastbound direction just past the on-ramp; in the westbound direction, severe congestion occurs as traffic approaches the merge area in the segment before the exit ramp. Under the No Build alternative in 2045, congestion is projected to increase during the a.m. peak hour. During the evening peak hour (4:45 p.m.–5:45 p.m.), there is already severe congestion on nearly every segment of the BQE within the study area. In 2045, under the No Build alternative, congestion is expected to worsen slightly.

The following questions and comments were raised during Mr. Prevost’s presentation:

- SAC members expressed doubt about the projected traffic shift from the Williamsburg Bridge to the Queens Midtown Tunnel. They cited tunnel tolls as one reason for questioning this projected change in traffic patterns.

- Anthony Nunziato, Maspeth Chamber of Commerce, expressed his opinion that accidents occurring at the crest of the bridge result from the short merge lane rather than the limited sight distance. He added that he believes that accident records would show that most of the cars have been sideswiped, rather than rear-ended. Ms. Gottlieb observed that accidents also result from trucks traveling westbound down the hill from the bridge at high speeds.
Michael Rossmy, Brooklyn Borough President’s Office, asked why the crest of the hill on the Kosciuszko Bridge has a high accident rate while a similar crest on the Gowanus Expressway has a low accident rate. Frank Catalanotto, Parsons, cited several conditions present on the Kosciuszko Bridge but not the Gowanus Expressway, including lane reduction (four lanes to three); merging traffic; the steep grade; and relatively faster moving traffic. In response to a follow-up question from Mr. Rossmy, Mr. Catalanotto replied that a number of features have been included in the build alternatives to reduce the accident rate. These include lower grades, smoother curves, shoulders, and longer merge/weave lanes.

Alison Cordero, OUTRAGE, asked if the BPM accounted for traffic pattern changes for sanitation trucks. She noted that a sanitation garage currently located on Kent Avenue is moving to Varick Street, a new New York City Department of Sanitation (DSNY) facility has been built on Review Avenue in Queens, and DSNY is considering two options for the location of another facility. Mr. Catalanotto stated that all of the known projects were included in the BPM. Ms. Neuhaus indicated that the project team could forward a list of planned developments used in the DEIS traffic studies to Ms. Cordero. In response to a request from Ms. Mihelic, Ms. Neuhaus agreed to include the list with the SAC Minutes. (See Attachment B.)

Mr. Nunziato asked if the VISSIM model included data from the Cross Harbor Freight Movement Project, and if so, what numbers were used. Mr. Catalanotto stated that the project team used data from the Cross Harbor Project’s DEIS. Mr. Nunziato expressed his opinion that these numbers are “not real.”

Ms. Gottlieb questioned the time selected for the peak hour, noting that she has observed the heaviest traffic after 8:00 a.m. Mr. Prevost replied that the peak hour designations are based on Automatic Traffic Recorder (ATR) counts taken at specific points over a two-week period. Acknowledging that traffic can be very heavy at times other than the peak hour, Mr. Bennett expressed confidence in the data used.

In response to a question from Mr. Rossmy, Nelson Ines, Parsons, explained that the areas of severe congestion shown earlier were identified on the basis of speed.

Results of Traffic Analyses: Part II
Mr. Bennett began with a recap of the six alternatives being studied in the DEIS (No Build, two rehabilitation with auxiliary lanes, and three bridge replacement). He also briefly reviewed one of the project goals (Improve mobility, safety, and access within the study area) and its objectives (Improve traffic operations; reduce traffic accidents; minimize traffic diversion to local streets and improve opportunities for pedestrian and bicycle travel). Mr. Bennett explained that Measures of Effectiveness (MOE) are used to evaluate how well each alternative meets the goals and objectives.

The MOEs used for the Kosciuszko Bridge Project are:
- Improve Traffic Operations, as measured in:
  - Average travel speed
  - Total delay (additional travel time)
  - Throughput (the number of vehicles that can travel a specific distance within a given time period. In this case, throughput was measured on the main span of the Kosciuszko Bridge.)
• **Reduce Traffic Accidents**
  Mr. Bennett noted that while it is not possible to predict accidents, it is possible to evaluate contributing factors. These are:
  - Frequency of lane changes
  - Number of stops

• **Minimize traffic diversion to local streets**
  Mr. Bennett explained that potential diversions were measured during Level 2 screening by comparing the projected number of vehicles that would want to use the highway in 2045 with the capacity of each alternative. The difference represented the number of potential diversions. He noted that because the BPM incorporates diversions into its modeling, there is no way to measure the numbers of diversions. It is, however, possible to estimate major sources of diversion such as incidents and lane closures. These can be reduced by improving safety and adding shoulders to the highway. Using a basic scoring system, Mr. Bennett showed how each alternative would perform in terms of number of stops, lane changes and the addition of shoulders. The alternatives that scored the best were RA-5, BR-2, BR-3 and BR-5.

• **Improve opportunities for pedestrian and bicycle travel**
  - Non-motorized accessibility
  Mr. Bennett noted that the MOEs for non-motorized accessibility consisted of an evaluation of the feasibility of including a bikeway/walkway on the bridge. As discussed at the September 2005 SAC meeting, a bikeway/walkway could be located on the new bridge under RA-5, BR-2, BR-3 and BR-5. The construction of a bikeway/walkway is unlikely under RA-6 because it would impact Calvary Cemetery on the westbound side and require an addition to the existing bridge on the eastbound side, which would be costly and impractical.

Following his explanation of the MOEs, Mr. Bennett presented a series of graphs that illustrated average travel speed, total delay, throughput, number of stops and number of lane changes for each of the alternatives. In most cases, alternatives RA-5, BR-2, BR-3 and BR-5 performed better than the No Build or RA-6. (See Attachment C for details.)

Finally, Mr. Bennett presented a two-dimensional simulation of traffic conditions at four locations (area of the on-ramps to BQE in Brooklyn; just past the on-ramps going toward the main span; near the LIE interchange; and on Meeker Avenue). For each location, the simulation showed existing conditions (2002), 2045 No Build, 2045 Alternative RA-6 and 2045 Alternative BR-3. He explained that because most of the build alternatives operate in essentially the same way, BR-3 would be used as a representative build alternative. The exception is RA-6, which has a significantly different lane configuration from the other build alternatives. Mr. Bennett noted that while the traffic analysis was performed over many hours, the simulation covers just a brief time period.

In a final comment, Mr. Bennett indicated that the traffic studies are one piece in the puzzle leading to a selected alternative. Other factors will include environmental and community impacts, along with cost.

Following Mr. Bennett’s presentation, Mr. Rossmy raised several questions. In response, Mr. Bennett indicated that the project team will still be in the process of completing the DEIS studies at the time of the fall Open Houses. Mr. Adams noted that the recommended alternative will be included in the DEIS, which is scheduled for publication in the spring of 2006. It was also confirmed that the DEIS will be discussed with the SAC prior to its release to the general public. Mr. Rossmy observed that
since there will be significant differences in construction costs between the alternatives, the DEIS will need to look at the trade-offs. Mr. Bennett replied that a matrix would probably be used to compare the impacts of the alternatives.

**New Business:**
Ms. Neuhaus facilitated a discussion of the formation of two SAC subcommittees: Waterfront and Environmental Enhancements and Parks and Streetscapes. After asking if there were any volunteers for either of the subcommittees, she emphasized that participation on each committee would require a significant time commitment. She also indicated that the first meetings could take place as early as November. Ms. Holowacz and Ms. Mihelic suggested that the two subcommittees be combined, since they are similar and several people expressed interest in serving on both. After a brief discussion, consensus was reached that only one subcommittee would be established, with the following members: Gus Amato and Joe Ruzalski, United Forties Civic Association; Mary Gottlieb, Meeker Avenue/Apollo Street Association; Laura Hofmann, Greenpoint Waterfront Association for Parks and Planning/Barge Park Pals; Ms. Holowacz; Ms. Mihelic; and Mr. Nunziato. Ms. Neuhaus also suggested that Neal Kronley, New York City Council Waterfronts Committee, be contacted about serving on the subcommittee. She stated that she would be in touch with subcommittee members shortly regarding the first meeting.

**Update on Related Projects / Meetings**
SAC members raised a number of issues related to other projects and local initiatives:

- Mr. Nunziato asked if the Grand Street Bridge would be rebuilt before the start of Kosciuszko Bridge construction. He emphasized that it is necessary to pressure the New York City Department of Transportation (NYCDOT) to get the project done. Mr. Arcuri reported that during his meeting with NYCDOT representatives in Queens, there was general agreement that reconstruction of the Grand Street Bridge should begin by 2009. However, since the bridge is currently being redesigned, the construction start date will likely be pushed back as far as 2013. Mr. Adams remarked that the upcoming IAAC meeting would be a good time to raise this issue.

- Mr. Nunziato reported that he recently met with Commissioner Iris Weinshall, NYCDOT, who assured him that Grand Avenue would no longer be used as a truck route and that the Maspeth Bypass Plan would be implemented by the end of the year.

- Mr. Arcuri indicated that he will be meeting with the Metropolitan Transportation Authority/New York City Transit Authority to discuss which buses will be housed in the Grand Avenue Garage, as well as which bus routes would be servicing the area both before and after the Grand Street Bridge is rebuilt.

- Ms. Mihelic and Ms. Gottlieb raised several concerns related to the Kosciuszko Bridge Interim Deck Repair Project, including the presence of workers who are noisy, park in front of residential buildings, and leave substantial amounts of trash. They also questioned the lag time between periods of work and requested a work schedule. In addition, Ms. Gottlieb asked if action could be taken to reduce the glare of lighting that is shining into adjacent apartments. Mr. Adams indicated that he would speak with the Engineer in Charge regarding these complaints and would look into the schedule. In response to a question from Ms. Gottlieb, Mr. Adams replied that work on the Vandervoort Avenue entrance ramp should be finished by December. In a final comment, Ms. Mihelic noted that community members are concerned that similar problems might arise during construction of the Kosciuszko Bridge Project.
Ms. Mihelic remarked that community residents are still interested in working with an independent environmental consultant.

Ms. Holowacz announced that there will be a Greenpoint community meeting on October 25th regarding the ExxonMobil oil spill. Noting that soil borings taken on Bridgewater Street showed high levels of benzene and methane, she asked how that will impact the Kosciuszko Bridge Project. Specifically, Ms. Holowacz asked if additional test borings would be taken to ensure that any contact with the oil spill does not impact the local community. Mr. Bennett replied that the Kosciuszko project team performed a series of soil borings and also collected samples from ExxonMobil’s monitoring wells. The sampling program has been completed, and the data is currently being analyzed. In addition, the project team is reviewing information about the oil plume and its proximity to the project area.

Mr. Adams also noted that the project team and Riverkeeper have exchanged information regarding the oil plume and testing in the area. The results of Kosciuszko Bridge Project sampling will be shared with Riverkeeper and the SAC once the data has been analyzed and approved by NYSDOT. This information is expected to be ready in early spring 2006. In response to questions from Ms. Mihelic, Mr. Bennett confirmed that an air monitoring program will be implemented throughout construction and that the project team does have a map of the oil plume.

Mr. Adams noted that the oil spill will be the subject of a public meeting in early November with the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation and ExxonMobil. Details of the meetings mentioned by Ms. Holowacz and Mr. Adams will be mailed to the SAC within the next few days.

In response to a request from Mr. Nunziato, Mr. Adams indicated that he will forward a copy of NYSDOT’s policies regarding property acquisition.

Follow-Up Items

1) Provide SAC with list of planned projects in the study area identified for review as part of the Kosciuszko Bridge Project. Responsibility: HNA/Parsons.

2) Provide Open House flyers to SAC members, as per request sheet. Responsibility: HNA.

3) Schedule Environmental and Parks Subcommittee meeting, pending meeting with the New York City Department of Parks and Recreation (NYCDPR). Responsibility for scheduling NYCDPR meeting: NYSDOT. Responsibility for scheduling subcommittee meeting: HNA.

4) Provide SAC with information regarding Interim Deck Repair Project, including: schedule and action on complaints (noise, litter, lighting, parking). Responsibility: NYSDOT.

5) Provide SAC with details of upcoming meetings regarding ExxonMobil oil spill. Responsibility: HNA.
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At the October 20, 2005 meeting of the Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC), a question was raised concerning the projects that were included in the traffic modeling being performed for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). This memo provides a list of all the projects that have been brought to the attention of the project team and information about how they were incorporated into the modeling. The list of projects below is based on information developed in cooperation with the SAC following its May 20, 2004 meeting, which discussed local projects.

Cross Harbor Freight Movement Study – Included data from published DEIS.

Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) East Side Access Project – Already included in the Best Practice Model (BPM).

Flushing Avenue Reconstruction – Not expected to have a significant effect on long-term (2015+) project area traffic.

Grand Avenue Bus Depot – Included data from Environmental Report, Compendium of Analyses.

Grand Street/Grand Avenue Bridge Replacement – Not expected to have a significant effect on long-term project area traffic.

Greenpoint Converted Marine Transfer Station – Included data from Commercial Waste Management Study.

Greenpoint-Williamsburg Waterfront Rezoning – Included data from published DEIS.

Hunters Point Subdistrict Rezoning – Rezoning application did not include traffic analysis because it does not meet the City Environmental Quality Review threshold of 50 peak hour vehicle trips.

Kent Avenue/Franklin Street Reconstruction – Not expected to have a significant effect on long-term project area traffic.

Long Island Rail Road Main Line 3rd Track – Not expected to have a significant effect on long-term project area traffic.

Long Island and JFK Airport Access Study – Outside traffic study area and not expected to have a significant effect on long-term project area traffic.

Long Island Truck-Rail Intermodal Facility – Outside traffic study area and not expected to have a significant effect on long-term project area traffic.
Maspeth Rezoning Study – The primary purpose of the rezoning is to reduce the density of development permitted. Therefore, the rezoning, which is still in process, is not expected to result in any significant increase in traffic.

Metropolitan Avenue/Fresh Pond Road Bridge Reconstruction – Outside traffic study area and not expected to have a significant effect on long-term project area traffic.

MTA Revenue Handling Facility – Not expected to have a significant effect on long-term project area traffic.

Newtown Creek Water Pollution Control Plant – Included data from published DEIS.

New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP) Newtown Creek Aeration Facility – Not expected to have a significant effect on long-term project area traffic.

NYCDEP Sludge Force Main – Not expected to have a significant effect on long-term project area traffic.

New York City Department of Sanitation Solid Waste Management Plan – The final location of one or more proposed truck-to-barge transfer facilities in the area has not yet been determined. Because it will shift waste export to barges, this plan is not expected to increase overall truck volumes in the project area.

New York City Department of Transportation Truck Route Study – Study is not complete.

New York Metropolitan Transportation Council I-278 Freightway Study – Outside traffic study area and not expected to have a significant effect on long-term project area traffic.

Queens West/Olympic Village – Already included in the BPM.

Sunnyside Yard Pedestrian Crossing – Not expected to have a significant effect on long-term project area traffic.
Measures Of Effectiveness (MOEs)

BQE Average Travel Speeds - AM Peak Hour
Between LIE & McGuinness Blvd

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Direction</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>RA-5</th>
<th>RA-6</th>
<th>BR-2</th>
<th>BR-3</th>
<th>BR-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measures Of Effectiveness (MOEs)

BQE Average Travel Speeds - PM Peak Hour
Between LIE & McGuinness Blvd

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Direction</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>RA-5</th>
<th>RA-6</th>
<th>BR-2</th>
<th>BR-3</th>
<th>BR-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total Delay - AM + PM Peak Hours
Traffic Study Area (BPM Subarea Network)

Measures Of Effectiveness (MOEs)

Throughput - AM Peak Hour
BQE Traffic Volumes at Newtown Creek

Measures Of Effectiveness (MOEs)
Measures Of Effectiveness (MOEs)

Throughput - PM Peak Hour
BQE Traffic Volumes at Newtown Creek

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic Volumes</th>
<th>Travel Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>EB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>EB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000</td>
<td>EB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000</td>
<td>EB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8000</td>
<td>EB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000</td>
<td>WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000</td>
<td>WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8000</td>
<td>WB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measures Of Effectiveness (MOEs)

Number of Stops
BQE and Meeker Avenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Stops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Stops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM Peak Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Peak Hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measures Of Effectiveness (MOEs)

Number of Lane Changes
BQE and Meeker Avenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA-5</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA-6</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR-2</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR-3</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR-5</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Helen Neuhaus, Helen Neuhaus & Associates (HNA), opened the meeting by welcoming everyone back after a long break. She then asked for comments on the Minutes of the October 20, 2005 meeting. Referring to a statement made at that meeting by Anthony Nunziato, Maspeth Chamber of Commerce, Moshe Strum, New York City Department of Transportation (NYCDOT), stated that Grand Avenue is still a designated truck route and that there are no plans to implement the Maspeth Bypass Plan. It was noted that during a Fall 2005 meeting with Mr. Nunziato, NYCDOT Commissioner Iris Weinshall indicated that the plan would be implemented by the end of the year. Ms. Neuhaus remarked that while the issue needs clarification, the Minutes accurately reflect statements made by Mr. Nunziato at the October meeting. After adoption of the Minutes with no further comments, Ms. Neuhaus announced that there were no outstanding follow-up items.

Recap of Open Houses
Ms. Neuhaus provided a brief review of the Public Open Houses held on November 30, 2005 at St. Cecilia’s Church in Greenpoint and on December 5, 2005 at Martin Luther High School in Maspeth. She thanked SAC members for their “monumental” effort in distributing materials throughout their communities and for their presence at the Open Houses. She noted that while attendance at the Open Houses was less than last year (with 60 people attending the Open House in Brooklyn and over 40 attending the Queens Open House), the fact that many new people turned out for the meetings was a positive sign. Ms. Neuhaus remarked that the format of the Open Houses seemed to work well for the material that was presented and allowed for numerous lengthy conversations between the public and the project team. She added that the 2005 Open Houses Report would be forthcoming.

Update on DEIS Studies
Dan Prevost, Parsons, provided the following update on the DEIS studies:

- The project team is continuing to work on stormwater handling issues.
- Air quality analysis is currently underway.
- The Contaminated Materials Investigation has been completed and will be presented later in the meeting.
- The results of the Noise Analysis and Visual Resources Assessment are nearly complete and will be presented to the SAC at the February 2006 meeting.
- The project team recently held discussions with both the New York City Department of Parks and Recreation (NYCDPR) and the SAC Environmental Enhancements and Parks Subcommittee regarding conceptual mitigation plans for Sgt. William Dougherty Playground. A report on the Parks Subcommittee meeting will be given later tonight.
The following questions and comments were raised following Mr. Prevost’s update:

- Joe Ruzalski, United Forties Civic Association (UFCA), asked if the final design for the bridge will include drainpipes that flow into catch basins, rather than the current system, which allows stormwater to fall freely to the street below. Steve Bennett, Parsons, explained that all stormwater will be collected and either carried to the New York City sewer system or carried in new storm sewers to Newtown Creek. Mr. Bennett indicated that measures will be taken to ensure that sediment does not run into the creek.

- Barbara Mihelic, Noble Street Block Association, asked if there are any planned or completed studies to determine the effect of road salt on Newtown Creek. Mr. Bennett replied that the project team is following federal and state regulations. He added that road salt is not an issue, since Newtown Creek is a saltwater creek.

**DEIS: Contaminated Materials Investigation**

Ms. Neuhaus introduced Rick Hart, Environmental Planning and Management, Inc., whose firm was hired to conduct the Contaminated Materials Investigation. Noting that it has been a pleasure working with Mr. Hart, Ms. Neuhaus stated that he holds a Masters degree in Environmental Pollution Control from Pennsylvania State University. Over the past 16 years, he has completed contaminated materials investigations for several New York City and State agencies, including NYSDOT, NYCDOT, Metro-North Railroad, the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority and the New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP). Among Mr. Hart’s recent work are investigations for several high profile projects, including Route 9A in Lower Manhattan, demolition of the Harlem Hospital Center in Upper Manhattan and reconstruction of portions of the FDR Drive.

Using a PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Hart began by describing the purpose of the investigation, which was to identify contaminated materials in areas of future construction; controls to limit community and worker exposure to contaminants; and material handling and disposal procedures. He explained that the investigation was conducted in two phases. The first phase—contaminated materials screening—examined potential sources of contamination. This was done through a review of government records of known areas of contamination; research of historic land use (going back to 1888) and a visual site inspection. As a result of Phase I screening, 33 potential hazardous waste sites were identified within the project corridor (Brooklyn and Queens). In response to a question from Anthony Parra, East Williamsburg Valley Industrial Development Corporation, Mr. Hart clarified that these sites were designated “potentially hazardous” because of historic land uses (e.g. machine shops, iron works, refineries). However, he emphasized that during Phase I, it is unknown whether these sites are actually hazardous. He added that the DEIS will include more detailed information regarding each of the sites.

