

CDTC Planning Committee Meeting – April 1, 2020
Transcript

>> Steve Iachetta: Thank you Mike we can commence the meeting, Steve Iachetta. It's a pleasure to serve your very first teleconference video hope everyone as well, to you and yours. April Fool's Day is officially cancelled, that was in New York Times, anyway thank you for taking time out of your busy schedule and we all got the agenda in front of us, we have some important action items to deal with. So that's my introduction the roll call should serve as our self-introduction I think Mike, do you agree?

>> Mike Franchini: Yes

>> Steve Iachetta: Okay any visitor issues is number two on our agenda, is anyone a visitor on the line wishing to address the board of the Capital District Transportation Committee Planning Committee for our April first meeting first video teleconference at this time? Item two, going once, going twice, hearing no visitor issues we move to adoption of our prior meeting minutes of February 6, 2020 distributed in advance by mail and electronically and this is our first voting action item. Item three adoption of February 6th minutes as recorded and distributed are there any corrections to be noted for the adoption of these minutes at this time? Any comments? Hearing none, going once, going twice. Vote for the adoption of our February 6th minutes. How do you want to do it Mike, a roll call or just say any abstaining or opposed? Are there any abstaining or opposed to the adoption of our distributed minutes of February 6th? Speak now. Any voting members chiming in? Going once, going twice, you want to do a just a verbal vote by affirmation? Everybody in favor please say "aye". Raise your hand in your picture. Very nice. Alright our minutes are hereby adopted thank you very much everyone. Item four is our fiscal constraint discussion which Michael will lead us on with the TIP summary table distributed. We should have that handy Michael take it away.

>> Mike Franchini: Okay the table four is in your package. Nothing has changed from the last or a very little change from last meeting. We are still very under programmed in the current year, over programmed in the second year but overall we're under programmed by 3% so really nothing new to report on the fiscal constraint at this time. Any questions about fiscal constraint?

>> Mike Valentine: You're saying overall by 3% are you carrying what the average of the years going out?

>> Mike Franchini: The under programming that I mentioned for the 3% is for the four, the full four years of the STIP.

>> Andrew Kreshik: I have a question Mike. With the governor's shutdown of contracting, non-essential etc. under the parameters that are established there's been some discussion about pushing road projects, municipal road projects, fixing the potholes etc. etc. that might not have been programmed for this year because street traffic and conditions that make fixing roads better. Any discussion about or consideration about putting any such project, pushing any such projects ahead on the TIP?

>> Mike Franchini: We have not heard anything Bob. Bob Rice DOT have you heard anything about that?

>> Bob Rice: No, I mean the word that we're operating from, from our commissioner, is that both the state and local program, transportation program, are both essential and they're continuing to push forward. A number of contractors have asked for exemption from lane closure provisions where work may have to be done at night that they could do things during the day on a case-by-case basis. They're sort of allowing that but if the ability is there to progress the project I would say it's well it's business as usual in that regard and if we want to advance something we certainly should as a body.

>> Mike Franchini: Just a reminder if you have some background noise please mute your microphone so the entire meeting doesn't hear it. Thank you. Andrew does that answer your question?

>> Andrew Kreshik: Yeah

>> Mike Franchini: Okay Steve do you want to go the next item?

>> Steve Iachetta: Should we vote on, is that a voting item on fiscal constraint?

>> Mike Franchini: No, no it's not.

>> Steve Iachetta: So item five is the 2019 through 24 TIP amendments for the TMC operating center. Items A, B and C are related. Greg did you want to do a quick overview on the item five amendment, TIP amendment for the five-year period relating to the TMC operating cost adjustments?

>> Greg Wichser: Yeah, I'll speak to that. Everyone can hear me all right?

>> Mike Valentine: Yup

>> Greg Wichser: All right um, so the TMC, we funded it in the mix of buckets that the TMC gets funded with, the operating, engineering and the help truck, and as the contracts are coming up to actually fund each phase the costs have changed and so were essentially moving money from operations and engineering to cover the consultant that operates the TMC and that contract is coming up for renewal in August so this reflects the funding to get that um to get that done, awarded an authorized. So it's a net zero effect on the funding but has to you know come through committee for approval to rebalance the money. Is that clear enough? Any questions on that?

>> Steve Iachetta: Thank you Greg. So there's no offset required, no change in cost or benefits. Balancing act of accounting adjustments is my view. Bob's letter was included in the agenda? Bob was there anything to add?

>> Bob Rice: No, no, I think Greg did a good job explaining it.

>> Steve Iachetta: Thank you. Very good, So we're ready to vote is there any further discussion any questions from committee members.

>> Andrew Kreshik: Just any additional information on the Albany Skyway that you could offer?

>> Steve Iachetta: That'll be next item up.

>> Greg Wichser: Yeah, I'll speak to that in a minute.

>> Steve Iachetta: So we're voting on A, B and C as a combined item. Is there any further discussion on A, B and C as presented? It's regional RG37A, 37B, and RG142, state PIN 1811.26 overhead sign structure as part of this.

>> Greg Wichser: Ah actually, I want to correct you. A and B are what the TMC is related to. C and D are related TIP amendments. So this is voting on A and B only.

>> Steve Iachetta: Oh just A and B. Thank you Greg yeah I'm glad, I'm glad we corrected that so I stood corrected. Alpha and Bravo, A and B are the only items to be voted on at this time. TMC. I apologize I thought the sign was part of the balancing.

>> Greg Wichser: No, nope. No worry.

>> Steve Iachetta: Good, thank you. A and B is there any further discussion? Any clarity required for the A and B cost adjustment, no offset, really it's just a balancing. Ready to vote? I think I'll do it in reverse again. Any abstaining or opposed? Going once, going twice. Now vote for the affirmative adoption of agenda item five A and B. Everyone in favor please say aye, raise your hand if you're on camera, thank you.

>> All: Aye

>> Steve Iachetta: Consensus is continued. Excellent protocol even with the constraints of our first pandemic. Alright, excellent. Item C charlie is the RG142 state PIN 1811.26 this is the overhead sign structure replacement.

>> Maria Chau: Hey Steve

>> Steve Iachetta: Yes

>> Maria Chau: Apologizing, you know this is Maria Chao.

>> Steve Iachetta: Hi Maria

>> Maria Chau: Hi, how are you doing? Before we move forward with the next item I'd like to go back to the fiscal constraint table for the TIP.

>> Steve Iachetta: Certainly

>> Maria Chau: Right now it's yeah it shows that there's um you know that the TIP is not fiscally constrained by year so to be fiscally constrained and it's not showing there right now. So I mean the second year it's 25% over that's programmed. That's going to need to be corrected otherwise it's it's not within compliance of the federal regulations.

