

Segment 1 Comments:

Town of Greenburgh comments:

Segment 1 spans both the Town of Greenburgh and the Village of Tarrytown. The desired result of maintaining a sidewalk and implementing a protected dedicated bike lane in each direction is great, however, several staff are skeptical that reducing capacity by one full vehicular lane each direction will not cause major traffic backups. Can the desired aspects of the alternative can remain, while keeping the lane capacity (there were no objections to the center turn lane reduction width)? It seems that this may be possible by one potential subtle modification (reduction of sidewalk widths from 8.5' and 9' respectively to 4 ft. and/or remove 4.5 ft. landscaped buffer, focus landscaping to outer extent of the sidewalk) or a major modification (extend the project limits outward to catch more space for interior design features, which may or may not require land acquisition).

In addition, two other problems with the preferred option were:

1. Eastbound from Rt. 9, the jug handle allows two lanes to Rt. 119. Do these two lanes safely transition to one lane?
2. Westbound from Rt. 119 toward Rt. 9, Depiction does not show transition to the intersection where tow left turn lanes exist and one right lane exists.

Village of Tarrytown comments:

The document serves only to show preferred cross sections along Route 119. It does not get into the design specifics at various points, such as what changes are implied to through and turning lanes for vehicles, parking spaces, provisions for pedestrian crossings or bus stops, or how cyclists switch from bike lanes on both sides to both bike lanes on one side, so we will need to see all that later. N\N should perhaps make that clear when the document is distributed to the full team.

-- I have nothing to add to the background material, through page 18, except one comment on page 5. Under Existing Conditions, this statement is questionable:

The narrowest portions of the route are located in downtown White Plains, Elmsford, and near the intersection with Route 9 in Tarrytown.

Route 119 at "the intersection with Route 9" is not notably narrower than the four-lane section along most of Segment 1 in Tarrytown. It may not matter, as this is a general description and nothing particular is proposed as a consequence, but we should avoid anything confusing or misleading.

-- On the Results and Key Findings from page 19, the cross sections are fine as reflections of public preferences, but we need more from N\N. Two points affect us directly.

1. At the intersection with Route 9, we have no indication of how the cross section in Figure 31 meshes with pedestrian paths and bike and vehicle lanes on Route 9. This will be important because we have to ensure smooth connections with the coming DoT redesign in the area, connectivity with the Shared Use Path landing, and the bike and pedestrian provisions recommended by N\N for Route 9.

2. I see that the preferred cross section for Segment 1 is not the same as for Segment 2 to the east. We will need a clear and detailed recommendation for safe and easy pedestrian and bike transitions from one to the other cross section (such as crosswalks).

Additional Village comments expected 9/28.

Segment 2 Comments:

Town of Greenburgh comments:

Preferred Concept provides two lane protected and dedicated bike lane to the south of Rt. 119. Does this concept become less costly/more viable without having to provide two 9 ft wide sidewalks on each side of Rt. 119. 4-5' sidewalks seem acceptable based on low volumes.

This option does not seem feasible (mainly the bike lanes) at a certain easterly point traveling towards Rt. 9A (perhaps in the vicinity of Valley Avenue in the Village of Elmsford) due to width constraints, and less so as you approach Rt. 9a/Saw Mill River Road. The study could have a section that should Elmsford plan a redesign of it downtown area in this vicinity, the end preferred option could be achieved (would have to confirm this concept with Elmsford)?

Village of Elmsford Comments:

Expected by 9/28

Segment 3 Comments:

Town of Greenburgh comments:

Segment 3 spans both the Town of Greenburgh and the Village of Tarrytown. The desired result of maintaining a sidewalk and implementing a protected dedicated bike lane in each direction is great, however, several staff are skeptical that reducing capacity by one full vehicular lane each direction will not cause major traffic backups, particularly closer to Rt. 9A/Saw Mill River Road

The study could have a section that should Elmsford plan a redesign of it downtown area in this vicinity, the end preferred option could be achieved (would have to confirm this concept with Elmsford)?

Village of Elmsford Comments:

Expected by 9/28

Segment 4 Comments:

Town of Greenburgh comments:

The transition at underpass (Knollwood Road/Rt. 119) is not referenced.

The block on Rt. 119 from Hillside Avenue to Fair Street contains on-street parking that if removed, would likely cause major sales impediments to several businesses. Could a shared use sidewalk/bike be proposed in this location?

In an eastbound direction (East of the Town of Greenburgh Police Station), the off-ramp from I-287 merges to a point that is often backed up to this merger point. Does the road have capacity to handle a reduction to 2 lanes here?

Much of segment 4B appears to have no use for a central turn lane.

Segment 5 and 6 comments:

City of White Plains received the requested capacity analysis 9/19, expecting comments by 10/5.

General Comments: Will need confirmation from Nelson/Nygaard that the design will be customized to particular deviations from standard locations such as, (Knollwood underpass, Rt. 9A/Saw Mill River Road approaches, segment transition points)