Mr. Hart then described the “contaminants of concern” that the project team would expect to find in an industrial area such as Greenpoint or Maspeth:

- **Semi-Volatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs)**
  Found in areas of historic coal use, as well as in heavy heating oils and mechanical fluids.

- **Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs)**
  Historically found in gasoline, dry cleaning fluids, and degreasers, these include benzene, perchloroethylene (PCE), and trichloroethylene (TCE).

- **Heavy Metals**
  Generally byproducts of industrial processes, these include copper, lead, mercury, cadmium and arsenic.

- **Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)**
  Historically found in electrical transformers and hydraulic fluids, PCBs are no longer in use.
Mr. Hart showed photographs of typical areas of concern, including the Mobil Gas Station (Morgan Avenue, Brooklyn), a waste transfer station (Brooklyn), a drum storage area (Cherry Street, Brooklyn) and a private fueling station (Dry Ice Corporation, Queens). He then elaborated on the following additional areas of concern:

- **The ExxonMobil Oil Spill in Greenpoint, Brooklyn.** Using a map prepared by Roux Associates (consultants to ExxonMobil) in February 2005 and provided by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC), Mr. Hart showed the limits of the spill, particularly in relation to the Kosciuszko Bridge Project.

- **Newtown Creek.** Mr. Hart indicated that a review of NYSDEC’s records found that the creek sediment is contaminated with heavy metals, SVOCs and PCBs. These can be attributed to historic industrial uses along the creek.

- **Phelps Dodge Site.** Both the soil and groundwater at this former copper refining operation are contaminated with heavy metals, SVOCs and PCBs. Remediation of this site includes the removal of “hot spots” (the most heavily contaminated locations) under the supervision of NYSDEC and groundwater collection and treatment at the banks of Newtown Creek.

Mr. Hart then explained that the second phase--subsurface investigation--involved the collection of soil and groundwater samples. Sampling was conducted during August and September of 2005 to determine the limits of the oil plume in the project area; characterize general soil and groundwater quality and identify community and worker exposure protections. Soil samples were taken using a geoprobe soil coring machine; groundwater samples were taken from existing monitoring wells. Using a map of the project corridor, Mr. Hart provided the following information: 13 soil, nine groundwater and one soil/groundwater sites were sampled in Brooklyn; five soil and one soil/groundwater sites were sampled in Queens. The samples were sent to a laboratory where they were analyzed for contaminants of concern as well as for four hazardous waste characteristics: ignitability; corrosivity, reactivity and toxicity.

Mr. Hart further explained that materials are classified either non-contaminated; contaminated, non-hazardous; or contaminated, hazardous. If a soil sample exceeds the state guidance values, it is considered contaminated. A sample is not considered hazardous waste unless its level of concentration exceeds the federal hazardous waste criteria.

He then reviewed the criteria used to evaluate the sampled soils and groundwater:

- **Soil Reference Values**
  - NYSDEC STARS Memo #1: A set of threshold values for petroleum-contaminated soil.
  - NYSDEC Recommended Soil Cleanup Objectives: A set of threshold values for VOCs, SVOCs, PCBs and metals.

- **Groundwater Reference Values**
  - NYCDEP Sewer Discharge Limitations: NYCDEP’s allowable limits of chemicals that can be discharged into the sewer.
  - NYSDEC Class GA (Potable) Groundwater Standards: State drinking water standards. While not directly applicable to the Kosciuszko Bridge Project, these standards provide a general indication of groundwater quality in the area. In the industrial area around the project site, one would expect to find groundwater contamination that exceeds drinking water standards.
Testing Results

Once again using maps of the project corridor, Mr. Hart summarized the results of soil testing:

- SVOCs and metals were above the contaminated soil criteria at most locations.
- VOCs were above the contaminated soil criteria at isolated locations.
- No PCBs were found above the contaminated soil criteria.
- Only one sample exceeded the hazardous waste criteria for lead, which is five parts per million (ppm). This sample, which was taken 4’-8’ below the surface of the New York City Police Department impound lot under the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway (BQE) near the Phelps Dodge site, showed a lead content of 5.99 ppm. Mr. Hart reported that this level is considered only slightly above the limit. He noted that since this sample was taken beneath the asphalt, there is no current exposure to the public. Another deeper sample was taken at the same location and did not exceed the hazardous waste criteria for lead.
- To put the results in perspective, Mr. Hart explained that the levels of SVOCs found are typical of New York City roadway projects he has worked on and are consistent with what would be found along most commercial waterfronts in the city. He noted that the presence of these contaminants in the soil is probably due mainly to the historic use of coal.

Mr. Hart further reported that groundwater testing showed that VOCs and metals are above the reference values across most of the project area; SVOCs are above the reference values at isolated locations; and no PCBs were found above the reference values.

Noting that the investigation also sought to confirm the extent of the oil plume in Greenpoint, Mr. Hart began by defining the term “free product,” which refers to the underground layer of oil that sits directly above the water table. He explained that the project team inspected ten of ExxonMobil’s wells on September 19, 2005 to confirm the limit and depth of the free product from the oil spill. He reported that the limits of the spill under the BQE coincided with the limits indicated on the Roux map, extending to the BQE in the area of Van Dam Street and Varick Avenue. Two of the sampled wells (at Van Dam Street and Meeker Avenue and Varick Avenue and Thomas Street) found a one-foot layer of free product approximately 40’-45’ deep. One well, located under the BQE near Porter Avenue, encountered a light sheen of free product (less than 0.01’) at a depth of 52’. To provide a comparison, Mr. Hart noted that the oil plume is about 15’-20’ thick at its source, approximately 2,000’ to the northwest of the BQE.

Mr. Hart then discussed the impacts of contaminated materials on construction activities. He explained that the majority of the soil disturbed for bridge construction (including creek sediment) will be considered contaminated. However, based on the samples taken, most of these are likely to be non-hazardous. An exception might be in the area of the Phelps Dodge property, where the soils may contain higher concentrations of contaminants. Mr. Hart emphasized that additional sampling will be conducted at specific excavation sites once an alternative is chosen to confirm the level of contamination.

He further noted that the majority of groundwater removed during excavation will probably require some type of treatment before it is discharged into either the sewer or the creek. Finally, Mr. Hart indicated that while the oil plume could be impacted if drilling or excavation reaches a depth of 40’ or more, it is anticipated that construction activities will only reach depths of 10’-15’ in the area above the plume.
Mr. Hart then provided the following information regarding the factors affecting soil and groundwater contamination as related to the different alternatives:

- The impacts to contaminated soil and groundwater are relatively consistent among all build alternatives. Specific factors will include the amount and depth of excavation required and the volume of material removed.
- The impacts from the free-phase oil plume are relatively consistent among build alternatives. Significant factors will include the amount, and more importantly, the depth of excavation required in the area of the plume.
- The impacts from contaminated creek sediment vary. Factors include:
  - the quantity, frequency and technique of dredging required for temporary platforms and barge-docking areas.
  - the removal of existing piers (under Alternatives BR-2, BR-3, BR-5), which could displace more contaminated creek sediment than under Alternatives RA-5 or RA-6.

**Mitigation Measures**

Mr. Hart first reviewed general procedures for the handling and disposal of contaminated and hazardous materials. These include the development of Soil and Groundwater Management Plans; a Health and Safety Plan (HASP), which will detail Emergency Response and Community Notification; and a Community/Worker Exposure Monitoring Plan. He noted that the contractor will be contractually obligated to follow all applicable federal, state, and local regulations.

Specific mitigation measures include:

- **For contaminated soil**
  - contaminated soil removed for construction of the chosen alternative will be legally transported and disposed of at a permitted off-site facility.
  - a “cradle-to-grave” tracking system will be used: this is a waste manifest paper tracking system that requires a generator (in this case, an NYSDOT representative) to sign as the truck is loaded at the site. The driver will then sign the document and take it to the landfill, where it will again be signed. The fully-executed document is sent back to NYSDOT and becomes part of project documentation.
  - airborne exposure to dust during excavation will be limited through misting with water trucks and possible tenting around larger excavations. Soil transport vehicles will be secured with tarps to prevent community exposure to dust during transport from the site.

- **For contaminated groundwater**
  - discharge to the sewer will require an NYCDEP permit.
  - discharge into Newtown Creek will require an NYSDEC SPDES (State Pollution Discharge Elimination System) permit.
  - both permits specify the type of treatment and tests to be performed, as well as the quality of discharged water.

- **For contaminated creek sediment**
  - an NYSDEC dredging permit is required, which stipulates specific handling and disposal procedures.

- **For free-phase petroleum**
  - oil will be separated from water that is extracted from excavations by such means as an oil-water separator or pump.
  - separated petroleum will be containerized for transport and off-site disposal or recycling.
  - the remaining water will be treated to remove additional contaminants per discharge permit.
Mr. Hart indicated that community residents and workers will be protected from airborne contaminants through air monitoring for particulates (contaminated dust), petroleum vapors (VOCs) and methane gas. Air monitoring stations will be installed both upwind and downwind of the excavation site.

Finally, Mr. Hart noted that the removal of contaminated soil, groundwater and creek sediment, along with the removal of petroleum from the groundwater surface (if encountered), will result in a net environmental gain to the community.

Questions and comments raised during Mr. Hart’s presentation are summarized below:

- Laura Hofmann, Greenpoint Waterfront Association for Parks and Planning (GWAPP), asked why more samples were taken in Brooklyn than in Queens. Mr. Hart stated that the project team found more areas of concern in Brooklyn, including several sites relating to the oil spill.

- In response to a question from Ms. Mihelic, Mr. Hart confirmed that only one water sample was taken in Queens. He explained that further away from the creek, water is 40’-50’ below ground, which is too deep to be affected by construction. In response to Mr. Nunziato’s request for testing below the Kosciuszko Bridge at the edge of the creek, Mr. Bennett explained that because the water flows down toward the creek, the results will be the same whether the sample is taken from 50’ away or at the shore. For this reason, ExxonMobil, as part of its oil spill remediation, will place a sheet pile wall at the waterfront to catch water flowing toward the creek.

- In response to a question from Christine Holowacz, Newtown Creek Monitoring Committee, regarding the depths of the soil borings, Mr. Hart stated that some of the borings were taken at a depth of approximately 30’. At other locations, the borings were only 12’-15’ deep because the probes hit rocks, debris or groundwater. Ms. Holowacz asked why groundwater was not sampled at these locations. Mr. Hart reiterated that the groundwater at many of the boring sites will not be affected by construction based on its depth below the ground surface. Additional groundwater samples will be collected on portions of the Phelps Dodge site once an alternative is selected and the specific areas of excavation and dewatering are identified.

- Noting that a large acid vat was once stored on the north side of 56th Road and 43rd Street, Mr. Ruzalski asked if that section of the Phelps Dodge site had been tested. Mr. Hart indicated that the project team requested, but was denied, access to the Phelps Dodge site. He stated that once an alternative is selected, the specific areas of excavation will be sampled. Mr. Hart added that the project team reviewed hundreds of soil samples and dozens of groundwater samples from the Phelps Dodge site. Data from areas of potential construction did not show any soil impacts significant enough for NYSDEC to require remediation.

In response to a question from Mr. Nunziato, Mr. Hart stated that the Phelps Dodge samples were collected by the owner’s consultants, with oversight by NYSDEC. Mr. Nunziato expressed his distrust of the consultants because they were hired directly by the owner, which may create a conflict of interest. Mr. Bennett commented that it is a crime for consultants to falsify information. Mr. Hart added that all of the reports are available for review at NYSDEC’s Long Island City office.

- Mr. Nunziato asked if the plume from the oil spill is moving from Brooklyn to Queens under Newtown Creek. Mr. Bennett indicated that oil has leaked into the creek but has not crossed over to Queens. Mr. Hart stated that it is unlikely that the plume will reach Queens by flowing
under the creek. He explained that any oil entering the creek from Brooklyn would flow
downstream rather than entering the water table on the Queens side.

- Vincent Arcuri, Queens Community Board (CB) #5, observed that NYSDOT might run into
problems if the portion of the Phelps Dodge property acquired for the Kosciuszko Bridge
Project is still contaminated, even after remediation by NYSDEC. Mr. Bennett replied that the
condition of the property (i.e. level of contamination) will be considered in the purchase price.

- Referring to remediation of the oil spill, Mr. Arcuri asked about the structural implications of
bearing down on a surface when there is movement underneath (i.e. ground settling with the
removal of the oil). Mr. Bennett explained that there will be very little settlement because the
soil impacted by this project is granular sand and gravel, which is very compact. He added that
areas composed of clay, which is mostly water, might experience more of a problem.

- In response to a question from Ms. Mihelic, Mr. Hart indicated that the contractor will be
responsible for hiring a truck to water the construction site but that NYSDOT will have onsite
inspectors to ensure that the contractor follows all applicable regulations. Noting that this
system has not been effective in the past, Ms. Mihelic asked about oversight of the contractors
and inspectors. Mr. Hart speculated that the community will be very aware of all activities on
the site and that the SAC will also play a monitoring role. The following additional comments
were provided regarding issues at the construction site:
  - Mr. Arcuri suggested that a separate contractor be hired to wash down and monitor the
    removal of debris, as was done at the World Trade Center site in lower Manhattan.
  - Ms. Holowacz emphasized the need for a decontamination area.
  - Mr. Hart commented that regardless of whether the soil is contaminated, there should be
    a soil erosion plan to stop the dirt from leaving the site.
  - Ms. Neuhaus noted that trucks should be completely covered with tarps that are
    properly tied down.
  - Mr. Ruzalski stated that contractors working at the Pepsi-Cola site in Long Island City
    placed a large tent over the excavation area. All work (decontamination of air, loading
    of trucks, etc.) was conducted under the tent. Mr. Hart indicated that this is one of the
    controls being considered for the Kosciuszko Bridge Project.
  - Mr. Hart remarked that proper controls will be included in the construction contracts;
    enforcement will be the key issue.

- In response to Ms. Mihelic’s question regarding construction site security, Mr. Hart stated that
fences will be set up around the excavation area, which will be well-lit. Mr. Bennett added that
on a project of this size, there is likely to be 24-hour security as well. These issues will be
assessed as the project moves into the contract phase. Ms. Neuhaus remarked that the SAC will
play an important role in developing the HASP.

- In response to a question from Mr. Ruzalski, Mr. Hart confirmed that designation of a specific
truck route will be included in the HASP and Soil Management Plan. Mr. Ruzalski observed
that in the past, truck drivers have not adhered to the designated truck route. A brief discussion
was prompted by Ms. Mihelic’s question regarding the types of fines imposed on contractors
who do not adhere to the HASP. Several SAC members expressed their view that fines are
considered part of the “cost of doing business” unless they are extremely steep and include
other penalties.
Mr. Hart indicated that air quality monitoring will be discussed at monthly construction project meetings; this will ensure that the SAC is aware of the results on an ongoing basis. In response to a question from Mr. Ruzalski, Mr. Hart reiterated that air monitoring stations will be placed at various points upwind and downwind of the excavation site. Health and safety personnel at the excavation site will carry hand-held air monitoring devices.

Dolores Rizzotto, Queens CB #2, noted that contaminated and hazardous materials are not always removed from the construction site on the same day they are excavated. Mr. Hart commented that materials may legally be stored on site for up to 60 days provided that they are stored in properly sealed containers. Ms. Holowacz added that the contract documents could specify a different time period.

Ms. Rizzotto expressed her concern about trucks parking at the construction site overnight. She suggested that the contract require all trucks to leave the work site at the end of the day. Alison Cordero, OUTRAGE, noted that waste transfer station trucks also park on local streets. She added that the project team should coordinate with the New York City Department of Sanitation regarding truck routes, because many local streets are already heavily used by trucks going to and from transfer stations. In response to a question from Mr. Ruzalski, Robert Adams, NYSDOT, indicated that NYSDOT could work with NYCDOT to install signage prohibiting overnight parking.

In response to questions from Ms. Mihelic, Mr. Hart provided the following information: air monitoring will begin on the first day of construction. No background level monitoring is proposed prior to that time, since the purpose of the air monitoring is to evaluate the level of impact during construction.

Gerald Esposito, Brooklyn CB #1, asked if a copy of Mr. Hart’s PowerPoint presentation could be made available to the SAC. Mr. Adams stated that it will be forwarded to the SAC upon final NYSDOT approval of the Contaminated Materials Investigation report.


By way of background, Ms. Neuhaus reminded the SAC that this subcommittee was formed at the October 2005 SAC meeting, with the following individuals volunteering to participate: Gus Amato, UFCA; Mary Gottlieb, Meeker Avenue/Apollo Street Association; Ms. Holowacz; Ms. Hofmann; Mike Hofmann, GWAPP; Neal Kronley, New York City Council Waterfronts Committee; Ms. Mihelic; Mr. Nunziato; and Mr. Ruzalski.

She noted that the first subcommittee meeting focused on Sgt. Dougherty Playground, specifically existing conditions, impacts of the DEIS alternatives, possible elements for new and enhanced parkland, and conceptual mitigation plans for renovated and expanded parkland. Handouts, which included materials on these issues, along with a land use map showing parkland, open space and recreational facilities in Brooklyn and Queens, were distributed to Subcommittee members.

Ms. Neuhaus then introduced Pat Monte and Leslie Peoples, Vollmer Associates, who provided a recap of the presentation to the subcommittee. Handouts showing the portions of Sgt. Dougherty Playground to be acquired and replaced, as well as the conceptual mitigation plans and potential park elements, were distributed to the SAC at this time. (See Attachment B.)
Using a PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Monte explained that the conceptual mitigation plans meet the requirements for using the Programmatic Section 4(f) process. The proposed mitigation would not only provide replacement land for the area taken by the project, but would also add to and improve the existing facilities, thereby resulting in a net benefit to the playground and community. Mr. Monte reiterated that in addition to meetings with the subcommittee, the project team is holding discussions with state and city agencies.

After showing several photographs of current conditions at Sgt. Dougherty Playground, Ms. Peoples reviewed a list of possible program elements for a renovated and expanded park. Potential active recreational elements include new basketball and handball courts, new play equipment (including water play areas), and a skate park. Passive recreational elements include new seating areas, additional shade trees and preservation of existing trees in the park, where possible. Ms. Peoples noted that members of the subcommittee also expressed their interest in having a dog run and comfort station in the park. She indicated that the project team will work with NYCDPR to consider these elements.

Mr. Monte and Ms. Peoples then provided the following information regarding impacts to Sgt. Dougherty Playground, proposed replacement lands, and conceptual park features:

Under all Alternatives Except BR-5 (RA-5, RA-6, BR-2, BR-3):
- These alternatives would require the acquisition of only a small portion of the park.
- The replacement lands and newly constructed parklands under the proposed mitigation plan would total 1.91 acres. (The current size of the playground is 0.75 acre.)
- New parkland would be developed on both sides of the BQE. Along Meeker Avenue, playground equipment, additional trees and a seating area would be created. Sgt. Dougherty Playground would gain a skate park and new handball and basketball courts.

Under Alternative BR-5:
- Approximately half of Sgt. Dougherty Playground would be acquired.
- The replacement lands and newly constructed parklands would total 1.78 acres.
- New parkland would be developed on both sides of the BQE. This might include a linear skate park along the westbound exit ramp between Van Dam and Varick Streets; a tree-lined sitting area in the triangle north of the highway; and an expanded Sgt. Dougherty Playground featuring active and passive recreational elements on the south side of the highway.

Ms. Peoples stated that the next subcommittee meeting, which will be scheduled for late February or early March, will focus on potential open space opportunities in the project area. These might include streetscape enhancements, including street trees; plantings; decorative sidewalks and crosswalks; and new pedestrian lighting, signage and signals. The bridge’s wall architecture would also be examined to remain consistent with the aesthetics of the area. Waterfront access, including a possible boat launch, will be explored, as well as potential bikeway and walkway connections.

Ms. Neuhaus then turned the discussion over to Mr. Hofmann for comments on behalf of the subcommittee. Mr. Hofmann indicated that the general consensus of the subcommittee was in favor of

---

1 While Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act of 1966 requires extensive inter-agency coordination and review of the impacts and mitigation measures for impacted parkland, Programmatic 4(f) allows for a more streamlined process involving only those agencies with jurisdiction over the parkland. It may be followed when the involved agencies agree that the proposed mitigation provides a “net benefit” to the community.
the mitigation plan for Alternative BR-5 because it is more consistent with the community’s current concerns. The skate park and comfort station were viewed as important elements of the new park.