>> Steve Iachetta: Thank You Maria. Michael can you guys, um, as to how this can be mitigated or corrected and balanced?

>> Mike Franchini: Well you know

>> Steve Iachetta: 2nd year 20-21

>> Mike Franchini: We work with DOT on fiscal constraint. One of the reasons why we're under programmed in the first year and overprogrammed in the second is to actually improve our performance measures our federal performance TIP measures. Um, you know so we did make several changes you know taking projects that we didn't think we're going to be obligated in the first year you putting them into the second you know so that we would score better on our performance measure. It seems, I mean, and DOT please chime in. It seems in some regards that the two requirements are contradictory that in other words to to improve our TIP performance we almost have to over program and under program. Bob what do you think of that?

>> Greg Wichser: Yeah

>> Bob Rice: Greg, go ahead.

>> Greg Wichser: Yeah, I can speak to it. We suggested a new table but I think that kinda that conversation got lost in the chaos of everyone going remote these days. There was a proposed revision of the table to show the cumulative ending balance the end of each fiscal year which would show that the surplus from this year lands next year with um. I'm looking it up right now what I sent, um it shows like a balance that's within a couple percent of program capacity um well within the five percent so it's not over. It actually next year it would still be under programmed because this year we're showing 19 million surplus, next year is a seventeen million dollar deficit but 19 million rolls in the next year there's still going to be a two million dollar surplus at the end of the second year so that in that sense it is fiscally constrained rolling forward.

>> Mike Valentine: Greg can I interject here for a minute?

>> Greg Wichser: Yeah

>> Mike Valentine: We have just as Maria brought up and we have had charts in the past where we've looked at exact sort of replication of what's on here for year to year when we had a not 22 percent but a large under and then over the next year and we've gone through explanations in meetings where either Mike or Bob has stated it just that that column show just for that year. It doesn't show the cumulative but we've talked about it as being that one would more or less wash out the other or be in favor of that being in compliance. So that that's why I had asked the question before about that sort of averaging out I think someone said there's under programming of 3% throughout.

>> Steve Iachetta: Throughout a five-year period, yes.

>> Greg Wichser: Yeah, I mean the fact that yeah the STIP period is constrained and we're if we were 25% over this year and 22% under next year that's a situation where we're not constrained cause we're overspending early. We're under spending and rolling it forward so it were well within bounds and we're just trying to keep the table clean so it's not more columns and more confusing but if you look at the ending balance year by year we're definitely within 5% at the end of next year and still under programmed. Is that satisfactory?

>> Maria Chau: Okay how could you show that in in the in the table to reflect that because right now what I'm seeing is that it's under programmed the first year and way over programmed the second year and

>> Mike Valentine: Have another row...

>> Maria Chau: That doesn't really speak to me that it's fiscally constrained. I mean as long as you demonstrate fiscal constraint I, you know, we would be able to accept it but there's got to be explanations behind that that is open and you know open to the public and readable.

>> Mike Valentine: Can I make a suggestion on that Greg? Another row underneath that area where it shows that row that shows 22 percent under, 25 percent over and 3 percent, you carry a row underneath that and say the cumulative at that point because what you're doing is showing year-to-year and I think if you show the cumulative in that next row that would answer Maria's question, I think.

>> Maria Chau: Um, well I mean that's a that's a good point. Um, you still need to demonstrate it, fiscal constraint, by year so whether it's cumulative or not we need to see by year that is fiscally constrained.

>> Mike Valentine: So we're saying, you're saying an under of 22 percent is not fiscally constrained.

>> Maria Chau: No that's not what I'm saying. I'm saying the over in the second year is not fiscally constrained because it's it's a full year to be fiscally constrained.

>> Andrew Kreshik: Right but again you're trying to package things into a calendar basis whereas a cumulative approach showing a rolling average would would better reflect project costs over time.

>> Maria Chau: Yeah, I, I can understand where you're going, what you're saying here. In the regulations it does say by year so you can demonstrate that in multiple ways you know with the table that shows that you guys are over programmed by you know 25 percent that doesn't say to me that you guys are fiscally constrained. So as long as you can demonstrate fiscal constraint say for instance you know that you know these projects that you know that are over programmed the second year are actually you know considered you know projects in the pipeline rather than you know in you know in the TIP itself that would that would say something else to me that then you then it would look like you're then to me you know that would be say that you're fiscally constrained

>> Andrew Kreshik: So the table should parse those particular projects out and identify them as in the pipeline as opposed to firm for lack of a better word and that way you can reduce you you can reduce the overall programmed amount to reflect the fiscal constraint this way. Would that suffice?

>> Maria Chau: Yeah, that's one way of doing it. Yeah, that's one way of doing it. There's multiple ways I mean you guys can be creative with about it but at the end of the day it should it should say in your you know in your TIP that you're fiscally constrained by year.

>> Greg Wichser: Can I? Is it possible for me share my screen quick? I can see if that works. I have an example table that is only two years but it illustrates what we're talking about. You know I don't want or we can pass it around later to talk about offline.

>> Andrew Kreshik: I'll try the technology first Greg, go for it. Brad's pulsing head. [laughing]

>> Greg Wichser: Okay never done this before so can everyone see this?

>> All: Yeah, yeah, you did it, yes.

>> Greg Wichser: Alright, there's only two years but I this could carry out four and this is old data so it's not the same data we're looking at today but it shows the end balance in the first year of 23 percent under programmed and then the second year it shows the end balance as five percent under programmed. This demonstrates the rolling balance possibly more clearly in depth that we're still within bounds? Is this a format that everyone would understand maybe going forward to demonstrate this?

>> Maria Chau: I mean the forecast that you guys have for how much you're allocated if you wanted if you all agree and know that the funding will be available for you for the following year you can adjust that amount. So that's okay too.

>> Steve Iachetta: So this is acceptable Maria and we should incorporate this format of data as a sub table to table four or amend table four to reflect Greg's new information?

>> Maria Chau: Yeah I mean the amount you guys receive for, um, you know for an annual allocation I, if if you say that it can you know that that funding is still available the following year you know then that's something that should be explained in your TIP or that you know you make adjustments based on that I mean but that is entirely up to, you know, what what NYSDOT is allowing for so I would say that you would you know you would

go about by those guidelines of what you know what is actually available to you guys for that year of for that year of funding that can be programmed.

>> Glenn Posca: So Maria this is Glenn Posca, can everybody hear me okay?

