NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
KOSCIUSZKO BRIDGE PROJECT
STAKEHOLDERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE: FEBRUARY 16, 2006

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 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 Rossmy, 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), he 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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