Questions and comments in response to the presentation are summarized below:

- Mr. Parra asked if eminent domain would be used to acquire industrial properties. Mr. Adams emphasized that there will be no property takings solely for the purpose of developing parkland. New park space will be created on land that is either already publicly owned (by the city or state) or that must be acquired for bridge construction. As an example, Mr. Adams noted that the skate park under BR-5 would be created where the current westbound exit ramp exists; no additional property takings would be required. He added that the project team is seeking to balance the need for parkland with the need to return some property to industrial use.

- Ms. Cordero suggested that the project team reach out to residents closest to Sgt. Dougherty Playground, including those living on Beadel Street and Vandervoort Avenue south of the BQE, and on Morgan Avenue north of the BQE. Ms. Neuhaus noted that the project team had developed mitigation plans for both sides of the BQE in the hopes of providing amenities for both neighborhoods. She remarked that one of the key responsibilities of the SAC is to carry the project’s outreach further into the community, and added that if there are critical constituencies that are not being reached, the project team and SAC need to find a way to involve them. Emphasizing that tonight’s meeting is only the first of several discussions regarding parks issues, Ms. Neuhaus urged members to review what they have learned with other community residents before the next SAC meeting.

- Dorothy Swick, Newtown Creek Monitoring Committee, commented that the main reason Sgt. Dougherty Playground is underutilized is because the crosswalk at the BQE underpass is extremely dangerous. Mr. Bennett stated that the project team is aware of this problem and is planning to improve pedestrian safety as part of the mitigation effort.

- Eric Peterson, NYCDPR, noted that Sgt. Dougherty Playground provides the only basketball court from Metropolitan Avenue in Brooklyn to the Queens border. Adding that NYCDPR receives many complaints about the lack of basketball courts in the area, he expressed his support for increasing the number of courts under the proposed mitigation plan.

- Ms. Mihelic mentioned that SAC member Joe Reemmer, who lives on Beadel Street near Sgt. Dougherty Playground, is very active in sharing news of the project with his neighbors. Mr. Adams suggested that Mr. Reemmer be asked to join the subcommittee, and Ms. Mihelic concurred.

- Ms. Hofmann requested that the project team prepare a brief write-up detailing the components of the two conceptual park mitigation plans for Sgt. Dougherty Playground. She offered to turn it over to the GWAPP board for circulation to its members. Ms. Neuhaus agreed to follow-up on Ms. Hoffman’s request.

- Theresa Cianciotta, New York State Assemblyman Joseph Lentol, stated that the area around the park is dismal, uninviting and dark, and that new lighting would be critical to attracting people back to the park. She proposed that exercise equipment be installed as active recreational elements. Ms. Cianciotta expressed doubt about the merit of replacing the children’s play area, noting that she never sees mothers with children playing in the park. Ms. Mihelic suggested that it might be useful to reach out to the local schools and PTAs to get their input.
Ms. Mihelic expressed her concern that amenities promised as part of the mitigation plan might be eliminated by the time the project reaches final construction. Ms. Neuhaus explained that because Sgt. Dougherty Playground falls under Section 4(f) regulations, federal law requires that any impacts be mitigated (including replacement of any parkland removed).

Mr. Hofmann noted that although the park’s mitigation will be carried out by the state, Sgt. Dougherty Playground will be maintained by the city. Mr. Strum raised the issue of the proposed skate park on the north side of the BQE, which would be built on state land. Mr. Adams responded that NYCDPR has indicated that it would be willing to maintain this property.

New Business

Ms. Neuhaus announced that a meeting regarding the Greenpoint oil spill will be held on Wednesday, February 25th at 7:00 p.m. at Princess Manor, located at 92 Nassau Avenue in Brooklyn. The meeting is sponsored by NYSDEC and will feature presentations by the oil companies.

Ms. Neuhaus reported that the SAC will be unable to meet at Jennings Hall for the foreseeable future, as the community room will be closed for renovations. She stated that her staff has investigated several alternate sites and proposes that next month’s SAC meeting be held in the gymnasium of the Williamsburg Community Center, located adjacent to the Williamsburg Houses at the intersection of Graham Avenue and Scholes Street in Brooklyn. Ms. Neuhaus agreed to send a map with directions to the entire SAC.

Ms. Cianciotta announced that she was unable to attend the last SAC meeting and Open Houses due to the birth of her granddaughter, news that prompted the congratulations of the SAC. She then referred to correspondence from Assemblyman Lentol to Douglas Currey, Regional Director, NYSDOT Region 11, regarding the impact of Kosciuszko Bridge construction on the ExxonMobil oil spill. In his response to Assemblyman Lentol, Mr. Currey indicated that the DEIS will include a detailed analysis of the oil spill and that NYSDOT is coordinating this work with NYSDEC.

Update on Related Projects / Meetings

SAC members raised a number of issues related to other projects and local initiatives:

Mr. Arcuri inquired about the status of the Grand Street Bridge Project. Muhummad Afzal, NYCDOT, stated that there are no new developments; construction is scheduled to start after 2012. Mr. Nunziato expressed his concern that the Grand Avenue Bus Depot and Maintenance Facility will be completed within 6 months to a year from now. He noted that once the depot is finished, the Grand Street Bridge will experience heavier traffic and will likely require replacement sooner than 2012. Mr. Adams suggested that Kamal Kishore, NYCDOT, attend the next SAC meeting in order to provide an update on the project.

Mr. Arcuri added that he has requested information from the Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) about which buses would be rerouted to the depot and what routes they would be using once the garage is completed. The MTA responded that it is unable to provide this information at the present time.

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, February 16th, at 6:30 p.m. at Williamsburg Community Center, 195 Graham Avenue, Brooklyn (corner of Scholes Street). [See attached map and directions.]
Follow-Up Items

1) Provide SAC with a copy of the Contaminated Materials Investigation PowerPoint presentation. Responsibility: HNA.

2) Provide SAC with information regarding maximum allowable penalties for violating contaminated material transport requirements such as following proper truck routes and using properly permitted and equipped vehicles (Barbara Mihelic). Responsibility: EPM/HNA.

3) Draft a brief write-up detailing components of the two conceptual park mitigation plans for Sgt. Dougherty Playground, to be circulated to GWAPP members and other interested groups/individuals (Laura Hofmann). Responsibility: Vollmer/HNA.

4) Reach out to residents living in the immediate vicinity of Sgt. Dougherty Playground, as well as local schools/PTAs (particularly St. Cecilia’s School and P.S. 132). Invite SAC member Joe Reemmer, Beadel Street resident, to join the Environmental Enhancements and Parks Subcommittee. Responsibility: HNA/SAC.

5) Invite Kamal Kishore, NYCDOT, to the next SAC meeting to provide an update on the Grand Street Bridge Project. Responsibility: NYSDOT.

6) Schedule an Environmental Enhancements and Parks Subcommittee meeting for late February or early March. Responsibility: Project Team.
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ALTERNATIVE BR-5

Park Lands to be Removed and Lands to be Reconstructed

LANDS TO BE REMOVED
LANDS TO BE RECONSTRUCTED

GRAPHIC SCALE (IN FEET)

December 9, 2005
4(f) Replacement Lands and Proposed Park Features

- **Skate Park**
- RA-5 has eastbound alignment of bikeway/walkway

### Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
<th>Square Meters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Park Land</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>32,688</td>
<td>3,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area to be Affected</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>7,873</td>
<td>731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area to be Reconstructed</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>24,815</td>
<td>2,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of New Park Land</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>58,206</td>
<td>5,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total New and Reconstructed Park Land</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>65,021</td>
<td>7,713</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Cost @ $50/sf**: $4,151,050

December 9, 2005
KOSCIUSZKO BRIDGE PROJECT

PROPOSED SGT. DOUGHERTY PLAYGROUND AND REPLACEMENT LANDS

PROGRAM ELEMENTS

Active Recreation
- Basketball Courts
- Handball Courts
- New benches
- Preserve existing trees
- New shade trees
- Hardscape (e.g., decorative pavers, asphalt, brick, etc.)
- Pavilion
- Dog run*
- Water play area*

Passive Recreation
- Sitting Areas
- New benches
- Playground equipment
- Preserve existing trees
- New shade trees
- Hardscape (e.g., decorative pavers, asphalt, brick, etc.)

Skate Park
- New benches
- Rails
- Wall
- Free skate elements and apparatus
- ‘Found Objects’
- Preserve existing trees
- New shade trees
- Hardscape (e.g., decorative pavers, asphalt, brick, etc.)

* These elements are proposed only for Alternative BR-5 plans.
Minutes

The 27th meeting of the New York State Department of Transportation’s (NYSDOT) Kosciuszko Bridge Project Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC) was held on Thursday, February 16, 2006 at the Williamsburg Community Center, Brooklyn. (See Attachment A for Attendance List.) The meeting was scheduled to present the results of the Noise Study prepared for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).

Helen Neuhaus, Helen Neuhaus & Associates (HNA), began by inviting everyone to remain after the meeting to chat with Pat Monte, Vollmer Associates, and to enjoy the cake that was brought to mark his retirement. In response to Ms. Neuhaus’ request for adoption of the January 19, 2006 SAC meeting Minutes, Moshe Strum, New York City Department of Transportation (NYCDOT), asked that his remarks regarding the Maspeth Bypass Plan be clarified to indicate that although implementation of the Plan is scheduled, it will not be done within the timeframe specified by Anthony Nunziato, Maspeth Chamber of Commerce, at the October 20, 2005 SAC meeting. Ms. Neuhaus then followed up on a number of issues raised at the January 19, 2006 SAC meeting:

- **Contaminated Materials Investigation PowerPoint presentation** – copies are available at the sign-in table.

- **Grand Street Bridge Project** – David Dunn, NYCDOT Project Manager, is present at tonight’s meeting to provide the SAC with an update.

- **Environmental Enhancements and Parks Subcommittee:**
  - In response to a request from Laura Hofmann, Greenpoint Waterfront Association for Parks and Planning (GWAPP), the project team prepared a brief memorandum describing the two conceptual proposals for Sgt. Dougherty Playground. The memorandum, along with the drawings and list of proposed park elements previously presented to the SAC, were e-mailed to Ms. Hofmann for distribution to GWAPP members. Hard copies are also available for other interested groups and individuals.
  - Joe Reemmer, OUTRAGE, was invited to serve on the Subcommittee. He expressed his interest and indicated that he would try to attend the next Subcommittee meeting.
  - In response to a question from Ms. Neuhaus, Mike Hofmann, GWAPP, stated that no community members contacted him with comments on the Sgt. Dougherty Playground proposals. After reiterating the importance of the Subcommittee’s role in reaching out to the broader community, Ms. Neuhaus asked if any SAC members had comments on the proposals. There were none.
  - In response to a question from Joe Ruzalski, United Forties Civic Association, Ms. Neuhaus clarified that the project team is seeking feedback on the conceptual plans for Sgt. Dougherty Playground at this time; environmental enhancements in Queens will be discussed at the March Subcommittee meeting.
Update on DEIS Studies

Dan Prevost, Parsons, provided the following update on the DEIS studies:

- The Noise Study has been completed and will be presented tonight.
- The Visual Resources Assessment and 3D Visualization is nearly complete and will be presented at the next SAC meeting.
- A field survey will be conducted next week for the Historic and Cultural Resources section of the DEIS.

Mr. Prevost reminded the SAC that publication of the DEIS is scheduled for June. In response to a question from Michael Rossmay, Brooklyn Borough President’s Office, Robert Adams, NYSDOT, indicated that the DEIS Public Hearings are likely to be held in September. Mr. Ruzalski asked if there will be further testing for hazardous materials at the Phelps-Dodge site in Queens. Ms. Neuhaus replied that there will be no further testing until an alternative is selected.

DEIS: Results of Noise Analysis

Using a PowerPoint presentation, Bruce Neiger, Parsons, began by providing a recap of information presented at the June and September 2004 SAC meetings regarding the DEIS noise monitoring studies. After describing noise as unwanted sound that is measured in decibels (dBA), Mr. Neiger noted that noise from transportation projects can interfere with individuals’ activities and enjoyment of their homes. Mr. Neiger stated that transportation projects can affect noise by increasing traffic volume, changing the nature of traffic flow (faster traffic is louder), or changing the type of vehicle using the roadway (trucks are louder than cars).

He then explained that standards for total noise levels, known as Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC), have been set by the federal government. A location where there is human activity that could benefit from a reduced noise environment is considered impacted if: 1) noise levels already approach (within 1 dBA) or exceed the 67 dBA criterion for residences (66 dBA or higher is the typically-used standard); or 2) a state- or federally-funded action would raise the sound level by six (6) dBA or more. Mr. Neiger remarked that a change of six (6) dBA is a clearly perceptible sound level; changes of less than three (3) dBA are inaudible to most people. Once an area is determined to be impacted, abatement must be considered.

Mr. Neiger clarified that the noise study focused on noise from future traffic operations. Construction period noise will be covered in another section of the DEIS and discussed in detail during the final design phase of the project. He then reviewed the five components of the noise study:

1) Review Land Use

Explaining that noise is considered in the context of outdoor use, Mr. Neiger indicated that each land use has its own criteria. Residences, playgrounds and cemeteries fall into the same category. Land use was investigated through site visits, consultation with the SAC, photographs, and maps.

In Brooklyn, the land use includes a large area of residential properties north of the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway (BQE); Sgt. Dougherty Playground; KeySpan/Greenpoint Little League Park; and a few residential clusters south of the BQE, especially on Vandervoort Avenue. Particular attention was paid to the residential areas on Vandervoort and Meeker Avenues, since
they could be impacted by improvements to the entrance ramp at that location. In Queens, land use investigations focused on small pockets of homes near the BQE and Long Island Expressway (LIE) and in the middle of the industrial area.

Mr. Neiger noted that another component of land use review is identifying outdoor activities and locations that would benefit from reduced noise levels. These might include building stoops or porches, backyards, playgrounds, or the cemetery.

2) Measure Existing Sound Levels
Mr. Neiger explained that existing sound levels were determined through long-term (24 hours or more) and short-term (15 minute) monitoring. Long-term monitoring, which measures daily noise patterns in a particular area, can be used to determine peak noise periods. In contrast, short-term measurements are used to describe the existing sound levels at specific locations. For the Kosciuszko Bridge Project, long-term monitors were placed on the rooftop of SAC member Mary Gottlieb’s residence in Brooklyn and in the backyard of the Choudri family residence in Queens. Short-term monitoring was conducted at ten representative locations: six in Brooklyn and four in Queens.

Mr. Neiger indicated that the use of computer modeling to predict noise levels is more effective than attempting to monitor every possible location. Noting that the data collected during short-term monitoring was combined with traffic data collected at the same time, he added that modeling takes into account traffic flow from all roadways in the project area.

Prior to discussing results, Mr. Neiger explained that the long-term monitoring was conducted over three consecutive days – from noon on the first day through 1 p.m. the following day in Brooklyn, and from 2 p.m. on the second day through 4 p.m. the following day in Queens. He then reviewed two graphs showing the long-term results in Brooklyn and Queens. Mr. Neiger observed that sound levels in Brooklyn were above the NAC for most of the monitoring period and were generally higher than sound levels in Queens. He noted that since the BQE is essentially the same in both boroughs, this can be attributed to the effects of local street traffic. Mr. Neiger further indicated that the drop in noise during the evening traffic peak reflects the effects of reduced speeds due to congestion (high volumes at low speeds are quieter). The highest sound levels measured in Brooklyn were 74 dBA. In Queens, the effects of traffic congestion were similar; however, the noise peaks and troughs were less sustained than in Brooklyn. The highest sound level measured in Queens was 73 dBA.

Using a map of the project area, Mr. Neiger then reviewed existing sound levels at modeled locations. Modeling showed that in Brooklyn sound levels are highest (69-75 dBA) in the following areas: the Meeker Avenue/BQE corridor; the side streets just off Meeker Avenue; Vandervoort Avenue; Sgt. Dougherty Playground; and KeySpan/Greenpoint Little League Park. Mr. Neiger observed that, with the exception of Vandervoort Avenue, sound levels drop off substantially as close as half a block from the highway. In Queens, noise levels exceed the NAC in two of the six modeled locations: in the backyard of the Choudri family residence and on 53rd Avenue near the LIE Interchange.
3) Predict Future Sound Levels
Prior to reviewing a series of graphics on predicted sound levels in the design year of 2045, Mr. Neiger noted that sound levels typically do not fall below 55 dBA during the peak periods in an urban environment. He then displayed graphics showing sound levels, in dBA, for existing conditions, the No Build Alternative, and the Build Alternatives at each of the modeled locations. On these graphics, the minimum displayed sound levels for the Build Alternatives represent the lowest number found for any alternative. Conversely, the maximum sound levels show the highest number found for any alternative. Mr. Neiger then discussed some of the findings:

Brooklyn
- Under the No Build alternative, sound levels would increase by up to three (3) dBA over existing conditions.
- The difference between existing conditions and the Build Alternatives at certain locations can be attributed to particular features of Alternatives BR-5 and RA-6. Under BR-5, which moves the highway further south (away from residences on the north side), noise levels drop to the north and rise to the south. Under RA-6, the sound level increases due to the addition of a lane on the north side.
- There is not much variation between the alternatives due to the relatively small changes in highway alignment between them. Depending on the alternative, a location would become slightly louder or slightly quieter.
- Sound levels in the parks would be relatively high because they are very close to Meeker Avenue and the BQE and because there are no intervening buildings to diffuse the traffic noise.
- In many instances, the local streets are louder than the BQE, because the latter is elevated and its noise is partially shielded by the viaduct structure. The fact that street-level traffic is louder restricts NYSDOT’s ability to implement effective abatement programs.
- The project alternatives would not increase sound levels more than four (4) dBA anywhere in the project area; this is well below the six (6) dBA criterion.
- It is not possible to compare predicted noise levels at proposed open spaces with existing conditions, because the parkland does not yet exist.

Queens
- Noise levels would be below the NAC in Calvary Cemetery.
- Noise levels in the Choudri backyard would be above the NAC; most of the noise here and in the remainder of the Queens study area can be attributed to the highway rather than to local streets.

4) Determine Impacts
Mr. Neiger summarized the noise impacts as follows:
- At 13 of the 27 modeled locations, the highest sound levels for the build alternatives would be the same or lower than for the No Build alternative.
- The maximum increase relative to the No Build Alternative (which occurs at only one location) would be three (3) dBA.
- The project would not create any new exceedances of the NAC at any modeled location.
5) **Evaluate Abatement**

After explaining that an abatement measure must be feasible and effective in order to be considered, Mr. Neiger indicated that six types of noise abatement were examined for the Kosciuszko Bridge Project:

- **Traffic Management Measures (e.g., traffic calming)**
  Traffic calming measures involve the elimination of trucks from local streets or slowing traffic by such means as speed bumps. These measures are not feasible for the Kosciuszko Bridge Project due to traffic volume on the highway and the number of trucks that require access to commercial and industrial areas. Other traffic management measures would be similarly infeasible or ineffective in abating noise.

- **Alteration of Alignments**
  Mr. Neiger noted that, although several alignments were examined during development of the alternatives, the constraints of the project corridor provide little opportunity for alterations to the alignment. He added that since the alternatives being studied in the DEIS include all feasible variations in alignment, the noise study already shows the effects of these different alignments.

- **Acquisition of Property Rights**
  This measure allows the state to purchase right-of-way for the construction of barriers, so that ownership or right-of-way issues would not prevent the construction of an effective barrier. This option is not feasible, because NYSDOT already owns the right-of-way in the project corridor.

- **Acquisition of Undeveloped Property**
  This measure, which is effective in rural areas, allows NYSDOT to purchase undeveloped property along the project right-of-way, thereby preventing the construction of homes or other potential receivers. Since there is no undeveloped property in the project area, this is not a feasible option.

- **Noise Insulation in Public Schools**
  There are no public schools within the project area.

- **Noise Barriers**
  Mr. Neiger explained that this abatement measure, which involves the construction of physical barriers to shield receivers from traffic noise, received in-depth consideration. He then described the following criteria that are essential in evaluating the effectiveness of noise barriers:
    - “Insertion Loss” – the amount of noise that will be reduced if a barrier is constructed. Although NYSDOT’s goal is to achieve a reduction of at least 10 dBA, a reduction of seven (7) dBA is acceptable under certain circumstances. Noise barriers are not considered a feasible option if they reduce noise by less than seven (7) dBA.
Adequate height, length and continuity – barriers that are interrupted by driveways or side streets are ineffective, because sound can pass through the openings.

- Maintenance requirements.
- Visual obstructions.
- Safety issues.
- Evaluation of the number of residences that will benefit from the barrier.