>> All: Yes

>> Glenn Posca: So what if instead of having that that column D and G we added a row and in the row in table four we had like where it says 23.11 there we have another one that is the, well in this case it is the end balance for the it's a cumulative balance not an end balance but it's cumulative balance for the for the first year and then for the second year where the 4.78 is, that's the cumulative balance and we don't have the column G we just have the 4.78 under the 17.287 and we say it's the cumulative balance. Rather than show it for every fund source in other words.

>> Mike Valentine: So Glenn are you talking, sort of, are you talking like I was saying before?

>> Glenn Posca: I'm repackaging your idea because it's as far as I'm concerned it's the same thing except the difference is that in the way Greg is showing this it shows the balance, the cumulative balance, by fund source.

>> Mike Valentine: Right, each individually

>> Glenn Posca: And I don't know that that's, Maria isn't really asking for that from what I can tell which gets us right back to...

>> Maria Chau: Yeah so the fund source to me I mean if fiscal fiscally constrained is the requirement in the CFR, doesn't say that it has to be balanced by fund source. What it does say though is by year so if you just you're gonna you know remove the fund sources that's not really going to do anything except give people less information.

>> Glenn Posca: So are you saying then that we don't need to show the cumulative balance by fund source so we can just show the one number the 4.78 on a separate row?

>> Mike Valentine: Just as Greg is showing on this one.

>> Greg Wichser: Yeah, it sounds like you'd get rid of my end balance and just put the 4.78 underneath and just say that's cumulative you know and then you're demonstrating that the conversation we're having.

>> Maria Chau: Is then what you're doing is are you saying you're moving the amount that is like kind of like a um an additional amount of funding you know from the previous year into this into the new budget year and that's why you that's why there's a an additional that you know that's why it's it's not over programmed it's still under programmed?

>> Glenn Posca: Yes that's the reason.

>> Greg Wichser: Correct.

>> Glenn Posca: What if we put a note at the bottom, I can't see the table four at the moment, what if we put a note at the end at the bottom of Table four unless there already is one that says that end balances at the end of a fiscal year roll into the next fiscal year?

>> Mike Valentine: Which we have stated that at meetings before and that's from an explanation as far as how we can balance one year from the previous year. It's been stated we just haven't shown it this way. I'm sort of I'm waiting to see is there a problem with that.

>> Maria Chau: I think maybe we should continue this conversation and work through this table and then maybe re-present in a way that would make sense. My my concern about rollover balances is that you know the thing is this is that the amount of funding that, um, that New York state receives annually is stable. We don't have rollovers. I mean once if say for instance that obligation funding is you know isn't completely used it you know it doesn't roll over, it just disappears. So in our in our sense, you know, where what we see is that by, you know, if say for instance you know that 1.8 or 1. you know 9 billion of dollars of obligation is isn't completely used that funding is, you know, it doesn't roll over to the next year. That's why we're concerned when we see rollover as you know as something that you know is being practiced because the obligation doesn't continue.

>> Greg Wichser: Statewide though, the state is over programmed but they use advanced construction as the mechanism and our planning targets are not a direct line from the DOT's allocation, it's a amalgamate of assumptions of a flat target of Washington's actions and as a state when you roll up the state you know the state every year spends all the money and the redistribution, but by region, main office has always allowed the region's to assume a role would happen because they will spend the money that year elsewhere and we were over this year we're over in the following year, we go over and someone else goes under that's how statewide it rolls together to zero out every year.

>> Maria Chau: No Greg you make a really good point. I guess if you guys showed advanced construction fund you know funding here that would help the balance because that would mean that the state then is is first is basically you know using advanced construction and putting out the funding out first so it doesn't actually impact the fund sources that you are represented here or or fiscal constraint cause then you basically say that you have got you know that you have advanced construction funding here that covers the you know the overage you know the over-over programming and that would actually help.

>> Greg Wichser: We we we don't have the mechanism to illustrate advanced construction that's just a mechanism that main office uses to balance the books. That does not convey down to the MPO level I mean those numbers are changing daily and that is an impossible target. So we should take this offline to clean this up for future discussions but um.

>> Maria Chau: Yeah okay I mean you would like to maybe you know have a discussion about how that could be, um, you know how it could be shown so that it demonstrates fiscal constraint that would that would be helpful.

>> Andrew Kreshik: Is there an example from another MPO that could be used?

>> Steve Iachetta: Maria?

>> Maria Chau: Yeah no I could look into some of the other tables that we have out there.

>> Steve Iachetta: Alright so that's a suggestion to carry this conversation offline after the meeting. Is there anything further Michael that you think we need on fiscal constraint at this time?

>> Mike Franchini: No, that that was a good conversation that we just need to continue. thank you

>> Steve Iachetta: Good, fiscal smoothing. Let's see so that was a jump back on our agenda now we're up to item five D, Delta is Albany project 588 on the TIP, state PIN 1051.82 skyway. Oh, did we do the signs did we do Charlie?

>> Andrew Kreshik: Overhead signs? Not yet.

>> Steve Iachetta: Not yet thank you very much. All right item Charlie C regional project 142 state PIN 1811.26, that's where we went back to fiscal. This is the overhead sign structure replacement regional project let's see cost increase of six hundred fifteen thousand, minus 4 percent. Fiscal constraint increase is offset with A588. What is A588?

>> Greg Wichser: A588 is the Skyway so C and D are related we're...

>> Steve Iachetta: C and D. Should we vote on C and D together, should we do them both as a joint action Michael?

>> Mike Franchini: Yes

>> Greg Wichser: Yes

>> Steve Iachetta: C and D will be a joint action so this is C and D we're looking at and correspondence was distributed. C is the overhead sign structure replacement D is the Skyway. These are not policy board so our action will be final action for this on the overhead sign it's um it says a decrease of cost six hundred fifteen thousand and on the Albany Skyway project A588, PIN 1051.82 is the Skyway is a fiscal constraint increase 1.685 offset is unknown. Presentation over to you Michael or...

>> Greg Wichser: I can talk to this one. so basically the Skyway project has to reroute Route 9 northbound. Currently Route 9 goes over the bridge that will be closed for this project, converted, so we have to replace a lot of the signage to reroute Route 9 which are mounted on overhead sign structures that are coming due and new signage can't be mounted to the old structure so we have to replace the structure which is what the overhead sign structure set aside, represented in agenda item C, is for. So, we're proposing to use 615,000 of that set aside and put it into this project to replace signs that needed to be replaced anyway and so we'll just do them as part of this project and the rerouting of route 9 so it it's provides some offset for the Skyway increase and the Skyway also. Another part of the Skyway project is to do a lot of the bridge repairs of the existing structure that are also due anyway along with some signal upgrades and crosswalk improvements and pedestrian safety in the vicinity of the new route 9 routing especially down by the DEC building there's a road there that we're going to upgrade the pedestrian crossing so altogether the TIP amendment is a 2.3 million increase in federal dollars but we're offsetting 600,000 with the overhead sign structure and there is also a pool of state money that is coming to this project as well so we're showing the 2 million dollars of non-federal aid because we have to show all the funding on the TIP and STIP.

>> Steve Iachetta: That's spelled out in your, in Bob's letter of March 25th item 5 in the advanced agenda. It had HPP and TAP FLEX and now it's getting some supplemental funding from the State, STP urban, let's see...yeah your tables show the expanded funding formulas.

>> Greg Wichser: Yep

>> Steve Iachetta: Yes any questions or discussion?

>> Andrew Kreshick: What is...does this change fiscal constraint any? In the current table 4?

>> Greg Wichser: It would, it would. It does, it does add about 1.5 or 1.6 million of federal programming so uh yes it will change the fiscal constraint but

>> Andrew Kreshick: What year?

>> Greg Wichser: This year. The first year it will reduce some of the under programming ok but if you look at the total at the end we're, there's still in the four year period, there's still a balance of nine million dollars of unprogrammed funding so this is using about 1.6 million of the rolling total.

>> Chris Wallin: Greg...[unintelligible]...Who is that...4 year total for STP Urban...[unintelligible]

>> Steve Feeney: Chris you're breaking up

>> Chris Wallin: I'm sorry I have a, I live in a marble building here with bad Wi-Fi. Can you guys hear me or no?

>> Steve Iachetta: We do now.

>> Chris Wallin: I'm just, table 4, 1.553 are left STP urban so we're wiping it out?

>> Greg Wichser: In the current, yeah, in the current picture yes it...I mean there's an 11 million dollar surplus now and in another year and a half we're gonna start a program update which will rebalance everything anyway so you know and we we are also still working on the total cost of this and this is covering, this is covering the current estimate but we're hoping also that that estimate comes down a little bit still lower looking to the final finish line here.

>> Steve Iachetta: Any other questions? get back to Robert's rules do I have a motion

>> Chris Wallin: The only issue I have...

>> Steve Iachetta: And a second

>> Chris Wallin: Steve?

>> Steve Iachetta: Say it again

>> Chris Wallin: I said the only issue is is that that leaves us with only NHPP and HSIP the two most restrictive fund sources for everybody else.

>> Steve Iachetta: Ok, any response to the comment?

>> Greg Wichser: You know, come program update time you know we have rebalanced things with a, again in the statewide pot they've given us permission to trade NHPP for other funds, we've done the past two updates, uh, when we're running short so that that can be addressed in the future if if needed.

>> Chris Wallin: Alright

>> Steve Iachetta: Any other discussion? item C and D. ready to move forward? everyone comfortable? should we get a motion and a second? I'm not sure I did that on the prior action items Michael. how important is Robert's Rules format with this video?

>> Mike Franchini: No, it is

>> Steve Iachetta: Who'd like to make the motion? who would like the motion? I call the motion. give me a motion. chair can move it, I'll move it. A second please?

>> Liz Kormos: Second. I can do a second

>> Steve Iachetta: Who's that?

>> Liz Kormos: Liz Kormos. second it.

>> Steve Iachetta: Thank, thank you Liz. Okay, now we're all voting any abstaining or opposed? hearing none, ready for a vote affirmative on items 5C and 5D all in favor please say aye and raise your hand if you're on video thank you.

>> All: Aye, aye

>> Steve Iachetta: Carried consensus, that is adopted. Thank you very much. Let's see so we're through with item five, item six is environmental justice title six analysis which is a thick section of our advanced agenda. A few minor revisions for personnel and staffing changes I would note from the 2019 for the 2020 we have a new CEO at the airport for instance any other changes or discussion on or Michael should lead us on an executive overview of the environmental justice title six. Mike.

>> Mike Franchini: Alright, yep, the new title six analysis is in your packet, it's right after the last TIP amendment letter. You can see it's several pages so I will try to summarize it. If you can see if you go to the cover page, this also says agenda item Roman numeral six, but on the other side of the coverage page cover page is a summary of why we do a title six analysis. I don't want to read it to you but in the end there are federal requirements but the information is valuable and and we do look at this and we try obviously to not have you know a negative impact and to increase our positive impact. So, it's an important analysis that is also required and you can read about that. One thing I'll point out is that you know the demographic analysis is the result of the last census...Chris Wallin you have to mute your mute your audio please, thank you. So again you can read it if you'd like but the entire project but I would reference the summary at the end of the document if you go to that page which is 30...33. Um, you know overall we analyzed all of our programs so we're you know we're looking at the TIP, long range plan, you know, our LEP our li... our limited-english-proficiency plan, our UPWP so we're we're now we're conducting this analysis on all on all that it's not just TIP. so in conclusion you know we do have if you look at the top of page 33 we have a very high percentage of positive impact projects. We do have four projects that could have a negative impact and again could have a negative impact. Being negative it has potential to have a negative impact and the impact on, what do you call it, non non EJ populations that impact is greater than the impact on EJ populations so it's kind of complicated but negative impacts, just projects that have negative impacts are really just they're pointed out as the potential for negative impacts. Two of those projects were on the last analysis and the two new projects were added the two new projects that were added if you go to page 25 the two new projects that were added to the negative project list were the Troy Menands Bridge study and the Rosendale Road intersection improvements having possible again possible negative impacts. So that's, that's kind of the quick summary. We'd really like to answer any questions you have regarding the analysis?

>> Liz Kormos: I have a question. When do you think the data is going to reflect what's just happened to our economy because I have a feeling there's gonna be a whole lot more areas that fall in this, you know, low-income and and high unemployment and all of that and I just wondered when do you think you're gonna have demographics that reflect that?

>> Mike Franchini: Well the the American Community Survey, they're otherwise referred to as ACS is part of the census. So Mark correct me if I'm wrong the ACS comes out every two years? Mark Castiglione? Todd? either one?

>> Todd Fabozzi: It comes out every year and we get the data in December.

>> Mike Franchini: Okay so it's every year so the Liz the question the answer would be if that information showed up in the next ACS data then we would look at that data and you know adjust the analysis accordingly.

>> Liz Kormos: Okay

>> Sean Maguire: Keep in mind there's gonna be a lag in that ACS data for what's happening today it's not going to be you know we're not gonna see that at the end of next year

>> Mike Franchini: Right.

>> Liz Kormos: Yeah.