Mr. Neiger then explained that the project team evaluated the construction of barriers on the eastbound BQE from Newtown Creek to the LIE Interchange in Queens and on both the eastbound and westbound sides of the BQE along the entire project corridor in Brooklyn. Although an extremely high barrier was considered (18’ high above a 30’ high viaduct), this abatement option was found to be ineffective for the following reasons:

- In Brooklyn, the maximum noise reduction would be three (3) dBA; this could only be achieved at one location. Mr. Neiger explained that the ineffectiveness of noise barriers results from both the configuration of the BQE (most of the highway is shielded by the viaduct deck) and the fact that noise from traffic on local streets is a greater contributing factor than highway noise.
- In Queens, sound levels were reduced by up to four (4) dBA (again at only one location), due to the shape of the viaduct and the configuration of the viaduct deck. The somewhat greater reductions in Queens can also be attributed to the lower levels of street noise in Queens.

Mr. Neiger concluded his presentation by briefly discussing measures that could minimize noise in the project area. These include new pavement; new, quieter joints; saw cut grooving; and absorptive panels.

Questions and comments raised during Mr. Neiger’s presentation are summarized below:

- In response to Mr. Nunziato’s question regarding the allowable noise level for highways adjacent to residential areas, Mr. Neiger reiterated that under the NAC, 66 dBA is considered a noise impact for residential areas. Anything over that level would be considered an impact and would trigger a review of abatement measures.

- Christine Holowacz, Greenpoint Property Owners/St. Cecilia’s Church, asked if New York City and the federal government have the same noise regulations. Mr. Neiger replied that the city’s noise code was amended last December to restrict night-time construction and to facilitate enforcement. The new code only requires that noise be “clearly audible,” rather than measured at a certain dBA level. However, he emphasized that since the Kosciuszko Bridge Project is a state project, it will follow state criteria, which are based on federal criteria.

- Irene Klementowicz, Concerned Citizens of Greenpoint, asked who will be responsible for evaluating noise levels following project completion, and what actions will be taken to address post-construction noise impacts. Mr. Neiger explained that the project team is using the best methods available to determine the potential noise impacts of each alternative. He noted that although traffic is likely to remain loud, the project will have little effect on the
area’s noise levels. In response to a follow-up question from Ms. Klementowicz, Mr. Neiger replied that a five year construction period is anticipated.

- Ms. Holowacz asked if anything can be done to mitigate the already high noise levels at Sgt. Dougherty Playground. Steve Bennett, Parsons, explained that while the project team is concerned about noise at parks and playgrounds, the New York City Department of Parks and Recreation (NYCDPR) generally opposes the construction of noise barriers around its properties, because they are believed to be visual obstructions that could hide criminal activity. In response to Mr. Neiger’s comment that safety is the overriding concern, Ms. Hofmann expressed her opinion that noise can create safety hazards for children in the park.

- Ms. Hofmann asked if overhead noise barriers had been considered for Sgt. Dougherty Playground. Mr. Neiger explained that because sound travels by compressed airways and does not come from above, overhead barriers would not likely reduce noise levels in the park.

- Ms. Hofmann suggested using trees and other buffering materials. Mr. Neiger explained that trees have a relatively small beneficial effect on noise, but can change the perception of noise. As a follow-up to Ms. Hofmann’s comment that NYCDPR favors using trees as buffers, Mr. Hofmann requested that Julius Spiegel, NYCDPR Borough Commissioner, or a member of his staff, be invited to the March Environmental Enhancements and Parks Subcommittee meeting and the April SAC meeting to discuss this issue, as well as the agency’s position on noise walls around park properties.

Commenting that construction noise will exacerbate existing noise levels, Barbara Mihelic, Noble Street Block Association, asked if noise analysis and monitoring will take place during construction. Mr. Bennett explained that the project team is currently examining construction impacts, including noise. However, detailed plans and procedures for noise analysis and monitoring during construction will not be completed until the final design stage of the project.

- In response to a question from Mr. Rossmy, Mr. Bennett confirmed that the BQE service roads along Meeker Avenue are city property.

Expressing his concern over the finding that local traffic is currently louder than traffic on the viaduct, Mr. Rossmy asked if the project team had looked into mitigating noise on local streets. Mr. Neiger confirmed that noise abatement measures for local streets were considered. However, none were found to be feasible: since the city’s local economy depends on trucks, banning them is not an option; nor is the installation of barriers and speed bumps.

- In response to a question from Gerald Esposito, Brooklyn Community Board #1, Mr. Neiger indicated that local street repairs would reduce the level of noise annoyance but would not affect overall sound levels. Mr. Strum suggested that many local streets near the Kosciuszko Bridge will be reconstructed as part of the project and that this work will contribute to noise reduction. Replying to Mr. Esposito’s inquiry about which specific streets will be reconstructed, Mr. Bennett agreed to provide this information as soon as it is available.
Ms. Holowacz asked if sound barriers could be constructed of a clear material, rather than concrete. In response, Mr. Bennett noted that although clear materials can be used, they quickly turn brown or become covered with graffiti.

In response to a question from Ms. Hoffman, Mr. Neiger indicated that the noise monitoring was conducted in October 2005. Commenting that she has noticed a seasonal difference in noise levels, Ms. Hofmann suggested that monitoring be conducted during a busier month. Mr. Neiger replied that measurements are only performed during certain times of the year, to exclude more congested traffic periods that would lead to lower or atypical sound measurements. For example, measurements are not performed between Thanksgiving and New Year’s Day. Mr. Neiger also noted that, as shown by the reduced sound levels in the p.m. peak period, heavier traffic, if congested, does not yield higher noise levels.

Mr. Nunziato urged the project team to be more creative in its search for noise abatement measures. This request was echoed by other SAC members, including Ms. Holowacz, who reiterated her request for a community engineer to explore creative solutions.

In response to Mr. Nunziato’s inquiry about the use of diamond grinding as a means of alleviating roadway noise, Mr. Bennett replied that this technique is now a state standard.

Commenting that noise bounces off the Meeker Avenue viaduct walls, Mr. Nunziato asked if the walls could be removed. Mr. Bennett replied that during early SAC meetings, residents living near the viaduct expressed their opposition to removing the walls. He added that the project team is considering absorptive panels for the viaduct.

Mr. Esposito observed that many of the issues raised this evening will not be solved by the Kosciuszko Bridge Project and should be brought to the attention of NYCDOT. He referred specifically to the sunken catch basins and deteriorated subsurface condition of Meeker Avenue and asked for a separate meeting to address these issues with appropriate city agencies.

Mr. Esposito asked if the BQE guard rails could be used as sound barriers. Mr. Bennett replied that considerably higher barriers (18’ high) were modeled and found to be ineffective in reducing noise levels. However, he indicated that the project will include construction of a 3-1/2’ tall concrete barrier that will serve as a safety wall.

In response to a question from Mr. Nunziato, Mr. Bennett explained that state highway regulations for abatement of indoor noise impacts apply only to public schools. Outdoor noise abatement measures apply to all land uses, both public and private.

Ms. Neuhaus reminded the group that the results of the construction impact study (which covers construction noise and the maintenance and protection of traffic plan) will be presented to the SAC as soon as it is completed. Mr. Adams indicated that this presentation is tentatively scheduled for the April SAC meeting.
Update on Related Projects: Grand Street Bridge Project

Mr. Dunn provided background on the Grand Street Bridge, which was built as a swing bridge in 1903, and requires replacement due to its age, substandard width, and structural problems. An NYCDOT project for construction of a new bridge is currently in the preliminary design phase, with an anticipated build year of 2013. Mr. Dunn explained that NYCDOT had originally intended to build a fixed bridge. However, this proposal generated opposition, because the elevation of the structure precluded navigation on Newtown Creek beyond the bridge. Specifically, the business community along Newtown Creek indicated that it wished to retain the option of accepting waterborne deliveries, despite the fact that the bridge has not been used for commercial purposes for quite some time. A successful appeal to the United States Coast Guard (USCG) blocked NYCDOT’s request for a permit for a fixed bridge.

Mr. Dunn explained that construction of a new movable bridge at this location generates numerous problems. In order to build a bridge at the standard width, a wider pivot pier is needed, which could create seismic disturbances. A consultant team is currently reviewing options to address the problematic geometry of the channel. It is likely that the selected alternative will be a bobtailed swing truss bridge with an off-center pivot pier. This requires a USCG permit and involves substantial cost.

Mr. Nunziato expressed concern about a build year of 2013, especially since construction of the Grand Avenue Bus Depot and Maintenance Facility is nearly complete and will generate increased bus traffic on the Grand Street Bridge. He asked if additional funding would help expedite the project. In response, Mr. Dunn indicated that the issue is one of time rather than money: project design will take several years, including at least one year for the USCG permitting process. He also noted that the recent completion of the Metropolitan Avenue Bridge will ease traffic congestion in the area.

New Business

- Ms. Neuhaus congratulated Ms. Hofmann and Ms. Holowacz on their recent appointments as co-chairs of GWAPP.

- Ms. Neuhaus announced that the next Environmental Enhancements and Parks Subcommittee meeting will be held in late March.

- Ms. Neuhaus indicated that the next SAC meeting is scheduled for April. Citing the acoustical problems encountered during tonight’s meeting, she noted that the meeting will not be held at the Williamsburg Community Center.

The next meeting is scheduled for **Thursday, April 20th at 6:30 p.m. in the Cafeteria of Martin Luther High School, 60-02 Maspeth Avenue, Maspeth, Queens.**

Follow-up Items

1) Invite Borough Commissioner Spiegel, NYCDPR, or an NYCDPR staff member, to the March Environmental Enhancements and Parks Subcommittee meeting and the April SAC meeting to discuss two issues: using trees for noise abatement and NYCDPR’s
position on noise walls around parks properties. (Mr. Hofmann). Responsibility: NYSDOT.

2) Explore “creative” noise abatement solutions, especially in sensitive areas such as schools, parks, playgrounds, residential neighborhoods and Calvary Cemetery. Responsibility: Parsons.

3) Provide map of streets to be reconstructed as part of the Kosciuszko Bridge Project (Mr. Esposito). Responsibility: Project Team.

4) Coordinate with city, state and federal agencies to ensure that issues under their jurisdiction in the area of the bridge (i.e. street repair/reconstruction) are addressed (Mr. Rossmy, Mr. Esposito). Responsibility: NYSDOT.

5) Provide copy of Noise Study PowerPoint presentation to SAC members (Ms. Hofmann). Responsibility: NYSDOT/HNA.

6) Schedule an Environmental Enhancements and Parks Subcommittee meeting for March. Responsibility: Project Team. Include Irene Klementowicz on the notification list. Responsibility: HNA.
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Minutes
The 28th meeting of the New York State Department of Transportation’s (NYSDOT) Kosciuszko Bridge Project Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC) was held on April 20, 2006 at Martin Luther High School, Maspeth, Queens. (See Attachment A for Attendance List.) The meeting was scheduled to present Conceptual Open Space Opportunities and Main Span Options for the Kosciuszko Bridge Project.

Helen Neuhaus, Helen Neuhaus & Associates (HNA), began by asking for comments on the Minutes of the February 16, 2006 SAC meeting. There were no comments, and the Minutes were adopted by consensus. She then facilitated a discussion of follow-up items from that meeting.

- In response to a request from Laura Hofmann, Greenpoint Waterfront Association for Parks and Planning (GWAPP), copies of the Noise Study PowerPoint presentation from the February SAC meeting were available at the sign-in table.

- The second meeting of the Environmental Enhancements and Parks Subcommittee was held on March 28, 2006. The presentation, which showed conceptual open space opportunities in both Brooklyn and Queens, will be shown at tonight’s SAC meeting. Ms. Neuhaus noted that Ellen Macnow and other New York City Department of Parks and Recreation (NYCDPR) staff attended the Subcommittee meeting and that Ms. Macnow is present at tonight’s meeting.

- In response to comments raised at the February meeting by Gerald Esposito, Brooklyn Community Board (CB) #1, and Michael Rossmy, Brooklyn Borough President’s Office, regarding improvements to local streets and inter-agency coordination, a handout showing project-related street reconstruction was distributed. (See Attachment B.) In addition, the project team met with the New York City Department of Transportation (NYCDOT) on April 10, 2006 to discuss local street issues. Referring to the meeting as the beginning of an ongoing dialogue, Robert Adams, NYSDOT, stated that the project team will continue to coordinate with NYCDOT on street reconstruction.

Dorothy Swick, Newtown Creek Monitoring Committee, asked if NYCDOT plans to change the alternate side parking regulations in the project area. Steve Bennett, Parsons, replied that alternate side regulations are under the jurisdiction of the New York City Department of Sanitation (DSNY). Mr. Esposito observed that the regulations were changed a few years ago, after an effort led by Councilman Kenneth Fisher. Noting that alternate side parking would most likely be suspended during construction, he suggested that representatives of DSNY be invited to SAC meetings. Alison Cordero, OUTRAGE, echoed this suggestion and remarked that once the DSNY District 1 garage is operational, traffic volume will increase. Ms. Neuhaus and Mr. Adams indicated that DSNY could be invited to SAC meetings; Mr. Adams added that the agency is a member of the Kosciuszko Bridge Project’s Inter-Agency Advisory Committee (IAAC).
Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS): Schedule Update

Mr. Adams stated that the project team had targeted late spring 2006 for publication of the DEIS. However, due to the complexity of the studies, completion of the document is taking longer than expected. Noting that summer is not an ideal time for publication (people are away, etc.), he indicated that the revised schedule calls for publication of the DEIS in the early fall, with public hearings by late fall. In response to a question from Barbara Mihelic, Noble Street Block Association, Mr. Adams replied that the comment period is typically 45 days.

Environmental Enhancements and Parks Subcommittee

Subcommittee member Mike Hofmann, GWAPP, thanked the project team for its efforts on behalf of the group, and indicated that tonight’s presentation would allow the rest of the SAC to develop an understanding of the conceptual plans. In return, Ms. Neuhaus thanked the Subcommittee for providing feedback to the project team.

Using a PowerPoint presentation, Leslie Peoples, Vollmer Associates, began by defining a master plan as an “overall guide to the eventual development” of an idea or area, and emphasized that the plans are only conceptual at this stage. She then presented the two Conceptual Plans for Open Space Opportunities in both Brooklyn and Queens (one for Alternative BR-5 and one for all alternatives except BR-5). After reviewing the legend and the plan elements (e.g., streetscape improvements, waterfront access and new parks), Ms. Peoples discussed the following specific open space opportunities in each neighborhood, moving from Queens to Brooklyn:

- **All Alternatives Except BR-5: 54th Drive to 54th Avenue – Queens**
  Proposed improvements for this area include:
  - A new skate park under the bridge between 54th Avenue and 54th Road. This area could also include a dog run.
  - An active recreational area under the bridge between 54th Road and 54th Drive that might include basketball and handball courts.
  - Streetscape improvements along 43rd Street, Laurel Hill Boulevard, 54th Drive, 54th Road and 54th Avenue, including new street trees and decorative paving.

- **Alternative BR-5: 54th Drive to 54th Avenue – Queens**
  Proposed improvements for this area are similar to those proposed for all other alternatives. However, the skate park and active park under the bridge are slightly larger, covering the full blocks between Laurel Hill Boulevard and 43rd Street.

- **All Alternatives: 56th Road to 54th Drive – Queens**
  Proposed improvements for this area include enhanced streetscape (e.g., trees and decorative paving) along 43rd Street, Laurel Hill Boulevard and 56th Road.

- **All Alternatives: Scott Avenue, Brooklyn to 56th Road, Queens**
  Small boat launches are proposed for both the Brooklyn and Queens sides of Newtown Creek, directly under the bridge. Ms. Peoples showed photographs of the former Penny Bridge site and Newtown Barge Terminal Playground, which are other potential locations for boat launches. As examples of existing facilities, Ms. Peoples showed photographs of boat launch docks at Roberto Clemente State Park in the Bronx.
All Alternatives Except BR-5: Hausman to Varick Streets – Brooklyn
Proposed open space opportunities for this area include:
- A revitalized and expanded Sgt. Dougherty Playground, including a dog run (as discussed at the January Subcommittee meeting).
- Enhanced streetscape along both sides of Vandervoort Avenue between Meeker Avenue and Division Street (linking KeySpan Ballpark with Sgt. Dougherty Playground); and on Meeker Avenue/Cherry Street between Kingsland and Varick Avenues.

Alternative BR-5: Hausman to Varick Streets – Brooklyn
Under this conceptual plan, Sgt. Dougherty Playground is slightly smaller than the plan proposed for all other alternatives and the skate park is proposed for the north side of the highway. All streetscape improvements are the same.

All Alternatives: Kingsland Avenue to Hausman Street – Brooklyn
Proposed improvements for this area include:
- Enhanced streetscape along Meeker Avenue, and on Sutton Street to Driggs Avenue, and Driggs to Morgan Avenues.
- A pedestrian underpass is proposed under the highway at the end of Hausman Street.

In addition to presenting the conceptual plans, Ms. Peoples showed several renderings that illustrated the completed improvements. Using photographs and schematics, she then reviewed examples of decorative paving, street trees and plantings, parks and playgrounds, and street lighting. She noted that planters and decorative pavement are often maintained through a contract with the Business Improvement Districts in the area. Ms. Peoples further indicated that all of these amenities require approval from the New York City Art Commission.

The following comments and questions were raised during the presentation:
- Anthony Nunziato, Maspeth Chamber of Commerce, and Dolores Rizzotto, Queens CB #2, questioned the location of the parkland proposed for Queens. Both expressed their view that the parks should be more centrally located and open, rather than under the viaduct. Ms. Rizzotto noted that CB #2 had previously asked NYSDOT for permission to use space under other bridges on the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway (BQE) and were informed that such locations are not safe for recreation. Mr. Bennett replied that the conceptual plans call for parks under the viaduct because this property must be acquired under all of the alternatives. He added that the project team will consider other options in the NYSDOT right-of-way. Ms. Neuhaus reiterated that the open space opportunities presented tonight are only conceptual and meant to promote discussion. She noted that the actual location of parkland in Queens will not be determined until Final Design.
- In response to questions from Joe Ruzalski, United Forties Civic Association and Christine Holowacz, Newtown Creek Monitoring Committee, Ms. Macnow explained that Sgt. Dougherty Playground will remain under the jurisdiction of NYC Parks, which will be responsible for security and maintenance. Any enhancements or park expansion will not change this. Regarding any additional parkland developed as part of the project, Ms. Macnow stated that NYC Parks would “be happy” to expand the city parks system in Queens and along Newtown Creek. She indicated that the issue of ownership is still being discussed with NYSDOT and will likely involve ongoing discussions as the project moves forward.
In response to a question from Ms. Mihelic, Mr. Adams confirmed that the parks will be built after construction of the bridge. Ms. Mihelic expressed her concern that a discussion of specific park elements is premature. She added that the community’s preferences and the amount of funding available for amenities might change in the intervening years. Ms. Neuhaus concurred but noted that it is better to begin a dialogue with the SAC earlier in the process rather than later.

Observing that there are plans for a skateboard facility in McCarren Park, Theresa Cianciotta, Assemblyman Joseph Lentol, reiterated her previous request that the project team consider installing exercise equipment in Sgt. Dougherty Playground. Ms. Peoples replied that both playground and exercise equipment are being considered in the conceptual plans.

Mr. Esposito asked if a comfort station could be installed at Sgt. Dougherty Playground. Mr. Adams replied that this suggestion is being considered.

Mr. Nunziato stated that he recently spoke with scientists from Brookhaven National Laboratory (Long Island) regarding the clean-up of Newtown Creek. The scientists, who are working on remediation of the Gowanus Canal, indicated that a similar clean-up is possible for Newtown Creek. Mr. Nunziato recommended that NYSDOT investigate the dredging of the creek for one-half mile east and west of the Kosciuszko Bridge as an environmental enhancement, and offered to provide Mr. Adams with contact information for the Brookhaven scientists.

In response to a question from Ms. Rizzotto, Mr. Adams stated that the project team met with Penny Lee, New York City Department of City Planning (NYCDCP), in October 2005 to discuss how NYSDOT might assist her agency in developing a small park along Maspeth Creek. However, NYCDCP must use the grant money allocated for this project in the near future; NYSDOT would not be able to develop new parkland within the required timeframe. Ms. Rizzotto remarked that projects are moving forward on the Long Island City waterfront and that Mr. Adams should speak with Ms. Lee for further information.

Main Span Options

Using a PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Bennett described the three structure types currently being considered for the Kosciusko Bridge Main Span (the section of the bridge over Newtown Creek.)

- **Concrete Segmental.** Examples of this bridge type include the JFK Airport AirTrain and the connector ramp between the BQE and the Williamsburg Bridge.

- **Cable-Stayed.** Mr. Bennett stated that this type of bridge would be appropriate if constructed with only one tower in each direction, rather than the typical two towers on each side.

- **Extradosed.** This bridge type is a hybrid between the concrete segmental and cable-stayed bridges. It includes two towers that are lower than the cable-stayed towers. Mr. Bennett noted that there are currently no extradosed bridges in the United States but that one is being planned in Connecticut.

Mr. Bennett stated that all of these bridge types are structurally appropriate and constructible, although the constructability varies with the different alternatives due to staging requirements. The visual appeal of each bridge type would also vary from one alternative to another. He noted that because selection of a bridge type requires more engineering than is done in the EIS stage, this decision will be made during Final Design. However, he added that input gathered from the SAC during the EIS process will be taken into account.
Mr. Bennett presented the following renderings, which showed a view of the Kosciuszko Bridge Main Span using each of the bridge types:

- Concrete Segmental (RA Alternatives) – built parallel to, and at a lower level than, the existing bridge.
- Concrete Segmental (BR Alternatives) – three new parallel bridges spanning Newtown Creek.
- Extradosed Bridge (BR Alternatives) – two or three parallel bridges across Newtown Creek; three bridges on the Brooklyn and Queens approaches.
- Cable-Stayed Bridge (BR Alternatives) - two or three parallel bridges across Newtown Creek; three bridges on the Brooklyn and Queens approaches.

Mr. Bennett noted that the extradosed and cable-stayed types are not being considered for the RA Alternatives, since the existing bridge would obscure the view of the new towers and cables. He then showed drive-through animations for extradosed and cable-stayed bridges that depicted a driver’s view of the roadway.

Returning to the PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Bennett reviewed the construction staging likely to be used for the extradosed and cable-stayed bridge types under the BR Alternatives and explained why some options may not be appropriate for certain alternatives.

The following questions and comments were raised regarding this presentation:

- In response to a question from Mr. Ruzalski, Mr. Adams confirmed that under Alternative BR-5, all three residential properties in Queens would be acquired. Mr. Bennett added that these properties are owned by one family. In response to a follow-up question, Mr. Adams stated that all acquisitions in Queens will be on the west side of 43rd Street.
- Ms. Cianciotta asked if the main span options presented are the only ones being considered. Mr. Bennett replied that while other bridge types could be considered in the future, the concrete segmental, cable-stayed and extradosed seem to be the most appropriate options at this time. He added that each of these options “makes a lot of sense” because they would allow the contractors to complete much of the construction from above, with minimal disruption to activities on the ground. In a follow-up statement, Ms. Cianciotta expressed her strong preference for a bridge design that relates to the existing bridge and incorporates its truss, if possible.
- In response to a question from Mr. Ruzalski, Mr. Bennett indicated that the existing plaque on the Kosciuszko Bridge could be integrated into any new structure.
- In response to questions from Ms. Macnow and Mr. Nunziato, Mr. Bennett replied that the towers of the cable-stayed bridge would be approximately 230’ tall. As a comparison, Mr. Adams noted that the deck of the existing bridge is 125’ above Newtown Creek and the highest point of the truss is approximately 165’.
- In response to a question from Peter King, NYSDOT, Mr. Bennett stated that the concrete segmental and extradosed options would cost roughly the same. He explained that cost estimates have not been developed for a cable-stayed bridge but estimated that it might cost $15 to $30 million more than other options due to the towers and cables.
- In response to Mr. Esposito’s question regarding bridge maintenance, Mr. Bennett indicated that bridges are now designed to require minimal maintenance. It is anticipated that the new Kosciuszko Bridge would not need significant maintenance for 30 years after its completion.
Mr. King asked about the length of the construction period for each of the options. Mr. Bennett replied that the timeframe does not vary much between the bridge types. He added that the length of the construction period will depend more on how work proceeds on the approaches than on the relatively short main span.

In response to a question from Ms. Mihelic about the base width of the cable-stayed bridge, Mr. Bennett replied that it would likely be between 40’ and 50’ wide. However, he emphasized that there are a number of different options for building the towers for this type of bridge.

**Other Business**

- In response to a question from Ms. Mihelic, Mr. Bennett stated that the relocation of utilities will be done during the construction phase. Ms. Mihelic commented that utility companies are notorious for working on a street prior to construction, with each company tearing up the street consecutively rather than simultaneously. She emphasized the need for coordination between individual companies and with the Kosciuszko Bridge Project. Mr. Adams noted that KeySpan and Con Edison are members of the IAAC.

- In response to a question from Ms. Cianciotta, Mr. Adams stated that construction of the bridge project is expected to take approximately four to five years.

- Mr. Nunziato urged NYSDOT to pressure NYCDOT to accelerate the reconstruction of the Grand Street Bridge. He expressed his concern that the construction periods for this project and the Kosciuszko Bridge Project will overlap, leading to gridlock on local streets. Noting that David Dunn, NYCDOT, provided an update on the Grand Street Bridge Project at the February SAC meeting, Ms. Neuhaus recommended that Mr. Nunziato coordinate this effort through another mechanism. Mr. Esposito offered to work with Mr. Nunziato to involve Congresswoman Nydia Velazquez in this issue, suggesting that a meeting with the Congresswoman might be more effective.

- Mr. Ruzalski asked if the project team has approached KeySpan regarding the possibility of reopening Varick Avenue between Maspeth Avenue and Lombardy Street. Mr. Adams stated that a meeting was held with KeySpan representatives, who indicated that the street could not be reopened due to security concerns.

**New Business**

- Ms. Neuhaus announced that next month’s SAC meeting will focus on construction issues. The meeting will be held at either Martin Luther High School or the Newtown Creek Water Pollution Control Plant.

**Update on Related Projects / Meetings**

- Ms. Neuhaus announced that information sessions regarding the Greenpoint oil spill will be held on Wednesday, April 26th and Thursday, April 27th in the conference room of the Newtown Creek Water Pollution Control Plant, located at 329 Greenpoint Avenue in Brooklyn. The meeting is sponsored by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation and will offer community members the chance to participate in one-on-one conversations with agency representatives. She indicated that SAC members could speak with her at the conclusion of tonight’s meeting for more details.

- Ms. Cordero stated that the New York City Council will likely hold hearings on changes to the Solid Waste Management Plan on May 9th.
The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, May 18th, at 6:30 p.m. in the conference room of the Newtown Creek Water Pollution Control Plant, 329 Greenpoint Avenue, Brooklyn. (See attached map and directions.)

Follow-up Items
1) Coordinate with DSNY to ensure that issues under their jurisdiction in the area of the bridge (e.g., alternate side parking rules) are addressed before construction. Invite representative of DSNY to attend SAC meetings (Alison Cordero/Gerald Esposito). Responsibility: NYSDOT.

2) Work with utility companies to facilitate coordination of utility relocation between individual companies and with the Kosciuszko Bridge Project (Barbara Mihelic). Responsibility: NYSDOT.

3) Provide copies of April SAC meeting PowerPoint presentations to SAC members. Responsibility: NYSDOT/HNA.
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NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
KOSCIUSZKO BRIDGE PROJECT
STAKEHOLDERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE: MAY 18, 2006

Minutes
The 29th meeting of the New York State Department of Transportation’s (NYSDOT) Kosciuszko Bridge Project Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC) was held on May 18, 2006 at the Newtown Creek Water Pollution Control Plant (NCWPCP), Greenpoint, Brooklyn. (See Attachment A for Attendance List.) The meeting was scheduled to present information on construction methods and impacts for the Kosciuszko Bridge Project.

Helen Neuhaus, Helen Neuhaus & Associates (HNA), began by asking for comments on the Minutes of the April 20, 2006 SAC meeting. There were no comments, and the Minutes were adopted by consensus. She then facilitated a discussion of follow-up items from that meeting.

- As requested, copies of the Conceptual Open Space Opportunities and Main Span Options presentations were available at the sign-in table.
- Ms. Neuhaus noted that inter-agency coordination is ongoing. In response to a specific request made by Alison Cordero, OUTRAGE and Gerald Esposito, Brooklyn Community Board #1, Robert Adams, NYSDOT, contacted the New York City Department of Sanitation (DSNY). Mr. Adams reported that the DSNY representative indicated that the department will become more involved in the project once an alternative is selected.

Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) Update
Dan Prevost, Parsons, stated that the project team will conduct soil gas sampling in Brooklyn in late June or early July for a period of two to three days. He noted that the sampling will test for volatile organic compounds, including benzene and methane. It will focus on areas where excavation will overlap with the underground oil plume in Greenpoint. Mr. Prevost added that the project team is completing several other studies, including air quality analysis, and will report on the results of these studies in the fall.

Construction Methods and Impacts
Mr. Adams introduced the presentation by referring to a handout (see Attachment B) that listed many of the post-EIS issues raised by the SAC over the past three and a half years. He remarked that these items will not be fully resolved until the final design, contract preparation, or construction phase of the project. Using a PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Adams then provided an overview of some of the issues that will be addressed in more detail in each of these phases:

- Final Design
  - Selection and detailed design of the final bridge type
  - Parks and open space design
  - Right-of-Way acquisition
  - Maintenance and Protection of Traffic (MPT) plan
  - Coordination with other agencies and utility companies
  - Community outreach/public involvement
Contract Preparation
- Environmental commitments, including noise, air quality and pre-construction monitoring
- Contractor penalties for non-compliance
- Incentives/disincentives
- Community outreach/public involvement

Construction
- Worker Health and Safety Plan (HASP)
- Contractor oversight/enforcement
- Site security
- Parking restrictions
- Community outreach/notification

Construction Methods
Before discussing construction methods, Steve Bennett, Parsons, reviewed several commonly used bridge terms, including:
- Superstructure: horizontal elements that go between vertical supports
- Substructure: vertical elements that support the horizontal elements
- Main Span: the portion of the bridge over Newtown Creek
- Brooklyn and Queens Approaches: the elevated roadway on both sides of the Main Span
- Brooklyn Connector: the low-level structure that is enclosed by walls.

He indicated that precast concrete segmental construction will likely be used, since the adjacent community is densely populated--particularly with businesses--and this method allows for construction from overhead. Mr. Bennett further noted that precast concrete expedites construction because the pieces can be fabricated off-site. He explained that a self-launching gantry can be used for the overhead construction on the approaches. This is a large frame that can span over three piers. It works by picking up materials and transporting them to where they need to be installed. Mr. Bennett stated that the project team is looking into the use of a winch to construct the Main Span. The winch picks up a segment from the ground and places it at the end of the built section. This method is also called Balanced Cantilevered Construction, because placement of the segments alternates between the two ends of the bridge, thereby allowing the load to remain equal. He then showed animation of this type of construction.

Mr. Bennett remarked that the construction methods for the Brooklyn Connector will be completely different. Demolition of this section will be conventional, using either a hoe ram (a backhoe with a very large jackhammer attached) or a saw. He noted that the saw, while not quiet, would be quieter than a hoe ram and might be more suitable in sensitive, residential areas. Mr. Bennett stated that the new Brooklyn Connector, similar to the Meeker Avenue viaduct, will be a multi-girder structure. Unlike the Meeker Avenue viaduct, the Brooklyn Connector will have concrete piers and will have new closure walls.

He explained that the temporary bridges and ramps along eastbound Meeker Avenue and Laurel Hill Boulevard will be pre-fabricated “Bailey Bridges.” Used during World War II, these modular bridges can be erected and removed quickly.
Construction Sequence and Schedule

Prior to reviewing sample construction schedules for Alternatives BR-5 and BR-3 (which represents all alternatives except BR-5), Mr. Adams described the construction staging for these alternatives. He explained that the conceptual schedules are neither too conservative (which would result in excessively long durations) nor too aggressive (which would result in unrealistic schedules). They represent reasonable construction schedules that a contractor might use to build the project. He then noted that the schedules, which anticipate a five-year construction period divided into six stages for BR-3 and five stages for BR-5, might proceed as follows:

BR-3

- **Stage A**
  - Start of project
  - Approximate Duration: 6 months
  - Location: Vandervoort Avenue, Brooklyn to 54th Avenue, Queens
  - Activities
    - demolish buildings
    - set up yards for contractor

- **Stage B**
  - Estimated Start: midpoint of year 1
  - Approximate Duration: 18 months
  - Location: Stewart Avenue, Brooklyn to 54th Road, Queens
  - Activities
    - begin construction of new westbound bridge (4 lanes and a bikeway/walkway)
    - begin construction of new eastbound bridge (3 lanes)

- **Stage C**
  - Estimated Start: beginning of year 2
  - Approximate Duration: 15 months
  - Location: length of project corridor
  - Activities
    - construct temporary bridges in Brooklyn
    - construct Vandervoort Avenue entrance ramp
    - continue construction of new westbound bridge
    - complete construction of new eastbound bridge (3 lanes)
    - construct Queens ramps (once Stage B has been completed)

- **Stage D**
  - Estimated Start: 2nd quarter of year 3
  - Approximate Duration: 1 year
  - Location: Kingsland Avenue to Stewart Avenue, Brooklyn
  - Activities: demolish and reconstruct Brooklyn Connector

- **Stage E**
  - Estimated Start: 2nd quarter of year 4
  - Approximate Duration: 1 year
  - Location: Stewart Avenue, Brooklyn to 54th Road, Queens
  - Activities: begin demolition of existing structure (including the Main Span over Newtown Creek and the approach spans)
- **Stage F**
  - Estimated Start: 4th quarter of year 4
  - Approximate Duration: 15 months
  - Location: length of project corridor
  - Activities:
    - complete construction of new westbound bridge in Brooklyn
    - construct new eastbound bridge (2 lanes)
    - complete demolition of existing structure
    - demolish temporary bridges

**BR-5**
- **Stage A**
  - Start of project
  - Approximate Duration: 6 months
  - Location: Morgan Avenue, Brooklyn to 54th Avenue, Queens
  - Activities
    - demolish buildings
    - set up yards for contractor

- **Stage B**
  - Estimated Start: midpoint of year 1
  - Approximate Duration: 18 months
  - Location: Varick Avenue, Brooklyn to Long Island Expressway (LIE) interchange, Queens
  - Activities: begin construction of new eastbound bridge (3 lanes)

- **Stage C**
  - Estimated Start: beginning of year 2
  - Approximate Duration: 2 years
  - Location: length of project corridor
  - Activities:
    - construct temporary bridges in Brooklyn and Queens
    - construct Vandervoort Avenue entrance ramp
    - construct eastbound Brooklyn Connector
    - construct new eastbound bridge (2 lanes)
    - complete construction of new eastbound bridge (3 lanes)
    - construct Queens ramps (once Stage B has been completed)

- **Stage D**
  - Estimated Start: beginning of year 4
  - Approximate Duration: 1 year
  - Location: length of project corridor
  - Activities:
    - begin demolition of existing structure (including the Main Span over Newtown Creek, westbound Brooklyn Connector and the approach spans)
    - demolish temporary bridge in Queens

- **Stage E**
  - Estimated Start: 4th quarter of year 4
  - Approximate Duration: 15 months
  - Location: length of project corridor
Activities:
- construct westbound Brooklyn Connector
- complete demolition of existing structure
- construct new westbound bridge (4 lanes and a bikeway/walkway)
- demolish temporary bridge in Brooklyn

The following questions and comments were raised following Mr. Adams’ presentation of the schedule:

- Peter King, NYSDOT, asked about the diversion of westbound traffic during demolition of the existing bridge for Alternative BR-5. Mr. Adams explained that all traffic will be shifted to the new eastbound bridges, which will be bi-directional during construction. He added that there will not be continuous work at all locations; the busiest time will be during year 2.

- Observing that the construction schedule is fairly aggressive, Barbara Mihelic, Noble Street Block Association, asked about the margin for contractor delay. Mr. Adams replied that the overlap in construction phases would allow the contractor to move on to another activity while previous activities are being completed. Mr. Bennett noted that while the schedule assumes daytime construction for most activities, additional shifts or weekend work could be added. He also confirmed that the contract will include incentives for early completion of construction and disincentives for delays. Ms. Mihelic remarked that the NCWPCP upgrade project has faced critical delays, resulting in construction that is seven years behind schedule.

- In response to a question from Christine Holowacz, Newtown Creek Monitoring Committee (NCMC), Mr. Adams indicated that the process of implementing a change order should take only six to seven months if the paperwork is filed correctly. Ms. Holowacz commented that because a contract must be registered for the contractor to receive payment, delayed registration can hold up a project. Mr. Adams concurred, noting that it is critically important that all contract-related issues are resolved during the final design phase, especially the development of accurate construction plans. A high quality final design will help minimize any “surprises” in the field that could lead to delay.

- In response to a question from Joe Vecchio, Emil Realty, Mr. Adams clarified that the Vandervoort Avenue entrance ramp would lead directly to the LIE. However, there would be a slip ramp at this location that would allow drivers to continue on the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway (BQE) with access to the Triborough Bridge and LaGuardia Airport.

- In response to a question from Gus Amato, United Forties Civic Association (UFCA), Mr. Bennett confirmed that the schedule assumes a five-year construction period for all of the alternatives.

Local Street Impacts
Mr. Bennett stated that no traffic will be diverted from the BQE to local streets; temporary bridges will be built to maintain traffic on the highway during construction. Although there will be no lane closures during peak hours, closures may be required during off-peak or overnight hours. However, he noted that impacts to some local streets in Brooklyn will be “unavoidable,” with the following streets being affected:

- Meeker Avenue (both directions): Kingsland Avenue to Varick Street
- Cherry Street: Vandervoort Avenue to Gardner Avenue
- streets underneath the bridge, including Morgan Avenue, Apollo Street/Vandervoort Avenue, Varick Street/Avenue, Stewart Avenue and Gardner Avenue.
Explaining that a temporary bridge would be built over eastbound Meeker Avenue, Mr. Bennett then reviewed the MPT plan for this roadway:

- maintain two lanes of traffic
- reduce travelway to two-10’ lanes to accommodate supports for the temporary bridge
- reduce sidewalks on the eastbound side to 5’
- close streets during off-peak and/or overnight hours, as needed. As examples, Mr. Bennett cited the need to close Meeker Avenue during construction of the temporary bridge substructure (for staging and delivery of materials) and during construction of the superstructure, which would require overhead work.
- implement detours only during off-peak and/or overnight hours for short periods of time and with early notification of drivers. He explained that Meeker Avenue traffic could be diverted to Lombardy Street and then Vandervoort Avenue.
- eliminate curb parking to allow this area to be used as a travel lane.

Mr. Bennett added that the project team has already studied local street traffic for the DEIS but will review it again during final design to determine the best ways to minimize disruptions. He showed slides illustrating the detour routes that could be used during the closures of Vandervoort Avenue (Meeker and Morgan Avenues, Anthony Street); and Morgan Avenue (Meeker, Kingsland and Vandervoort Avenues, Lombardy Street).

Mr. Bennett then reviewed the affected streets in Queens. These include:

- Laurel Hill Boulevard: 56th Road to 54th Avenue, due to a temporary bridge over this stretch of roadway
- 43rd Street: 56th Road to 44th Street
- streets underneath the bridge, including 54th Avenue, 54th Road and 56th Road.

The MPT plan for Laurel Hill Boulevard will:

- maintain two lanes of traffic
- reduce the travelway to two-11’ lanes
- reduce sidewalks on the westbound side to 5’
- close streets during off-peak and/or overnight hours, as needed
- implement detours only during off-peak and/or overnight hours for short periods of time and with early notification of drivers
- eliminate curb parking to allow use of this area as a travel lane.

Mr. Bennett noted that traffic diverted from Laurel Hill Boulevard would be directed to 54th Road and 43rd Street. Traffic diverted from 54th Road may use any of the adjacent local streets.

The following questions and comments were raised regarding Mr. Bennett’s presentation:

- Ms. Holowacz observed that the elimination of curbside parking, combined with the parking restrictions imposed by DSNY for street cleaning, will create a hardship for local residents. She asked if the project team could coordinate with DSNY to ensure that some parking is left for residents. Mr. Bennett indicated that the project team will continue to work with DSNY.
- Ms. Mihelic remarked that traffic detours will impact business operations--specifically, trucking--in the area. Mr. Bennett replied that the impact will be minimal if traffic diversions
are done during off-peak hours and are limited to short periods of time. He added that the impacts to businesses must be balanced against noise impacts to local residents.

- In response to a question from Mr. Esposito, Mr. Bennett noted that the brick enclosure of the Brooklyn Connector was discussed with community members early in the project. At that time, the project team proposed opening the area under the viaduct for parking. However, residents along Meeker Avenue opposed this idea, stating that the brick enclosure absorbs noise from the bridge and that opening this area would lead to dumping of trash and other sanitation problems. In a related comment, Mr. Esposito remarked that the clearance under the Brooklyn Connector is so low that DSNY cannot use its mechanical brooms to clean beneath the viaduct. He asked that the project team keep this issue in mind during final design.