>> Andrew Kreshick: Hey, Mike?

>> Mike Franchini: Yep

>> Andrew Kreshick: This is Andrew. On the Troy Menands Bridge Study, isn't it isn't it premature to assess a potential EJ on a on an academic kind of study? I mean wouldn't the at wouldn't the alternatives once they're developed prove the potential for it but the study itself? I mean it just it just seems premature but does it follow a guideline to make it so?

>> Greg Wichser: I mean that that's part of the scope of the study is actually going to be to evaluate EJ impacts as part of the planning study. We're going to look at traffic, where it would land and other environmental factors but an environmental justice is certainly one of the factors getting vetted in the study when vetting alternatives so what I would hope or presume a preferred alternative would be a neutral or positive neutral or better but, um, I guess, yeah, I mean the potential is there that there's a negative impact at the end but uh we environmental justice is one of the factors it's going to weigh alternative selections.

>> Mike Franchini: Right, that's a good point. I think we can talk to Carrie more about that. Carrie are you on the line?

>> Carrie Ward: Yeah, I mean I think my understanding of that is that it will be a new bridge and so it's new construction and it's in an environmental justice area and so the potential is there to have a negative impact. Again, for any of these projects we don't really know what the exact design is or the exact details of it so we are just basing the analysis on a broad interpretation of the project.

>> Rob Rice: I guess I'm not ready to jump that there's going to be negative outcomes from the bridge replacement but as Greg said I mean it's certainly something we want the consultant to look at.

>> Andrew Kreshick: I think, I think it just the title potentially negative TIP projects is a kind of a misnomer. It should say something like potential EJ impacts. Why, why identify it as negative just make it if it's in an EJ area then obviously there are issues that one will have to contend when assessing the project itself. To identify it early on as potentially negative it just it's a catch that seemingly may not have to be made. you know. It just sheds a sheds a bit of a shadow before it needs to be.

>> Bob Rice: I'd agree with that.

>> Steve Iachetta: Michael, can that be amended? Can that be amended Mike?

>> Mike Franchini: Absolutely. If that's the sense of the committee then we'll amend it. We will remove that project.

>> Steve Iachetta: Does everyone agree? Should we vote on this verbiage?

>> Mike Franchini: We do need action so, yes, we could vote on it as amended and the amendment would be to remove the study from the list of negative projects.

>> Steve Iachetta: For all four?

>> Andrew Kreshik: Well, it's not so much that the study being removed I just the the nomenclature used. Can we say you know potential EJ impact projects? Does it have to say negative?

>> Mike Franchini: I think in the definition of negative impact that's exactly what we say

>> Andrew Kreshik: Okay

>> Mike Franchini: We just used the term negative and then define it as almost the exact words that you gave. So, I think we're doing that I don't think that's the problem I think it's you know trying to deal with a study and potential outcomes.

>> Andrew Kreshik: Okay

>> Michael Franchini: I think we could, we could move the study to the neutral category. Ah and then not as the new alternate what the recommended alternate is for the study.

>> Andrew Kreshik: Okay, I'm not heavy one way or the other just bringing up the issue.

>> Mike Franchini: Yep

>> Steve Iachetta: Alright, so the proposed amendment would be just for R344/A605 study of the Troy Menands Bridge not the other three projects A602, R195a or S269 traffic operations?

>> Mike Franchini: Correct

>> Steve Iachetta: Just the one project gets a neutral as this posed a potential negative all right that's amendment any other amendments to discuss before we vote on the EJ section title six?

>> Laura Robertson: Hey Mike? Um, does it explain in the environmental justice study anywhere why the Niskayuna one is potentially a negative?

>> Carrie Ward: I think that was expanding capacity at the intersection?

>> Laura Robertson: So, it would be a potential negative for people who live on the side streets?

>> Carrie Ward: Right.

>> Steve Iachetta: Anything else for amendments on the EJ title six? Are we ready to vote? Everyone comfortable?

>> Andrew Kreshik: Sure

>> Mike Franchini: Yes

>> Steve Iachetta: All right motion please.

>> Brad Birge: So moved

>> Steve Iachetta: Who said that?

>> Brad Birge: Bradley Birge

>> Steve Iachetta: Thank you. Thank you Brad and a second by?

>> Chris Wallin: I'll second it

>> Steve Iachetta: Is that Andrew?

>> Chris Wallin: Chris.

>> Steve Iachetta: Or Chris Wallin okay Chris Wallin second it all right all in favor please say aye

>> All: Aye, aye

>> Steve Iachetta: All right any abstaining or opposed? Hearing none our title six is adopted. Michael should I go back to the A and B of item five to get for the minutes a motion and a second? I think I neglected the Robert's Rules on A and B.

>> Mike Franchini: Ah, no, we don't need to go back. Let's keep the meeting moving forward

>> Steve Iachetta: Moving forward item seven is next we're into discussion items now item seven is complete street workshops. Michael?

>> Mike Franchini: That information is in your packet and Chris Bauer from our staff is on the meeting and can give a summary. Chris?

>> Chris Bauer: Good morning everybody I hope everybody can hear me okay. Um, just going to give you a brief overview of the 2020 Complete Streets workshop program and um everything I'm gonna say is ah going to be posted on our website and in the letter you'll receive about this with more detail just so you know. Ah, so the program itself you know the primary goal really simply is to help our government's our local governments develop and implement complete streets projects like Complete Streets policies and to identify and overcome the barriers you know to doing Complete Streets projects and complete streets policies. you know how the program kind of fits into the greater the bigger picture is it supports the New York Complete Streets Act of 2011, it implements the recommendations from new visions 2040 and draft new visions 2050, and is part of the Complete Streets advisory committee work plan. We've done two previous rounds of this, one in 2016 and one in 2018, so it's an every other year program. This is the next year of it, 2020. There are four workshop types that we offer. The first is Complete Streets basics, this is kind of like a 101 for communities that don't have a Complete Streets policy and are considering it, kind of just dipping their toe in. The second is Complete Streets policy for communities who have decided they want to develop a policy and want to delve deeper into what it should have in it. The third is Complete Streets implementation which is for communities that have a policy or an ordinance but are struggling in one way or another with implementation and so it's a little more design oriented, detail oriented. Then the fourth is um larger scale workshops with say you know County or region wide