- Mr. Esposito asked if the street corners at Meeker and Morgan Avenues and Meeker and Vandervoort Avenues would be recessed to allow trucks to maneuver more easily. Noting that there are two major problems at these intersections--truck movements and pedestrian safety--Mr. Bennett indicated that both of these concerns will be addressed in final design.

- In response to a question from Mr. Vecchio, Mr. Bennett confirmed that flag persons will be present at key intersections to direct detoured traffic. He noted that these will most likely work for the contractor. Mr. Adams added that New York City Traffic Enforcement Agents may also be used, particularly at such major intersections as Morgan Avenue and Vandervoort Avenue.

**Construction Impacts**

Anthony Lee, Parsons, introduced the discussion of construction-period noise and traffic impacts by reviewing the key steps used to analyze impacts. These include identification of areas of construction, major construction activities (e.g., demolition, construction of superstructure), major construction periods, peak periods of activity, and the types of equipment that are likely to be used. Referring to a chart describing various equipment types, Mr. Bennett noted that peak noise periods can be predicted by looking at the number and type of machines being used at the same time. He then turned the presentation back to Mr. Lee.

Mr. Lee explained that computer modeling was done for 21 locations in Brooklyn and six locations in Queens to predict construction-period noise levels. Noting that the sites used were the same as the locations modeled for operational noise, he emphasized that three factors determine noise levels: distance between the receiver and the construction activity, height of the construction, and shielding. Decibel (dBA) levels were then shown for existing traffic conditions, 2012 (No Build) traffic, and peak construction periods at each of the modeled locations. In Brooklyn, the lowest dBA level during peak construction is predicted to be 60; the highest 88. In Queens, the lowest dBA level during peak construction is predicted to be 85; the highest 95. Mr. Lee reminded the SAC of activities with comparable noise levels, including: average conversation (60 dBA); noisy restaurant (70 dBA); subway, average factory (80 dBA); truck traffic, blender (85 dBA); and elevated train, chain saw (100 dBA).

He noted that, in accordance with NYSDOT’s Noise Analysis Policy, construction-period noise must be 85 dBA or higher to be considered an impact. This differs from NYSDOT’s policy for operational noise, which considers a location impacted if the dBA is 66 or higher. Mr. Lee further explained that certain locations will experience high noise levels during temporary peak periods and that noise will be the highest during the daytime (when most of the construction
occurs). He added that a compressed construction schedule will result in shorter periods of noise, but at higher levels during peak periods.

Ms. Mihelic remarked that the dBA level is not the only concern; the duration of the activity should be considered when determining noise impacts. Mr. Lee acknowledged her point, noting that while construction will be noisy, there are mitigation measures that can be implemented. These include:

- source reduction measures
  - acoustic screens
  - temporary barriers
  - noise tents
  - alternative equipment (rotary/auger drill vs. pile drivers)
  - hydraulic or electrical equipment rather than diesel
  - distance between equipment and receivers
  - equipment maintenance
  - use of silencers or mufflers
- pre-cutting of materials off-site
- enforcement of activity limits in contractor specifications
- sensitivity to land uses (e.g., residences, parks)
- limits on the maximum number of consecutive days for noisy activities at any given location
- compression of schedule (shorter construction duration with potentially louder noise)

Mr. Lee stated that construction methods, equipment and details will be finalized during final design and incorporated into plans, specifications & estimates, where appropriate. All impacts and proposed mitigation will be presented to and discussed with the SAC. Commenting that impacts will be monitored during construction, he indicated that methods may be changed, depending upon monitoring results.

Mr. Lee then briefly discussed traffic impacts and potential mitigation measures. He noted that construction-related truck traffic is expected to represent a small percentage of the total number of vehicles using truck routes during the 2010-2015 construction period. Although traffic impacts are therefore not anticipated, Mr. Lee reviewed a number of potential mitigation measures:

- use of barges to deliver materials and remove demolition debris
- worker shifts that do not coincide with rush hours
- incentives to encourage workers to park away from residential areas in specified parking lots near the staging area.

The following questions and comments were raised regarding Mr. Lee’s presentation:

- In response to a question from Ms. Mihelic, Mr. Lee stated that there would not be many concrete trucks traveling to and from the construction site because most concrete segments would be precast off-site and delivered by barges. Mr. Bennett noted that there are several concrete companies in the vicinity of the bridge. He added that although it is too early to know which company will supply the concrete, it is generally less expensive to purchase from local businesses.
- During a discussion regarding worker parking, the following points were raised:
Mr. Lee reiterated that workers will generally arrive early in the morning and leave before the evening rush hour.

Ms. Holowacz stated that workers should be required to park in a nearby parking lot. Citing a contractor who implemented a lottery with monthly cash prizes for workers who used the parking lot, she suggested that the project team use innovative ideas to encourage worker use of a lot.

Ms. Mihelic and Ms. Holowacz expressed their view that any parking fines collected should benefit the local community.

Mr. Bennett indicated that the main yard and field office will likely be located at the edge of Newtown Creek in Queens. If so, workers would generally report to, and park in, this area.

Joe Ruzalski, UFCA, stated that damage to the headstones in Calvary Cemetery should be avoided. Mr. Adams explained that construction will extend only to the edge of cemetery property. In response to a follow-up question from Mr. Ruzalski, he stated that a barrier might be erected at the edge of the temporary bridge to prevent debris and other materials from blowing off the bridge onto the headstones.

In response to a question from Ms. Holowacz, Mr. Bennett acknowledged that dust control will be very important, especially during demolition. He stated that dust is typically controlled by watering the construction site. Ms. Holowacz added that construction vehicles often track dirt and dust through the neighborhood as they leave the site. Mr. Bennett replied that this can be controlled by spraying the truck and providing heavy gravel for the trucks to drive over to remove dirt from the tires.

In response to a comment from Ms. Holowacz regarding vapors from the Greenpoint oil spill, Mr. Bennett assured her that excavation in the area of the spill will not go as deep as the oil plume. Even so, soil vapor sampling will be conducted this summer.

Ms. Holowacz expressed concern regarding noise impacts on residents living near the construction area. She asked if NYSDOT would pay for new, insulated windows if the noise is so loud that people cannot live in their own homes. Mr. Adams replied that while special, soundproof windows are required for impacted schools, he does not know if there is a similar policy for residences.

Ms. Mihelic asked how construction-related problems will be resolved. She emphasized that a mechanism must be in place for addressing community issues quickly and efficiently. Mr. Bennett indicated that a community liaison will be hired and will be available throughout construction. Ms. Mihelic further noted that the liaison should be well informed about the project and sensitive to community concerns. Ms. Neuhaus remarked that it will be important for the SAC to remain involved in the project. She encouraged SAC members to keep the handout distributed tonight for future reference to ensure that all issues on the list are addressed. Moshe Strum, New York City Department of Transportation, stated that on most construction projects this size, monthly task force meetings are held with community members, NYSDOT and the Engineer in Charge (EIC). Mr. Amato suggested that local residents actively monitor contractor compliance.

Laura Hofmann, Greenpoint Waterfront Association for Parks and Planning, asked who is responsible for hiring the community liaison. She expressed her view that the SAC should have input into this decision. Ms. Neuhaus replied that the construction management team (not the contractor) has this responsibility. Mr. Bennett observed that NYSDOT has shown its...
commitment to public outreach on this project and will continue to keep the community involved through construction.

- In response to questions from Ms. Mihelic, Mr. Bennett replied that the nearest residences to the Brooklyn Connector are 45’ away and that it will be possible to protect these homes from dust. As an example, he remarked that a circular saw, which uses water as a lubricant, could be used to reduce the amount of dust. He added that while contractors could be required to use certain types of equipment, the requirements must be “workable.”
- Dorothy Swick, NCMC, asked if the temporary bridges would be made of concrete only, or concrete with steel inserts between the concrete segments. She observed that steel plates on the BQE were uneven and extremely noisy. Mr. Bennett explained that the bridges will likely have concrete decks with a thin layer of asphalt on top and no steel plates on the driving surface.
- Ms. Swick commented that NYSDOT has erected signs at the corner of Kingsland and Meeker Avenues that block the Walk/Don’t Walk signals. Mr. Adams speculated that the new signs relate to the Vandervoort Avenue ramp repaving. He offered to contact the EIC the next day.

New Business
Noting that the project team will be working on the DEIS through the summer, Ms. Neuhaus recommended that the SAC reconvene in September. Agenda items for the fall will include a discussion of the air quality studies and a preview of the DEIS. In response to a question from Ms. Mihelic, Mr. Adams clarified that publication of the DEIS is scheduled for October; the document will be presented to the SAC before it is distributed to the general public. He indicated that the public will have 45 days (at a minimum) after publication of the DEIS to provide comments. The Record of Decision announcing the selected alternative is expected in the spring of 2007. Ms. Holowacz asked if the SAC would receive the full document or an executive summary. Mr. Adams confirmed that the SAC will receive the full DEIS, which may be distributed on a CD. He added that the DEIS will also be posted on the project website.

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, September 21st, 6:30 p.m. in the conference room of the Newtown Creek Water Pollution Control Plant, 329 Greenpoint Avenue, Brooklyn. (See attached map and directions.)

Follow-up Items
1) Investigate whether NYSDOT would pay for new windows for residents most impacted by construction noise (Ms. Holowacz). Responsibility: NYSDOT.
2) Request the relocation of NYSDOT signage at the corner of Meeker and Kingsland Avenues so that it does not block the Walk/Don’t Walk sign (Dorothy Swick). Responsibility: NYSDOT.
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POST EIS-PERIOD ISSUES

Over the past three and a half years, the Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC) has raised many important questions and concerns regarding construction-related impacts on the business and residential communities surrounding the bridge. Several of these issues will be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and discussed at tonight’s meeting. However, many issues cannot be fully resolved until the final design/contract preparation/construction phases of the project. These include:

Final Design
• Selection of Bridge type

• Maintainence and Protection of Traffic
  o Signage (on highway and local streets)
  o Measures to minimize traffic diversions onto local streets
  o Inter-agency coordination, including coordination with emergency services and the New York City Departments of Transportation and Sanitation

• Business Concerns
  o Relocation
  o Disruptions

• Residential Displacement (Queens)

• Creative solutions for long-term noise abatement

• Traffic signal timing changes

Contract Preparation
• Air Quality
  o Frequency and locations of monitoring
  o Contract requirements to minimize the spread of particulate matter/dust, including construction site watering; use of excavation site tents; materials transport; and equipment specifications
• Enforcement / Contractor Oversight
  o New York State Department Of Transportation on-site inspectors to ensure contract compliance. Specific areas of concern include:
    ▪ Scheduling: standard work hours / special conditions (nighttime, weekend) / restrictions / options for accelerated completion
    ▪ Penalties and incentives to avoid impacts on surrounding neighborhoods
    ▪ Health and safety regulations
    ▪ Noise and air pollution (from construction equipment and vehicles, removal of contaminated materials, etc.)
    ▪ Untidy staging areas and work sites
    ▪ Dumping of debris in surrounding neighborhoods
    ▪ Truck routes
    ▪ Parking: construction equipment, worker vehicles

• Pre-construction monitoring

Construction
• Public Health and Safety / Worker Health and Safety
  o Health and Safety Plan / Community Protection Plan
  o Decontamination area
  o Removal of hazardous materials from construction site
    ▪ Timeframe
    ▪ Methodology (containerization and placarding)
    ▪ Transport (truck routes, barges, etc.)

• Security / Site Safety
  o Fencing and lighting to restrict access and illuminate area
  o 24-hour security
  o Emergency contact numbers / Hotline

• Best Management Practices

• Soil Management Plan

Community Outreach / Information and Notification
• Full-time community liaison

• Field office

• SAC

• Website

• Informational materials
  o Newsletters
  o Fact sheets
  o Updates: staging, scheduling, progress
  o Notices: special conditions / upcoming work
NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
KOSCIUSZKO BRIDGE PROJECT
STAKEHOLDERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE:  SEPTEMBER 21, 2006

Minutes

The 30th meeting of the New York State Department of Transportation’s (NYSDOT) Kosciuszko Bridge Project Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC) was held on September 21, 2006 at the Newtown Creek Water Pollution Control Plant, Greenpoint, Brooklyn. (See Attachment A for Attendance List.) The meeting was scheduled to present the results of the Soil Gas Investigation and Air Quality Analyses conducted for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).

Helen Neuhaus, Helen Neuhaus & Associates (HNA), began by welcoming everyone back after the summer break and announcing the retirement of Queens Community Board (CB) #2 District Manager Dolores Rizzotto and her replacement by Debra Markell, who would be joining us later in the evening. In other announcements, Ms. Neuhaus reported that Dan Prevost, Parsons, has relocated to Ohio and that Denise Woodin, HNA, has taken another position closer to home. She then asked for comments on the Minutes of the May 18, 2006 SAC meeting. There were no comments, and the Minutes were adopted by consensus. Ms. Neuhaus also referenced three handouts that were available at the sign-in table:

- A revised SAC Membership List that acknowledges the status of community boards as city agencies. Ms. Neuhaus thanked Gerald Esposito, Brooklyn CB #1, for reminding her of this fact.
- An updated Inter-Agency Advisory Committee Membership List.
- An updated version of the “Post EIS-Period Issues” handout that includes comments provided at the May 2006 SAC meeting. Ms. Neuhaus noted that this handout will continue to be updated as new issues are identified.

DEIS: Results of Soil Gas Investigation

Using a PowerPoint presentation (see Attachment B), Richard Hart, Environmental Planning and Management, Inc. (EPM), presented an overview of the soil gas investigation, along with a summary of the results. Mr. Hart began by describing the purpose of the survey, emphasizing that it focused on soil conditions in areas near the bridge that are likely to be disturbed during excavation activities related to construction of a new bridge. The investigation was designed to analyze below-ground soil conditions; determine the presence of volatile organic compounds (VOC) and methane gas; identify potential exposures that could arise during construction; and ensure that contract specifications include appropriate monitoring and mitigation measures.

Mr. Hart briefly reviewed the federal and state standards used to evaluate the soil gas samples that were collected at seven locations (5 in Brooklyn and 2 in Queens) in July 2006. He noted that two of the locations were within the approximate limits of the oil plume. At Boring SV-2, a sample collected at an 8-foot depth at Meeker Avenue and Van Dam Street exceeded the permissible exposure limits (PELs) set by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). This sample had elevated benzene and total VOC levels. No exceedances were found.

1 These handouts are not being included with the Minutes. Anyone wishing to obtain copies may contact Ms. Neuhaus at (212) 532-4175.
at Boring SV-2 at a 20-foot depth. Nor were any exceedances found at the other sampling locations.

In response to several questions, Mr. Hart and members of the project team provided the following additional information:

- The purpose of the study was to determine existing soil conditions, not to identify the source of contamination.
- Methane is an explosive hazard, but only when levels of the gas are within a specific range. None of the samples contained methane at levels anywhere near the explosive range.
- This initial investigation was conducted to obtain a general understanding of subsurface conditions in the area. Once an alternative is selected and the limits of excavation are better identified, additional samples will be collected from affected areas to further define soil conditions, protocols for removal and transport, and any required mitigation measures.
- Gases in the soil will dissipate as they vent to the atmosphere when exposed during excavation. The potential health impacts are therefore of greatest concern to on-site workers in the immediate vicinity of the excavation.

In summary, Mr. Hart indicated that, based on the study results, the greatest potential to encounter VOCs exists in the vicinity of the Brooklyn Queens Expressway (BQE) at Van Dam Street and Meeker Avenue. He reiterated that during construction, appropriate monitoring and safety precautions will be implemented, as needed.

Other questions and comments raised during Mr. Hart’s presentation are summarized below:

- Christine Holowacz, Newtown Creek Monitoring Committee (NCMC), asked where samples were taken in relation to those previously collected by Roux Associates on behalf of ExxonMobil. Mr. Hart replied that although Roux had collected many more samples than the project team, some were taken in the same area. He explained that the purpose of the testing conducted by Roux was to determine if the oil plume was impacting soil gas in the area, which is why samples had been collected both inside and outside the limits of the plume. In response to a follow-up question from Ms. Holowacz, Mr. Hart indicated that the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) is developing a plan to begin sampling indoor air quality in the homes of residents in the area. This issue will be discussed at an NYSDEC-sponsored meeting on Wednesday, September 27th at 7:00 p.m. at Princess Manor (92 Nassau Avenue, Brooklyn).
- Responding to a comment from Barbara Mihelic, Noble Street Block Association, Steve Bennett, Parsons, stated that construction activities will not reach the depths of the samples taken at Boring SV-2. Mr. Hart added that contract specifications will include provisions for monitoring, as well as protocols to be followed if readings exceed the PELs. He also reiterated that an explosion is unlikely, as methane levels were not found to be within the explosive range of the gas.
- In response to a request from George Kosser, Karp Associates, Inc., Mr. Hart illustrated the limits of the oil plume and indicated that, for this study, the project team focused on areas where construction is likely to occur.
- In response to a question from Ms. Mihelic, Mr. Hart indicated that samples collected outside the limits of the plume were generally cleaner than those taken within the limits of the plume.
• In response to a question from Irene Klementowicz, NCMC, Mr. Hart explained that according to OSHA, there is a potential health risk only if concentrations are above the PELs for specific exposure durations.
• Ms. Mihelic expressed concern about 24-hour exposure levels, which impact the community more than 8-hour levels. After acknowledging this concern, Mr. Hart noted that outdoor ambient air VOC measurements taken during the soil gas study did not detect any measurable VOC vapors in the areas sampled by EPM.
• Laura Hofmann, Greenpoint Waterfront Association for Parks and Planning, questioned why samples had not been collected beneath the BQE, between Varick and Scott Avenues. Mr. Hart explained that samples were taken to establish a general understanding of conditions in the area of the plume or areas that might be disturbed during construction; there was no reason to suspect a problem in the referenced area. He added that from a community safety perspective, the potential exposure risk is very low, unless an individual is immediately adjacent to an excavation site.
• Ms. Klementowicz remarked that residents in the vicinity of Boring SV-2 (the only location with elevated levels) should be informed of conditions in their neighborhood. Mr. Bennett replied that NYSDEC will be discussing its indoor air quality sampling program at next Wednesday’s previously referenced meeting.
• Evelyn Cruz, Congresswoman Nydia Velazquez, asked if the project could be stopped if high levels of methane or benzene were found. Mr. Hart explained that this could occur if extraordinarily high levels were detected that could not otherwise be controlled or mitigated. However, he noted that the preliminary findings do not indicate the presence of high levels of these contaminants. In addition, Mr. Hart explained that there are a number of ways to mitigate exceedances of methane and benzene.
• Noting that vapors are worse when the tide is in, Dorothy Swick, NCMC, questioned if tidal positions were recorded when soil gas samples were collected. Mr. Hart agreed to provide the SAC with this information.
• Ms. Mihelic asked if the findings of the soil gas tests will be built into the Health and Safety Plan (HASP). Mr. Hart explained that the results of the soil gas investigation will be used to develop the safety protocols specified in the HASP. In response to a follow-up question from Ms. Klementowicz, Mr. Hart acknowledged that the contractor will be required to provide qualified on-site health and safety professionals. Ms. Neuhaus added that the HASP is an official document that describes all the procedures that need to be followed to ensure the health and safety of on-site workers and the community.
• Ms. Holowacz emphasized the importance of including the HASP, along with a contingency plan, in the contract documents.
• In response to a question from Ms. Klementowicz, Mr. Bennett indicated that excavation would take approximately one week at each location. Mr. Hart noted that a section in the DEIS will discuss the requirements of the HASP. Ms. Neuhaus remarked that her firm recently worked on remediation of the worst State Superfund site in New York City. She indicated that the project team worked closely with the project’s advisory committee to develop the HASP and a Community Protection Plan (CPP). In response to a request from Ms. Mihelic, Ms. Neuhaus agreed to send her copies of the HASP and CPP that were developed for the referenced project.
• Ms. Holowacz commented that the project team needs to explain what the soil gas results mean or provide the SAC with an advisor to interpret the results. In response, Mr. Hart
discussed two primary issues related to the soil gas investigation: 1) determine what is in the soil that would be disturbed during construction of the bridge, which was the purpose of the soil gas investigation; and 2) determine what is in the basements of homes in the area, which is being examined by NYSDEC.

DEIS: Results of Air Quality Analyses

Bruce Neiger, Parsons, summarized the results of the air quality analyses conducted as part of the DEIS. Using a PowerPoint presentation (see Attachment C), Mr. Neiger began with an overview of why air quality is studied, before describing three scales of analysis, the latter two of which were used for the DEIS:

- **Regional**, which assesses total emissions for an area (county/counties). Although this level is not project-specific, the Kosciuszko Bridge Project is included in the New York Metropolitan Transportation Council’s regional emissions analysis.
- **Mesoscale**, which assesses total emissions for a project study area and compares the effects of each of the alternatives under consideration.
- **Microscale**, which examines local concentrations and compares them to national standards.