workshops which would be multiple municipalities, similar to what we held in 2016 in Albany County. The consultant who will be the instructor will be Planning4Places with Sam Schwartz engineering who did the two previous rounds and did an excellent job at those. The solicitation like I said you'll receive a letter and a flyer in the mail, we're going to send it to the same mailing list that we sent our linkage mail out to. The form that you'll complete is an online application form. The theory I'm going to say very tentative timeline for this is to release the solicitation today with a due date of June 19th. Hoping to select the sponsors in the June and July time period and hold the workshops in August through December. That's kind of based on where we are today with Covid-19. We will follow all CDC, state and local guidelines with respect to meetings and gatherings so that schedule is subject to change. Our consultant and CDTC is prepared to use online and virtual tools like this for the coordination meetings and the pre meetings. Not quite sure, I don't think that would work for the actual workshops but uh we'll we'll adjust the schedule as we need to. let's see here anything else. The workshops, there's no local cost share, these are free. The only thing you have to do is provide a work meeting space, you have to ensure that your key stakeholders are going to attend and help us document that for our in kind match requirements. I will say if you applied in 2018 and you didn't receive it I encourage you to apply again. We had way more applications than we expected then in 2018. What else here, we use a regional representative selection committee of folks from DOT, CDRPC, our staff and CDTA will review the applications. And I think that's it for the high points. Does anybody have any questions or anything I can answer at this point?

>> Steve Iachetta: Thank you Chris. Any questions for Chris on the Complete Streets workshops coming up?

>> Mike Valentine: Chris you cut out on some of that transmission. You said the mailing is going out today the deadline? I didn't catch the deadline.

>> Chris Bauer: The mailing will go out soon, not today, at some time after today, hopefully by the end of the week and right now the tentative deadline is June 19th. And we may push that out you know if it, seems a little foreign right now to be applying for a workshop that it's all about gathering people in one space so you know people are hesitant to apply or we're not getting a lot of applications we may push that out.

>> Mike Valentine: And you're looking at August through December for the workshop meetings?

>> Chris Bauer: Yeah yeah August, September through December, later in the year, definitely.

>> Liz Kormos: I have a question. Who is, who is usually attending these workshops?

>> Chris Bauer: Well generally we say you know anybody who has a stake in the Complete Streets process. In the package we send out there'll be a list of suggested attendees but it's everything from you know your board members, your public works people, local advocates, school districts, public health folks, you know any anybody who kind of has a stake in that decision-making process

>> Mike Valentine: Chris is there also going to be in that mailing a list of types of projects to be considered for review in the workshop?

>> Chris Bauer: Yeah there'll be a detail about each workshop type and kind of what the expectations are and what we cover within those and then you know when when they're awarded we really work to kind of tailor that to the specific workshop type and the area that we're in so there's a lot of room for customization,

>> Liz Kormos: Just to clarify, so it's it's more professionals attending or people who are heads of the local organization than for the general public?

>> Chris Bauer: Uh, it's a mix. You know we have had some where the sponsor said you know we really feel like to have a frank discussion that this is going to need to be kind of I don't want to say closed doors but maybe

a more private discussion and then something public. We would like to have some public component to it. We have had others where there were some members of the public in the room and then we've had others where we did kind of a public presentation like at the end of the day that was open where people could come in and kind of kind of see. So, it really kind of depends on what we're trying to accomplish but if the sponsor wants to open it to the public or have a public component then we're we actually encourage that, we want that to be included in some way

>> Lilz kormos: Oh, great. Thank you.

>> Steve Iachetta: Excellent program and note the guidance on how to apply is in the advanced agenda. There's a few little tricks on clearing cookies, etc. and it'll save your form automatically. Anything else on Complete Streets? Moving forward, Capital Coexist Traffic Safety Ambassador Mini-grant Program is next item 8 in our agenda.

>> Mike Franchini: Go ahead Jen.

>> Jen Ceponis: Sure okay so CDTC released a solicitation late last year for the fifth round of our Capital coexist traffic safety ambassador grant or what we sometimes refer to as the mini grant program and we made \$25,000 available. We had a selection committee of folks from the Department of Health and the Department of Transportation and a member of our Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee in addition to CDTC staff. The program makes very small grants up to \$5,000 available to local governments, first responders, nonprofits and other organizations for small bicycle and pedestrian safety projects and programs. We received a total of 10 proposed projects from nine different project sponsors and the committee chose these eight projects for funding. Not all projects were awarded 100 percent of the funding that they requested but we worked through the budgets to fund elements that we thought were that were eligible and that we thought were um priorities for us so these are the eight projects. We tried to prioritize new communities that we haven't worked with traditionally, more innovative more innovative types of projects that haven't been done in the past. If anyone has any questions about any of the projects or the programs let me know but we we funded about \$24,000 of the \$25,000.

>> Steve Iachetta: Supporting \$47,156 again, good bang for the buck on a small but important program. Any other questions on capital coexist traffic safety for Jen? Thank You Jen. All right moving forward if we're ready Item 9 Bike to Work Day June 5th and bike to school day to be determined. Mike did you want to make any remarks on the bike to work and bike to school.

>> Mike Franchini: Yes, please. So we normally would be in the process of preparing for our bike to work program or day it actually would be I think this month, at the end of this month or in the middle of this month normally but of course with the the coronavirus issues, the pandemic we look to delay the ride, delay both bike to work and the bike to school programs so in your in your package there's a handout. So, we're looking to change the bike to work program right now and refer to it as pledge to ride campaign that would actually start in the 1st of May. Now that wouldn't require riding you know biking to work it would just be requesting a pledge to ride somewhere that you'd ride before or ride anywhere. So more information will be going out, we'll be sending emails and using social media to initiate the campaign for pledge to work and then we will look at later having a bike to work program in either September of September or October of this year and a bike to school program probably the week of October 7th. So stay tuned on when those programs will be but in the meantime if you'd like to and we'll send out you some information about the pledge to work we really would encourage people to pledge to work on their bicycle, I'm sorry pledge to ride on their bicycle. Any questions? Thanks.

>> Steve Iachetta: Thanks Mike. Moving to item 10 is the CDTC project delivery update from the advanced agenda the table at the back of your packet

>> Mike Franchini: Jacob is going to talk about that program.

>> Jacob Beeman: Yes so since our last update in February we've had a few projects that have hit some key milestones base on our consultant updates that we receive so I'll just go through a few of those and highlight them. Village of Green Island, Hudson Avenue preservation project submitted PS&E in February, Saratoga County, Middle Line Road over Gordon Creek Culvert project also submitted PS&E in February and the Town of Clifton Road, Sitterly Road at Woodin Road crossing intersection improvement project was let for construction in February. so good to see those projects moving forward and as usual I'll be reaching out to a few project sponsors this month for updates in May. Those sponsors will be Town of North Greenbush, City of Troy and Town of Clifton Park so we'll be asking for updates on all your active TIP projects for next month so expect to see those emails coming out later today or later sometime this week most likely.

>> Steve Iachetta: Okay, any questions for Jacob? Thank you Jacob. Good overview, this is a very useful tool to track our MPO projects. Ready to move forward DOT project delivery is up next Item 11. Bob.

>> Bob Rice: We don't have anything new to report Steve. Like I said, lettings are still happening, we're getting bids, nothing major that's off schedule.

>> Steve Iachetta: Thank you. We can move to Item 12 then around the table status of Planning, CDTC. Michael.

>> Mike Franchini: Okay so we're working with FHWA and FTA to reschedule our in-person certification, which was scheduled for last month actually. So we're doing that we're working with them on rescheduling maybe we'll be doing it remotely we haven't got there yet but we're that's where we are with that project. Outside of that we are we are really working on several of our solicitations right now and I want to point this out because I want to make sure that members know that there's opportunities for funding or assistance or both so we have about seven different solicitations that we approved in the UPWP and I'll just go over them really quickly and maybe talk some detail later but we just talked about the mini grant program and that's going well and and Jen just summarized that. We talked about Complete Streets. We also have the Technology Technical Assistance Program that we jointly implement with CDRPC and our staff that's going out so if you you know if you want if you're looking for some technical assistance you know go to our website go to the links that are in the in the package you know we'd love to see a lot of applications there too. With the tech assistance we're also doing something new we're doing a little bit of work on safety analysis, crash analysis and a little work on traffic signals so the tech assistance program has been expanded. Take a look at take at that on our website if you're interested. We're also doing a local bridge study and Andrew is going to talk more about that before he does that we're also in the process of soliciting for ADA transition assistance so if you're looking to develop a transition plan and you need some assistance on that we're also soliciting some some staff work and consultant work on that will be in the future. We're also looking at a traffic signal retiming program and some offering assistance to our members on that and finally looking at a trail feasibility study soliciting ideas for a trail feasibility study. the trail feasibility study you know we looked at our trails plan which was just completed last year the revised up-to-date trail plan and there are some priority projects that we really feel strongly you know would be great to implement so we thought by adding this opportunity to do a feasibility study on those priority trail projects we may be able to encourage them to be to be built to be implemented so there are seven different solicitations I just went through. Andrew Tracey is going to talk a little bit about the local bridge study we've done those before we've done one of those before and we're really excited to do that again so Andrew would you please talk a little bit about the local bridge study

>> Andrew Tracy: Yes, good morning everybody. can you hear me. yes I'm preparing an RFQ for an update to the local bridge preservation study. The last report was completed in 2015 it kicked off in 2014 finished up in 2015 and the new project is intended to be a complete refresh of the report that was completed in 2015. So we're going to retain a consultant to review inspection reports for all roughly 371 locally owned bridges in the

CDTC planning area and prepare recommended preservation treatments and work strategies for each bridge as appropriate. So I intend to reach out to all of the stakeholders that were involved in the prior 2015 study in the coming weeks in in April with a with a rough draft of the RFP and I'd like to speak to everyone involved and I'm particularly interested in any lessons learned from the prior study that could be carried forward to improve the the upcoming study and any feedback on the deliverables that the consultant prepared from the 2015 study if anybody has any ideas on how those might be improved so I intended to issue the RFQ early May and then hopefully finish the whole project by the end of the calendar year in time for that information to be useful for the next update so I just wanted that on everyone's radar expect if you were involved in the prior study I'll be reaching out to you in the month of May. thank you

>> Steve Iachetta: Thank you Andrew. Any questions for Andrew.

>> Andrew Tracy: Sorry, month of April

>> Steve Iachetta: Yep, April. thank you Andrew. Any questions or comments it's an important study update. Ready to move forward? regional planning commission. is it Mark?

>> Mark Castiglione: Yes. hmm can you hear me?

>> Steve Iachetta: Yes. All right here we go good job. Haha.

>> Mark Castiglione: Yes, it's census day today. It's not April fools day. This census is the first online census our response rate in New York state is about 31 percent. We need to make sure everyone gets counted. The census is undertaking a social media campaign today so I would encourage everyone to share any information that you can about the census and getting the word out and encourage people to complete the census in a timely fashion. There's also another resource it's put out by CUNY the City University of New York that shows where hard to reach populations are so live tracking map that shows the response rates in every census tract in that's a pretty handy tool if you're considering targeted outreach the next phase of the census is obviously a very involves direct contact with people so again we're in uncharted territory about that. So just a reminder, complete the census and get the word out. CDRPC will be sharing a variety of information on training and technical assistance programs that are being afforded to connect people with a variety of recovery resources afforded in the Cares Act in the coming days we will also be undertaking some other assistance programs through our EDA funding as those opportunities to become more clear we will share that with this group and get the word out with you all. that's my update. Thanks.

>> Steve Iachetta: Thanks mark

>> Todd Fabozzi: I have one more thing to add. I just wanted to mention that at CDRPC we just completed a major update of all the static maps that are on our website. There's 53 new regional maps on the website including census data but also land use data, land cover data, satellite change analysis, a growth of residential growth change over time so there's a lot of different interesting views of the region in both PDF and and JPEG format that you can put into PowerPoint presentations or you can put into reports or you can just peruse in your downtime and see interesting patterns about the region

>> Steve Iachetta: Important resource. Thank you Todd. Any questions for regional planning? Hearing none we'll move forward is anyone on from the CDTA? No Ross Farrell?

>> Mike Franchini: It doesn't look like anyone is on from CDTA Steve.

>> Steve Iachetta: Okay thank you Mike. DOT anything to add? Bob or Greg?

>> Greg Wichser: Bob had to step out for another call. No, not too much we're you know we're open for business, we're still everyone's working remotely successfully so for folks that have local agreements and all all your local projects all of our crews are fully functional and mail still goes to 50 Wolf and folks are going in periodically to pick up what's there you know we're I'd say every day 90% of us are working from home and somebody's in the office just doing something so we're all spread out. Otherwise a lot of our folks are getting pulled off for other Covid related duties now it's all hands on deck for this this effort so any questions for me at this time? Stay safe everybody.

>> Steve Iachetta: Thank you Greg. No one on from the Thruway Authority. Michael I don't see anyone from Thruway Authority. Is there anyone on?

>> Mike Franchini: No, I think you're correct.