In discussing regional air quality, Mr. Neiger explained that, in general, vehicular emissions including carbon monoxide, particulates (dust), and pollutants that form ozone (smog) are decreasing due to technological improvements (alternative fuels, new vehicles, etc.) and improved transit programs. On the other hand, traffic volumes and congestion can increase emissions. Although it is assumed that emerging technologies will continue to improve and further decrease emissions, the air quality model cannot project the impacts of technological advances beyond the year 2020. As a result, projections do not show further regional improvements after 2020. In addition to examining regional air quality, mesoscale and microscale analyses were performed to compare the effects of the individual alternatives and to compare the project to federal and state standards, respectively.

Mr. Neiger also reviewed some of the measures to be undertaken during construction to minimize impacts on air quality. Potential measures relate to traffic (no traffic diversions to local streets, use of temporary bridges, lanes closures during off-peak hours, etc.) and sources (watering of construction areas and equipment to reduce dust, equipment specifications, covering materials during transport, etc.). He explained that the initial construction screening indicated that all of the build alternatives would exceed the threshold for particulates. Therefore, a more advanced analysis will be performed following award of the construction contract, when the specific methods of construction and equipment to be used on the project are known. Mitigation measures will be implemented if the project continues to exceed the threshold for particulates.

In conclusion, Mr. Neiger reported that on the mesoscale level, all of the alternatives increase pollutant levels slightly over the No Build Alternative. He reiterated that the model overestimates total, as well as project, emissions by not reflecting new technologies or improved traffic flow resulting from the project. On the microscale level, there are no air quality impacts.

The following questions and comments were raised regarding Mr. Neiger’s presentation:

- In response to a comment from Mr. Kosser, Ms. Neuhaus noted that the EIS process requires projecting conditions 20 years beyond the project’s estimated completion date. Mr. Neiger explained that although the project team assumes that technology will continue...
to improve, the model cannot project the timeframe or nature of future improvements. Peter King, NYSDOT, noted that the model provides relative numbers, in order to compare and evaluate the alternatives; technological advances would cover all of the alternatives.

- Mr. Esposito expressed concern about traffic diversion during construction. While acknowledging that the project includes measures to preclude diversions, he noted that motorists will divert if congestion occurs. He therefore asked the project team to consider detour routes in anticipation of such diversions. In response, Mr. Bennett agreed that accidents and heavy traffic will result in diversions but emphasized that lane closures (which will only be allowed during off-peak hours) are the primary cause of diversions. Harold Fink, NYSDOT, added that during construction, at least one tow truck (funded by the project) will be on site at all times to keep traffic flowing. Moshe Strum, New York City Department of Transportation, reiterated that daytime lane closures will not be permitted.
- Ms. Klementowicz praised Mr. Neiger’s presentation and requested a copy of the PowerPoint slides. It was agreed that these will be provided with the Minutes (see Attachment C) and that, in the future, the SAC will receive copies of the PowerPoint slides at the time of presentation.

**Update on Other DEIS Studies**

Mr. Adams remarked that all of the technical studies and analyses to be included in the DEIS have been completed. He announced that the document is nearing completion and will be available shortly for review. The November SAC meeting, which is tentatively scheduled for November 30th, will provide the SAC with a preview of the DEIS prior to its publication. Ms. Neuhaus added that members of the SAC will receive the full DEIS on CD. In addition, an Executive Summary of the document will be distributed to all persons on the project mailing list. Upon publication, the DEIS will also be available at each of the project repositories and posted on the project website.

Citing other projects where consultants have been hired to review technical materials for the community, Ms. Mihelic requested that the community be provided with an independent environmental consultant to assist it with review of the DEIS. She was supported by Ms. Klementowicz, Ms. Cruz, and Ms. Holowacz, who asked the team to respond to the request at the next SAC meeting.

Mr. Adams also reported that over the summer, the project team discussed the eligibility of the bridge for inclusion in the New York State and National Registers of Historic Places (S/NRHP) with the New York State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). He informed the SAC that SHPO has determined that the bridge and Old Calvary Cemetery are S/NRHP-eligible. Additional consultation with SHPO will therefore be required. The outcome of the upcoming discussions will, of course, be reviewed with the SAC. Ms. Mihelic asked if any of the bridge alternatives will no longer be feasible based on SHPO’s determination. Mr. Adams replied that since the purpose and need for a new bridge is strong, demolition of the bridge will be permitted as long as adequate mitigation measures are in place. Christopher McBride, American Automobile Association, questioned if the determination would exclude the Bridge Replacement (BR) alternatives. The project team responded they would not be excluded but that selection of a BR alternative would require consideration of mitigation measures. These could include
incorporating features of the old bridge into the design of the new bridge. In response to a question from Mr. Esposito, Mr. King indicated that while it is unlikely that the project will be eligible for special funding due to the bridge’s historic eligibility, the project team will explore innovative funding options due to the cost of the bridge (currently estimated in the range of $500 million).

Other
- Theresa Cianciotta, Office of Assemblyman Joseph Lentol, reported that a very serious accident recently occurred on the bridge and asked if there are any plans for interim safety improvements. Mr. Adams discussed the ongoing maintenance and repair program, which will provide a smoother riding surface for motorists. Work on the Brooklyn side of the bridge is expected to be completed by the end of September; work will then begin on the Queens side.
- Ms. Holowacz questioned the status of planning for a sewer system in the Greenpoint-Williamsburg industrial area. She emphasized the need to continue coordination with the New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP) now that Doug Greeley is no longer Deputy Commissioner of the Bureau of Water and Sewer Operations. Ms. Mihelic echoed the need to remain on top of the issue, and Ms. Neuhaus agreed to reach out to NYCDEP to obtain status and contact information.
- Ms. Cianciotta asked if the relationship between fumes prevalent in the neighborhood and water pollution from Newtown Creek has been studied. Ms. Cruz indicated that Congresswoman Velazquez has secured funding for an independent study to address this issue. The study, which is expected to take about a year to complete, will focus on the ecology of the creek and sources of vapors.

Update on Related Projects/Meetings
- Mr. Adams noted that the October 19th SAC meeting will include a presentation on the Visual Resources Assessment and further discussion of the bridge’s S/NRHP-eligibility. The November SAC meeting will focus on a preview of the DEIS.
- Ms. Neuhaus provided additional information on NYSDEC’s September 27th meeting on the Greenpoint oil spill. She indicated that its agenda includes an update on current remediation efforts and further discussion of the residential indoor vapor intrusion sampling program (including attempts to enlist additional participants). Ms. Holowacz commented that residents are reluctant to participate in the program due to problems with the testing protocol. However, now that the Attorney General’s office is involved, she speculated that residents may be more willing to participate.

The next SAC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 19th at 6:30 p.m. in the community room of the North Fork Savings Bank, 807 Manhattan Avenue, Brooklyn. (See attached map and directions.)

Follow-up Items
1) Provide copies of Soil Gas Survey and Air Quality Analysis PowerPoint presentations to SAC Members (Ms. Holowacz and Ms. Klementowicz). Responsibility: HNA.
2) Provide information on tidal positions at times when soil gas survey samples were collected (Ms. Swick). Responsibility: Rick Hart, EPM.

4) Provide SAC with hard copies of PowerPoint slides at time of presentation (Ms. Cruz). Responsibility: Project Team.

5) Request that community have an environmental consultant available to assist with review of DEIS (Ms. Mihelic and Ms. Klementowicz). Responsibility: NYSDOT.

6) Reconsider hiring a community engineer to assist the SAC. Provide response to this request at next SAC Meeting (Ms. Holowacz). Responsibility: NYSDOT.

7) Follow-up with Deputy Commissioner Doug Greeley, NYCDENP, regarding status of sewer and water main projects in the Greenpoint-Williamsburg industrial area (Ms. Holowacz). Responsibility: Helen Neuhaus, HNA.
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Soil Gas Survey Results
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Purpose of Soil Gas Survey

- Analyze soil vapor conditions near underground petroleum plume (which is 40-50 feet beneath project site near Van Dam and Varick Streets in Brooklyn)
- Determine presence of volatile organic compound (VOC) vapors or methane gas within excavation limits
Purpose of Soil Gas Survey

- Determine levels of exposure to potentially harmful vapors during construction
- Ensure proper protocols for exposure monitoring and mitigation in the construction specifications

What are the standards?

- Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) Permissible Exposure Limits (PELs) for Air Contaminants
- NYSDOH Generic Community Air Monitoring Plan (CAMP)
  - NYSDOH and NYSDEC evaluate exposure based on CAMP levels
Scope of Soil Gas Survey

- 12 samples collected at 7 locations - 5 in Brooklyn & 2 in Queens (July 2006)
- Depth range of 6 to 20 feet below grade
- Results evaluated by NYS certified facility for VOCs & methane

Soil Gas Sample Locations

[Map showing sample locations SV-1 to SV-7 with indicated limits of oil plume]
Evaluation of Results

- VOC levels were compared to OSHA levels for air contaminants and to the NYSDOH CAMP

- Methane results were compared to explosive range for methane gas of 5% to 15% by volume

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Location</th>
<th>SV-1</th>
<th>SV-1</th>
<th>SV-2</th>
<th>SV-2</th>
<th>SV-3</th>
<th>SV-3</th>
<th>OSHA PELs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample Depth</td>
<td>8 ft.</td>
<td>20 ft.</td>
<td>8 ft.</td>
<td>20 ft.</td>
<td>8 ft.</td>
<td>20 ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ppmv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzene</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>3.750</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethylbenzene</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toluene</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>2.050</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Xylenes</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total BTEX VOCs</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total VOCs</td>
<td>1.317</td>
<td>1.938</td>
<td>241.6</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>4.307</td>
<td>1.830</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methane</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>&lt;6.5</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>&lt;5.9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>&lt;6.4</td>
<td>50,000 (LEL)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation of Results

#### Sample Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Location</th>
<th>SV-2</th>
<th>OSHA PELs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample Depth</td>
<td>8 ft.</td>
<td>Ppmv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclohexane</td>
<td>63.80</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heptane</td>
<td>21.60</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hexane</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sample Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Location</th>
<th>SV-4</th>
<th>SV-4</th>
<th>SV-5</th>
<th>SV-6</th>
<th>SV-6</th>
<th>SV-7</th>
<th>OSHA PELs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample Depth</td>
<td>8 ft.</td>
<td>20 ft.</td>
<td>8 ft.</td>
<td>8 ft.</td>
<td>20 ft.</td>
<td>6 ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzene</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethylbenzene</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toluene</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Xylenes</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total BTEX VOCs</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.455</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total VOCs</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td>1.410</td>
<td>1.133</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methane</td>
<td>&lt;5.8</td>
<td>&lt;5.7</td>
<td>&lt;6.4</td>
<td>&lt;6.0</td>
<td>&lt;6.0</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>50,000 (LEL)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation of Results

- **Methane**
  - All samples well below explosive concentrations (50,000 to 150,000 ppm)
  - Highest concentration: 88.5 ppm at SV-2 (8 feet)

- **Benzene**
  - All but one sample below OSHA levels
  - SV-2 (8 feet): 3.75 ppmv
  - Exceed OSHA’s (1.0 ppmv) level, but below OSHA short-term limit (5.0 ppmv)

- **Total BTEX VOCs**
  - All but one sample below OSHA levels
  - SV-2 (8 feet): 6.07 ppmv
  - Exceeds NYSDOH’s response level (5.0 ppmv)

- None of remaining compounds exceed OSHA levels
Conclusions

- Potential to encounter VOC vapors exists in vicinity of BQE at Van Dam Street and Meeker Avenue
- Monitoring will be necessary in specific areas of excavation

Community and Worker Protection

- Exposure Air Monitoring For:
  - Petroleum Vapors (VOCs)
  - Methane Gas
- Workers: OSHA “HAZWOPER” Guidelines (CFR 1910.120)
Air Quality Analysis Results

Stakeholders Advisory Committee Meeting

September 21, 2006

Why Do We Study Air?

- Clean Air Act (1970) and Clean Air Act Amendments (1990)
  - Identifies pollutants
  - Sets human health standards (NAAQS)
  - Determines attainment status for each area
- State Plan to Achieve Standards (SIP)
- EIS
  - Compares project alternatives
  - Demonstrates that standards are met
Different Scales of Analysis

- **Regional:**
  - Total emissions for an area (county/counties)
  - Not project specific

- **Mesoscale:**
  - Total emissions for a project (study area)
  - Compares effects of the alternatives

- **Microscale:**
  - Local concentrations
  - Compared to national standards (NAAQS)

Sources of Pollution

- **Stationary sources:**
  - Factories, heating plants, power plants, chimneys
  - Parking lots

- **Mobile sources:**
  - Cars, trucks, other vehicles
  - Diesel trains
Pollutants from Vehicles

- Carbon Monoxide (CO)
- Particulate Matter (PM)
  - Inhalable particles (PM$_{10}$)
  - Fine particles (PM$_{2.5}$)
- Precursors to Ozone (Smog)
  - Oxides of Nitrogen (NOx)
  - Volatile Organic Hydrocarbons (VOC)

Attainment Designations

- Determined By EPA for Each County
- Attainment: area attains standards
- Maintenance: area attains standards
  - Area was not-attainment, previously
  - Demonstrate maintenance to re-designate
- Non-Attainment: area continues to experience exceedances
  - “Severity” assigned for some pollutants
  - Demonstrate attainment to re-designate
### Attainment Status of the Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide (CO)</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhalable Particulates (PM(_{10}))</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine particles (PM(_{2.5}))</td>
<td>Non-Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozone</td>
<td>Severe Non-Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applies to Both Brooklyn and Queens

---

### TIP Conformity

- **Regional**
  - 10-county NYMTC region
    - Carbon monoxide
    - Nitrogen oxides
    - Hydrocarbons
    - Particulate matter
  - Evaluated by NYMTC through TIP process
  - Must meet CAAA90 conformity criteria
Regional Emissions Are Decreasing

- Technology improvements
  - Clean/Alternative fuels
  - Emissions control devices
  - Required by EPA for new vehicles
- Demand management
  - NYMTC “Regional Choice” program
  - Rideshare/transit programs

NYMTC Projections
Excluding Putnam County

Reflects only current technology and requirements.
Factors that Increase Emissions

• Carbon Monoxide
  – Higher volumes / miles traveled
  – Congestion (idling emissions)
  – Slower speeds
  – Stop-and-go drive cycle
  – Vehicle type (gasoline using vehicles emit more than diesel users)

Factors that Increase Emissions

• Particulate Matter
  – Higher volumes
  – Stop-and-go drive cycle
  – Diesel trucks
  – Roadway dust
Analysis Performed for this Project

- **Mesoscale:**
  - Total emissions for a project (study area)
  - Compares effects of the alternatives

- **Microscale:**
  - Local concentrations
  - Compared to national standards (NAAQS)

What is a Mesoscale Air Impact?

- Principle purpose is to compare the alternatives
- No impact criteria for CO, NOx, or VOCs
- No federal impact criteria for PM
- State definition for PM impact: an increase of 2.0% over the No Build
Where We Look for Mesoscale Analysis

• Mesoscale
  – Project’s Traffic Study Area
  – Pollutants: all vehicular pollutants
  – Considers:
    – Projected VMT
    – Vehicle mix
    – Emission factors
  – Evaluated on 24-hour basis

Mesoscale Analysis

• Analysis Years
  – ETC (2015), ETC+10 (2025), & ETC+20 (2035)
• Alternatives
  – No Build, RA-6, and “All but RA-6”
• 24-Hour Time Period
  – Peak Periods (a.m., p.m.)
  – Off Peak Periods (early, mid-day, evening)
• Emissions from “Traffic Links”
  – Volumes and Roadway Length (VMT)
  – Emission Factors
Mesoscale Results

**CO Emissions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No Build</th>
<th>Not RA-6</th>
<th>RA-6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>1.22%</td>
<td>0.76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>2.03%</td>
<td>1.87%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mesoscale Results

**NOx Emissions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No Build</th>
<th>Not RA-6</th>
<th>RA-6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1.43%</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>1.16%</td>
<td>0.73%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>1.69%</td>
<td>1.44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mesoscale Results

### Hydrocarbon Emissions (VOCs)

- **2015:** No Build - 1.05%\(\pm\)0.28%, Not RA-6 - 1.11%\(\pm\)0.11%, RA-6 - 1.11%\(\pm\)0.11%
- **2025:** No Build - 0.10%\(\pm\)0.22%, Not RA-6 - 1.22%\(\pm\)0.11%, RA-6 - 1.22%\(\pm\)0.11%
- **2035:** No Build - 1.05%\(\pm\)0.28%, Not RA-6 - 1.11%\(\pm\)0.11%, RA-6 - 1.11%\(\pm\)0.11%

### PM10 Emissions

- **2015:** No Build - 1.62%\(\pm\)0.70%, Not RA-6 - 1.62%\(\pm\)0.70%, RA-6 - 1.62%\(\pm\)0.70%
- **2025:** No Build - 1.47%\(\pm\)0.70%, Not RA-6 - 1.70%\(\pm\)0.70%, RA-6 - 2.52%\(\pm\)2.70%
- **2035:** No Build - 1.47%\(\pm\)0.70%, Not RA-6 - 1.70%\(\pm\)0.70%, RA-6 - 2.52%\(\pm\)2.70%
Mesoscale Results

### PM2.5 Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No Build</th>
<th>Not RA-6</th>
<th>RA-6</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>1.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>1.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pollutant Results

#### 2025

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>No Build</th>
<th>Not RA-6</th>
<th>RA-6</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide (CO [tons])</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxides of Nitrogen (NOx [kg])</td>
<td>1,744.9</td>
<td>1,769.9</td>
<td>1,765.0</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrocarbons (VOCs [kg])</td>
<td>1,358.9</td>
<td>1,373.1</td>
<td>1,355.0</td>
<td>-0.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhalable Particulates (PM_{10} [kg])</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>1.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine particles (PM_{2.5} [kg])</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>1.58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2035

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>No Build</th>
<th>Not RA-6</th>
<th>RA-6</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide (CO [tons])</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>1.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxides of Nitrogen (NOx [kg])</td>
<td>712.5</td>
<td>724.5</td>
<td>722.7</td>
<td>1.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrocarbons (VOCs [kg])</td>
<td>942.2</td>
<td>952.6</td>
<td>943.2</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhalable Particulates (PM_{10} [kg])</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine particles (PM_{2.5} [kg])</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>2.75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mesoscale Results

• Evaluated Change for 2015, 2025, 2035

• Project effects:
  – All alternatives increase pollutant levels slightly over No Build:
    - CO: up to 2.03%
    - NOx: up to 1.69%
    - VOCs: up to 1.11%
    - PM: up to 2.75%

Mesoscale Results

• 2015 / 2025
  – Project increases less than 2.0%
  – No project impact

• 2035
  – Project Increases greater than 2.0%
    - PM$_{10}$: Not RA-6 2.52% RA6: 2.70%
    - PM$_{2.5}$: Not RA-6 2.52% RA6: 2.75%

  – Unavoidable project impact
Mesoscale Conclusions

- PM levels in 2035 show a project impact under state definitions, but:
  - Total pollutant emissions are much lower in the future
  - Total emissions are over-estimated
    - New technologies will further reduce emissions
- Model overestimates project emissions:
  - Does not account for smoothed traffic flows (less stop-and-go driving)

Where We Look for Microscale Impacts

- Microscale
  - Intersections within project’s Traffic Study Area
  - Pollutants:
    - Carbon monoxide
    - Particulate matter

New York State Department of Transportation
What is a Microscale Air Impact?

Project Must Not:
- Cause concentrations to exceed federal standards (NAAQS)
- Cause concentrations already in exceedance to worsen

Microscale Analysis

• Carbon Monoxide
  - Select intersections with highest potential for project impact:
    - Highest volumes (3 intersections)
    - Worst Level of Service (3 intersections)
Microscale Analysis

• Carbon Monoxide: Screening procedure
  – Volume threshold
  – Locations below volume threshold cannot cause CO impacts
  – Volumes at all locations below threshold
  – No potential for CO impacts

• Technology has effectively reduced CO emissions over the past 35 years

Microscale Results

• Carbon Monoxide
  – Locations below volume threshold cannot cause CO impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Volume Threshold (veh/hr)</th>
<th>Maximum Approach Volume (veh/hr)*</th>
<th>Analysis Required?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grand Street at Vandervoort Avenue</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>1,457</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeker Avenue at McGuiness Boulevard /Humboldt Street</td>
<td>2,809</td>
<td>1,456</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeker Avenue at Vandervoort Avenue</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>1,251</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh Pond Road at Flushing Avenue</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>1,727</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGuiness Boulevard Between Meeker Avenue eastbound and Meeker Avenue Westbound (under the BQE)</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Avenue at Meeker Avenue</td>
<td>2,942</td>
<td>1,098</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Microscale Analysis

- Particulate Matter (PM)
  - EPA revised microscale analysis methodology (March 2006)
  - Only PM$_{2.5}$ considered, since we are in a non-attainment area
  - Qualitative analysis underway

Construction Period Measures - Traffic

- No traffic to be diverted from BQE to local streets
- Temporary bridges to be built to maintain volumes and flow
- No highway or local street lane closures during peak hours
- Highway lane closures during off-peak and/or overnight hours (as necessary)
- Local lane closures to occur only for temporary periods and off-peak/overnight and where necessary
Construction Period Measures - Source

- Ensure use of trucks and equipment that meet specifications to minimize emissions
- Cover materials during truck transport
- Water construction areas to reduce dust
- Wash down truck tires prior to leaving site to reduce dust

Construction PM Analysis

- Initial construction screening
  - Based on construction cost estimate
  - All Build Alternatives exceed threshold
  - Project requires advanced analysis

- Advanced analysis
  - Performed after contract is awarded
  - Includes project-specific non-road equipment list
  - Must mitigate to extent possible if still above threshold
Summary of Results

- Regional: Project included in NYMTC conformity determination
- Mesoscale:
  - All alternatives increase pollutant levels slightly over No Build:
    - CO: up to 2.03%  - NOx: up to 1.69%
    - PM: up to 2.75%  - VOCs: up to 1.11%
  - Unavoidable PM impact in 2035 (only)
- Microscale: No impact
- Construction: Advanced analysis to be performed after contract is awarded
NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
KOSCIUSZKO BRIDGE PROJECT
STAKEHOLDERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE: OCTOBER 19, 2006

Minutes
The 31st meeting of the New York State Department of Transportation’s (NYSDOT) Kosciuszko Bridge Project Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC) was held on October 19, 2006 at the North Fork Bank Community Room, Greenpoint, Brooklyn. (See Attachment A for Attendance List.) The meeting was scheduled to present updated results of the Historic and Cultural Resources study conducted for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).

Helen Neuhaus, Helen Neuhaus & Associates (HNA), opened the meeting by asking for comments on the Minutes of the September 21, 2006 meeting. Following adoption of the Minutes without comments, Ms. Neuhaus facilitated a discussion of follow-up items from that meeting.

- Ms. Neuhaus noted that hard copies of tonight’s PowerPoint slides are available at the sign-in table, in response to requests made at the last SAC meeting that they be distributed at the time of presentation.

- Referring to a handout that was created in response to a request by Dorothy Swick, Newtown Creek Monitoring Committee (NCMC), to provide information on tidal positions at the times when soil gas samples were collected, Steve Bennett, Parsons Corporation (Parsons), explained that additional testing will be needed to determine if soil gas vapors fluctuate with the tide. This will be done in connection with more extensive investigations during final design.

- Ms. Neuhaus indicated that copies of the Health and Safety Plan (HASP) and Community Protection Plan (CPP) prepared in connection with a project to remediate a New York City hazardous waste site were sent to Barbara Mihelic, Noble Street Block Association, as requested at the last meeting. She added that copies of the CPP are available at the sign-in table, along with a reference copy of the HASP. Ms. Neuhaus explained that a HASP is a document specifically developed by the contractor to protect the workers at the site, whereas a CPP is developed to protect the surrounding community. After noting that both a HASP and a CPP will be prepared for the Kosciuszko Bridge Project prior to the start of construction, she emphasized that it is expected that the SAC or a SAC subcommittee will be involved in preparation of the CPP.

- In response to comments made by Christine Holowacz, NCMC, at the September SAC meeting regarding the status of sewer and water main projects in the Greenpoint-Williamsburg Industrial Area, Ms. Neuhaus indicated that she had followed up with Deputy Commissioner Doug Greeley, New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP). Ms. Neuhaus emphasized that the referenced sewer and water main work is separate from the drainage plan that will be developed for the Kosciuszko Bridge Project. She reiterated that although Deputy Commissioner Greeley is no longer in charge of the Bureau of Water and Sewer Operations, he indicated that discussions regarding designation of the Greenpoint-Williamsburg Industrial Area as an Empowerment Zone (which could expedite funding of infrastructure projects) had been held with representatives of the Mayor’s
Office and Anthony Parra, East Williamsburg Valley Industrial Development Corporation (EWVIDCO). He had no further information on whether there was recent progress concerning this issue. Nor did Mr. Parra, whom Ms. Neuhaus contacted prior to the SAC meeting. However, Commissioner Greeley suggested to Ms. Neuhaus that the community reach out to Jim Garin, Chief of Development and Planning for NYCDEP’s Capital Program, who now has jurisdiction over projects of this type. Ms. Neuhaus recommended that the SAC work with its elected officials and EWVIDCO to lobby for the sewer and water main job. In a related comment, Vince Arcuri, Queens Community Board (CB) #5, noted that a number of NYCDEP capital improvement projects are not anticipated to be funded until 2010; he added that this project is likely to be one of them.

- In reference to the subject of a community engineer, which was raised at the last meeting, Ms. Neuhaus noted that the issue dates back to the pre-scoping meetings that were held in February 2002. In order to familiarize people who were not involved in the early days of the project with this issue and to refresh everyone else’s memory, she provided the following chronology:
  - **February 2002 (Pre-Scoping Open Houses):** Several people from Brooklyn asked that a community engineer be hired for this project to help people understand complex technical issues.
  - **September 2002 (1st SAC Meeting):** In response to comments received at the pre-scoping meetings, NYSDOT proposed the use of a five-person Community Advisory Team (CAT) composed of experts in traffic planning and engineering; structural design and analysis; and the environmental disciplines. CAT members would be drawn from the University Transportation Research Center (UTRC), a consortium of university professionals who work in partnership with NYSDOT. Highlights of NYSDOT’s proposal were:
    - Allocation of up to $300,000 for CAT services over a three-year period;
    - SAC participation, including review of the candidates’ resumes, interview of candidates, and final selection of individuals to serve on the CAT; and
    - Consideration of individuals (but not companies) recommended by the SAC, who were not part of the UTRC.

  The issue was discussed over several months, during which the SAC developed criteria and qualifications for the CAT and formed a subcommittee (three people each from Brooklyn and Queens) to address the issue and review resumes.

  - **January 2003 SAC Meeting:** Douglas A. Currey, Regional Director, NYSDOT Region 11, addressed the SAC to encourage it to review CAT resumes. After reiterating the impartiality and independence of the CAT, Mr. Currey indicated that the UTRC offer, which was the result of a special request to Albany officials, was still on the table. However, he emphasized that he could not guarantee that the funds would be available in the future.

  The SAC subcommittee rejected the UTRC offer and decided to pursue independent funding for a community engineer through its elected officials.
Subsequent to the meeting, the subcommittee drafted a letter to elected officials requesting funding. This letter was sent in May 2003.

During this time, Assemblyman Joseph Lentol initiated two actions related to the community engineer issue. In December 2002, he sent a letter to NYSDOT Commissioner Joseph Boardman urging support for an independent community consultant. In his response, Commissioner Boardman indicated that the UTRC offer was still available and could be restructured to meet the Assemblyman’s concerns. In January 2003, Assemblyman Lentol sponsored a bill that would require transportation agencies to provide a community engineer for all projects of $10 million or more in cities with populations greater than one million. This bill was referred to the Assembly Committee on Corporations, Authorities, and Commissions. [At the April 2005 SAC meeting Theresa Cianciotta, Assemblyman Lentol’s representative on the SAC, confirmed that the Assemblyman had advocated for a community engineer but was unable to secure funding.]

- **May 2004 SAC Meeting**: Ms. Mihelic asked whether the project would provide an on-site community liaison. Robert Adams, NYSDOT, indicated that this would be considered for the construction phase of the project.

- **April 2005 SAC Meeting**: Ms. Mihelic reminded the project team that hiring an independent environmental consultant was still an issue of importance to the SAC. Referencing previous discussions, Ms. Neuhaus noted that the need for a community engineer was likely to be greater during final design and construction.

- **February 2006 SAC Meeting**: Anthony Nunziato, Maspeth Chamber of Commerce, suggested that a community engineer might be a valuable resource for exploring creative noise abatement solutions. The project team acknowledged Mr. Nunziato’s recommendation, noting that noise abatement options will be further explored during final design.

Following this meeting, the project team began to develop a Post-EIS Issues List that documents issues raised by the SAC that will be explored in the project’s post-EIS phases. [This list was originally distributed at the May 2006 SAC meeting; an updated version was distributed at the September 2006 SAC meeting.]

- **May 2006 SAC Meeting**: Ms. Mihelic emphasized the need for a mechanism to address community issues quickly and efficiently during construction. Mr. Adams responded that the project team is committed to hiring a full-time on-site community liaison during construction.

- **September 2006 SAC Meeting**: Ms. Holowacz requested that an independent consultant be made available to assist the SAC in its review of the DEIS. She was supported by Ms. Mihelic; Evelyn Cruz, Congresswoman Nydia Velazquez; and Irene Klementowicz, NCMC, who reiterated the need for a community engineer. The project team was asked to respond to this request at the October SAC meeting.
Mr. Adams continued the discussion by reviewing the options currently available to the SAC. He stressed that, similar to other large ongoing projects, such as the Gowanus Expressway and the Whitestone Expressway, NYSDOT is committed to providing a full-time on-site community liaison during construction. The community liaison office will be located near the project site; it will be accessible and convenient to members of the public.

Mr. Adams also reiterated that the SAC was created to help the community understand the project, from alternatives analysis through construction. He emphasized that the project team has been committed to presenting technical material in a clear and coherent manner. The SAC has already been active for four years, and NYSDOT is dedicated to continuing to meet with the SAC through the end of construction.

After reporting that UTRC funds are no longer available, Mr. Adams presented an alternative: staff from the Federal Highway Administration’s (FHWA) Resource Center, who are available to work with the SAC to review the material presented in the DEIS. He explained that the Resource Center, which is based in Atlanta, includes three satellite offices (San Francisco, Chicago, and Baltimore) and is staffed with professionals covering a wide range of fields (hazardous and contaminated materials, construction techniques, air quality, noise, etc.). He added that there is no fixed budget to limit its use and that staff would be available to assist the SAC as often as needed. Furthermore, based on availability, one or more individuals could be assigned to the Kosciuszko Bridge Project for whatever time is required.

Tom Breslin, FHWA, added that SAC members may wish to review the FHWA Resource Center website (http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/resourcecenter), which includes staff resumes. Mr. Breslin emphasized the expertise of Resource Center personnel, as well as their independence, and reiterated that staff from around the country would be available to work with the SAC.

Questions and comments raised during this discussion are summarized below:

- Michael Rossmy, Brooklyn Borough President Marty Markowitz, commented that he had a very positive experience with the FHWA Resource Center on a project involving the transportation plan for the National Park Service’s Gateway National Recreation Area.

- In response to a question from Mr. Arcuri, Mr. Breslin indicated that SAC members would need to contact either Mr. Adams or himself to initiate involvement of Resource Center specialists.

- Mr. Arcuri commented that the community’s lack of trust in public agencies dates back to the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway (BQE) project. He added that the SAC is interested in assurance that the technical studies will be reviewed by an external source. Mr. Breslin confirmed that FHWA will be reviewing the DEIS. Mr. Bennett added that FHWA sets the policy regarding application of federal law in preparation of a DEIS and will not sign off on the document if it is not accurate, complete and in compliance.
• Ms. Cianciotta reiterated that Assemblyman Lentol made every effort to secure funding for a community engineer. She added that the situation may change after a new governor is elected.

• In response to a question from Ms. Cianciotta, Mr. Adams indicated that while the location of the community liaison office will not be known for some time, NYSDOT will ensure that it is convenient and accessible to residents of both Brooklyn and Queens. Mr. Bennett added that the liaison will have a presence throughout the project area and is likely to split his or her time between Brooklyn and Queens.

• Mike Hofmann, Greenpoint Waterfront Association for Parks and Planning, commented that having one community engineer would be preferable to having a number of experts. Mr. Breslin reiterated that a specialist selected from FHWA’s Resource Center could be dedicated to working with the SAC. He added that because of current budget constraints, NYSDOT can only offer the SAC the opportunity to use the Resource Center, which would incur no extra project costs.

• In response to a question from Ms. Cianciotta, Mr. Adams indicated that the DEIS is likely to be published in January, after the holidays. Ms. Neuhaus noted that the SAC will receive copies of the full DEIS prior to its publication and will have an opportunity to review its contents at an Open House-style SAC meeting. Mr. Adams added that comments received during the public comment period will be incorporated into the Final EIS. Referring to the overall project schedule, he indicated that the Record of Decision is expected in mid-2007; the final design phase will last approximately three years; and the earliest anticipated date for the start of construction is early 2011.

• Mr. Rossmy asked about the timeframe of the public comment period following release of the DEIS. Mr. Adams indicated that the public will have until early Spring to comment, which is more than the 45 days required by the federal government.

• Ms. Cianciotta announced that Brooklyn CB #1 requested funding for an independent community engineer as part of its 2007-2008 Capital Budget. She noted that this individual might be able to provide some support to the SAC if the budget is approved. Ms. Cianciotta also indicated that Congresswoman Velazquez might be of assistance in securing funding for a community consultant. In a related comment, Mr. Nunziato reported that the Congresswoman secured $250,000 for a truck study in Maspeth that is no longer needed; he suggested investigating if this money could be used for a community engineer.

DEIS: Historic and Cultural Resources
Using a PowerPoint presentation¹, Anthony Lee, Parsons, presented the updated results of the Historic and Cultural Resources study. Mr. Lee began by explaining that there are two types of cultural resources: historic and architectural resources and archaeological resources. He indicated that Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 requires federal agencies to consider the effects of a project on historic properties and allows the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the public to provide comments. This consultation process balances historic preservation concerns with the needs of federal undertakings. Compliance with

¹ This presentation was provided as a handout at the meeting. Anyone wishing to obtain copies may contact Ms. Neuhaus at (212) 532-4175.
the New York State Historic Preservation Act of 1980 and the New York City Landmarks Law of 1965 is also required.

Mr. Lee then explained that the Section 106 process essentially serves to determine if historic resources that are present in the Area of Potential Effect (APE), or study area, will be impacted. This process involves consulting with the New York State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission, and the public (through Open Houses, the SAC, etc.).

The next step in the process involves identification of historic properties within two APEs: historic architecture and archaeology. This includes conducting background research to see if properties within the APE are eligible for or already listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Mr. Lee explained that, in general, properties are determined to be historic if they are over 50 years of age and meet at least one of the four NRHP criteria:

- Criterion A: Association with significant events;
- Criterion B: Association with significant persons;
- Criterion C: Distinctive design or construction;
- Criterion D: Likely to yield important prehistoric or historic information or data.

Mr. Lee explained that properties also must have integrity consisting of seven items: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and/or association. This means that a property’s original use and characteristics must remain fundamentally intact.

The third step in the Section 106 process involves identification of any adverse effects on historic properties that would result from the project. For the archaeological study, a block-by-block analysis within the APE was conducted. Although no known archaeological sites were found, 12 blocks with a moderate or high archaeological potential were identified. However, these areas are currently inaccessible, either because they are located under pavement or are in people’s backyards. Prior to construction, a “Phase I Archaeological Survey and Monitoring Plan” will be implemented in consultation with SHPO.

Mr. Lee also explained that the project team’s initial review did not locate any known architectural resources within the APE. The first phase of the architectural survey, conducted in March 2005, focused on 15 resources immediately adjacent to the approaches to the bridge. At that time, an informal evaluation was prepared that concluded that the Kosciuszko Bridge was ineligible for placement on the NRHP. The second phase of the survey, completed in March 2006, focused on 82 separate resources that would be indirectly affected by the reconstruction or rehabilitation of the bridge. This evaluation included a more specific set of guidelines that specifically assesses bridges built before 1961. Based on the Phase II evaluation, both the Kosciuszko Bridge and Old Calvary Cemetery were found to be NRHP-eligible. SHPO has concurred with these recommendations. As detailed in the breakdown of criteria below, the cemetery’s eligibility is based on Criteria A, C, and its integrity; the bridge’s eligibility is based on Criterion C and its integrity:

**Calvary Cemetery**
- Criterion A: The cemetery is associated with a significant event, in that it served as the primary burial ground for Roman Catholics in New York City. Its design is also representative of the popular rural cemetery movement.
- **Criterion B**: The cemetery is not associated with a person or group of persons of outstanding importance to the community, state, or nation.
- **Criterion C**: In general, the cemetery’s naturalistic setting is representative of a large 19th century cemetery. The cemetery also possesses several distinctive design features, including the Queen Anne style gate house and the Roman/Byzantine style chapel. Many of the mausoleums and headstones are also of high artistic value.
- **Criterion D**: It is highly unlikely that the cemetery will yield additional prehistoric or historic information.
- **Integrity**: The cemetery retains all aspects of its integrity.

**Kosciuszko Bridge**

- **Criterion A**: The construction of the Kosciuszko Bridge itself, which was completed before the BQE, is not considered an event of national significance. The incorporation of the bridge into the BQE after the expressway was completed is also not considered an event of national importance or unusual when compared to other bridges along the BQE.
- **Criterion B**: While the bridge is named for Thaddeus Kosciuszko, he did not have any direct association with the structure.
- **Criterion C**: The bridge is representative of a Warren combination (deck and through) truss bridge, which is unusual for the New York region. It is also unique because of its multiple spans and polygonal chords on the top and sides.
- **Criterion D**: It is highly unlikely that the bridge will yield additional prehistoric or historic information.
- **Integrity**: The bridge retains high levels of integrity in its location, workmanship, and association, and its integrity is moderate in its materials, setting, design, and feeling due to extensive renovations.

Mr. Lee also discussed the adverse effects of each of the build alternatives on the bridge. He noted that the bridge replacement alternatives involve demolition of the bridge, which would be a direct effect. The rehabilitation alternatives would visually impact the bridge by requiring construction of a parallel bridge; this is considered an indirect effect. Alternatives RA-5, RA-6, and BR-3 would also visually impact Old Calvary Cemetery. During construction, all five build alternatives would result in noise impacts on the cemetery.

Mr. Lee continued his presentation by discussing the fourth step in the Section 106 process, which is determining how to mitigate any adverse effects resulting from the project. He indicated that the bridge will be documented according to Historic American Engineering Record Standards, which are designed to ensure that records are kept. The bridge’s history (including photographs and drawings) will be disseminated to research facilities and libraries (including city, state, and the Library of Congress). Interpretive displays could be installed on the new bridge, and any new bridge design would likely incorporate both the original dedication plaque and the Polish and American eagle statues.

In conclusion, Mr. Lee briefly noted that the next steps in the process involve continued coordination with SHPO; submission of the DEIS to the public for review and comment; and development of an archaeological work plan.
Questions and comments raised during Mr. Lee’s presentation are summarized below:

- In response to a question from Ms. Cianciotta regarding whether any part of the bridge structure will be kept or reused, Mr. Bennett indicated that this would be unlikely for any of the bridge replacement alternatives.
- Mr. Arcuri commented that the project team may want to reevaluate Criterion B for Old Calvary Cemetery, since the cemetery was directly related to the diaspora of Irish Catholic immigrants out of Lower Manhattan. He also noted that many well-known people are buried in the cemetery. Joseph Ruzalski, United Forties Civic Association, added that Civil War veterans are among those buried at Old Calvary. In a final comment, Mr. Nunziato suggested that the project team reexamine the role of the cemetery’s original property owners in local history.

Other

- Mr. Arcuri reported that the Grand Street Bridge Project is still in the process of being redesigned and expressed concern that reconstruction of the bridge will coincide with that of the Kosciuszko Bridge.
- In response to a question from Mr. Nunziato, Mr. Adams indicated that the next IAAC meeting will be held in conjunction with publication of the DEIS.
- Ms. Cianciotta remarked that elected officials had recently secured funding for a study of Newtown Creek.

It was announced that if requested by a SAC member, a SAC meeting would be held on November 30th to further discuss specific technical studies developed for the DEIS.

Follow-up Items

1) Reconsider Old Calvary Cemetery’s NRHP Eligibility under Criterion B: Association with Significant Persons. Specific reference was made to the cemetery’s historic use as a burial ground for Irish Catholics and Civil War veterans. Additionally, re-examine the role of the cemetery’s original property owners in local history. Responsibility: Project Team.

2) Provide a copy of the HASP prepared in connection with remediation of a New York City hazardous waste site to Ed Michaleski, Oak Street Block Association. Responsibility: HNA.
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