>> Steve Iachetta: Okay airport's next boy what a month. Steve I reporting. We're missing 95% of our passengers as of mid March there's still 5% flying. Limited schedules about only 40% operations so we're down 60% operations. American did an early strategic move shifting from passenger to cargo. one of the American is focused on Freight. Freight is in the planners view equal to passengers but obviously we're way down on passengers. The authority is following governor's guidelines and I've got a skeleton crew in the office functioning keeping the intermodal facilities all open. We have substantially completed major a hundred million dollars in major terminal, garage and airport access improvements that's all substantially complete before this national emergency was declared. That's a quick wrap-up so it's difficult times. Staff are holding out and similar to DOT there's a lot of we're fully functional but a lot of remote working with FAA daily most of FAA is also working at home. Any questions on the aviation or passenger freight front for me? let's see port district I don't think we have anyone from port district on? Tony Vasil? Anyone else? Linkage, Michael anything to add on CDTC linkage or planning activities or local anyone want to chime in just announce yourself

>> Mike Franchini: Yep, we have a new summary table with the new linkage studies for the three Village studies that were approved last month while we're working with new villages to develop an MOU and advertise for a consultant so we're looking forward to the new the new linkage study program plans. That's it.

>> Steve Iachetta: Any local reports of note? I hope everyone is well

>> Brad Birge: Saratoga Springs. I just wanted to indicate the Geyser Road Trail. Trails are transportation and still considered essential so the construction is ongoing we're very appreciative of that and we're taking that day-to-day

>> Steve Iachetta: Thank you Brad. anyone else?

>> Mike Valentine: Steve can I go back to Mike's part of this item some questions for him

>> Steve Iachetta: Which item Mike?

>> Mike Valentine: Going back to what Mike had reported on at the very beginning under this on letter A okay

>> Steve Iachetta: Oh yeah, Item 12A. Michael.

>> Mike Valnetine: Um Mike I think you had listed you went to technical assistance then the traffic signal retiming and trail feasibility study. Are these, are these on the website or do you have where would where would I find more information on these or did you already send some stuff out.

>> Mike Franchini: Some of the information is in are well all the information is in our UPWP so if you

went to the UPWP, clicked on the text you could find a really good description of each one of those projects, each one of those solicitations. Most of them are actually, well not, a lot of them are new so they would actually be in both the introductory portion but they also have their own individual text. Go to the table of contents and it'll tell you the task description and where it is in the UPWP.

>> Mike Valentine: Quick one Mike on the traffic signal retiming has there been a solicitation

>> Mike Franchini: No not yet we're working on that.

>> Mike Valentine: All right we don't have timetable for it then?

>> Mike Franchini: Correct.

>> Mike Valentine: Okay and then you added you said that the safety analysis and the traffic signals were part or included now or part of the technical assistance?

>> Mike Franchini: On a smaller on a smaller scale that's correct and that and that solicitation is out now.

>> Mike Valentine: As part of the technical assistance one then right then my question will come is how what's the differentiation between that as far as safety and traffic signals and traffic signal retiming. Are they completely different then?

>> Mike Franchini: They are different. The tech assistance when it comes to traffic signals will probably be more will be smaller in scale more like examining the warrants for a traffic signal you know it may be looking at the possibility of a turn lane at an intersection, things like that. With the signal retiming that'll be you know that will look at analysis for the entire signal and all the movements, through movements and turning movements at that signal, so it will analyze the entire intersection Andrew you're on the line still does that does that sound right to you?

>> Andrew Tracy: Yes for the signal retiming project I did actually have a rough timeline prepared but then recent events occurred so we might be pushing that back a bit but we intended to hire a consultant to do an analysis of a signalized intersection or a whole corridor a series of intersections and develop a revised timing plan that the local agency could implement so that was that would be much larger in scope than what we would be able to do under the technical assistance I think.

>> Liz Kormos: If the signals are on a state route does that complicate things? I mean who who applies? I mean we have route 50 going right through the middle of the village and that's a problem.

>> Andrew Tracy: Right, well I I'd encourage you to apply and probably collaboratively with the state if they would be okay participating in the study and considering a revised timing plan to be field implemented then you know a possibly a joint application between you and the state would be okay.

>> Mike Franchini: Well what we've done Liz before is if a local sponsor wanted to offer say a TIP a new TIP project they had to work with DOT and make sure that DOT was in agreement with the scope of that project so we would for the traffic timing retiming project we definitely want some documentation showing that DOT is willing to cooperate or approves the project before it would be considered.

>> Liz Kormos: Yeah, I think they may may have already been looking at it because they are working on some of the signals so I'm not sure you know they don't often tell us tell us in the village what they're up to.

>> Mike Valentine: Yours is still tied on route 50 to the Rossi project. I'm work on the timing and the signalization there.

>> Liz Kormos: Right that's at the other end though that's actually outside the village. I'm talking about the two signals that are in the center of the village.

>> Mike Valentine: I'm talking about 67 and 50.

>> Liz Kormos: Yeah that's that's a different. that's up out of the village and the Town of Ballston.

>> Greg Wichser: We do have our own, it's new it's just getting implemented a a multi-regional signal timing contract that's gonna rove around and look at hotspots so if you coordinate with us we may look at that section ourselves with our own other mechanism as well so

>> Liz Kormos: Yeah

>> Greg Wichser: But do stay tuned.

>> Steve Iachetta: Hmmm any other local planning activities for discussion at this time.

>> Andrew Kreshick: Yeah Steve Andrew Kreshik, months ago you might have read that locusts were afflicting Africa and other areas now we have a global pestilence but unless the frogs start falling from the sky in rain turns red the South Troy industrial park road bid will open on April 8th.

>> Steve Iachetta: Miracles will never cease thank you Andrew.

>> Brad Birge: May we all hold are breaths on that one Andrew?

>> Steve Iachetta: Good competitive bidding. A big shot of hurray there that's a long-running story project. Congratulations. Any other local notes it's 11 o'clock our next meeting I believe is is it policy board may 6th? I had a May 5 Planning Board. Mike?

>> Mike Franchini: That is a mistake on the agenda that's not a policy board meeting that's a planning committee meeting

>> Steve Iachetta: Are we on for Wednesday the 5th or Thursday the 6th of May let's see oh may 6 is a Wednesday so we will meet again Wednesday May 6. I promise to have a video hookup and maybe I can join Sean on the Star Trek Enterprise. any closing remarks thank you so much everyone and stay safe keep your social distancing and tune in daily to our governor's great state leadership etc. local officials around this is really unfolding and dynamic time daily so local and state and national all needs to be tracked closely so I wish you and yours all the best health any closing remarks Michael? Thank you.

>> Mike Franchini: No I just want to say thank you to everybody who participated we did have a really good turnout and stay safe.

>> Steve Iachetta: Thank you everyone, best wishes.