

CDTC October 7, 2020 Planning Committee Meeting

>> Steve Iachetta: Thank you for supporting uh safety and capacity for our regional transportation I am trying to share with you a view of the airfield so you can see some plane action out here this morning hope it's not too distracting um so that's my introduction Mike did you wanted to call the roll call uh in lieu of self-introductions you have the complete roster there

>> Mike Franchini: yes that would be great thank you Steve, Randy Milano I have you Brad Birge, Chris Wallin, anybody from um city of Watervilet? Okay hearing none. Anyone from city of Rensselaer? Okay Joe Simon graves. I have Joe, Andrew from Troy um Sean Maguire, have you Ross Farrell Bob and Greg from DOT, Tim Wayne Wright got Tim. No one from the port, Steve Iachetta, Peter Camenza, I am sorry Peter. Um for the town reps I have uh John Scavo, Jen Ceponis, Jamie O'Neill, Liz Kormos anyone else from the town representatives okay um all right from the county I have Bill Angelo, Mike Valentine I do not have Steve Feeney um Steven did you make it are you on hearing none and from Rensselaer county any Representative from Rensselaer county okay Steve I am that is fine I am ready to go

>> Steve Iachetta: excellent thank you everyone for taking time out of your busy schedules following our Traditional agenda um item two is the visitors issues and this is a public meeting and we welcome any uh visitors to raise a brief comment up to two or three minutes on regional transportation issues of interest to CDTC planning is there any visitor wishing to address the board of the planning committee at this time going once going twice and hearing none we can move to the adoption of our prior meeting minutes of august 5th we're exhibited in advance hope everyone had a chance to glance at these minutes and they will be posted on the cdtc.org website cdcmpo.org website any comments recommended revisions to our Prior meeting minutes of August 5th please speak up at this time

>>Sean Maguire: hearing none I would like to move the minutes

>> Steve Iachetta: so moved in a second please

>> Bradley Birge: second by Bradley Birge

>> Steve Iachetta: who seconded

>> Bradley Birge: Bradley

>> Steve Iachetta: thank you brad all right all in favor please say aye raise your hand affirmative all in favor please say aye

Aye

>> Steve Iachetta: I didn't hear it but that's all right everyone's muted so any abstaining or opposed please speak up unmute remember on mute if you want to take action going once going twice hearing no abstention or opposition the meeting minutes of august 5th are hereby adopted moving forward we have a presentation from the regional planning commission on the capitol district atlas by Todd Fabozzi are you ready Todd

>>Todd Fabozzi: I am

>> Steve Iachetta: excellent thank you go ahead and take it away

>> Todd Fabozzi: You just confirm that you can see the presentation all right. Then I will just ask that Everyone mute and then we can have some questions afterwards. So thanks for inviting me to present on the Capitol Region Atlas and I am showing you a picture actually of the first regional atlas. Uh was one of the first tasks that I undertook when i was brought on a CDRPC back in 1997 so quite a while ago and it was charged with building a GIS system for the commission which has a long since been accomplished and one of the ways in which we first showed that accomplishment was to put together the first digital

produced atlas so it was an atlas produced with GIS software from ESRI and we worked out an agreement with a local bank to help fund the production of an atlas so we did it as a hard copy atlas and since that time we have and I have updated this many times and used it basically as an online mechanism to commit to communicate this data. So we've uh called it the digital atlas and so when we get new data from the census or other sources we put this on online on our website at cdrpc.org for others to be able to take advantage of one of i think the great assets of the atlas is the ability to look at the big picture and that's why i like this cover image of a satellite image it's a near-infrared image of the development areas uh in the in light blue in the region doesn't show municipal boundaries so it's really a way of looking past that and looking broadly at the region and how the individual actions of communities um add up to something bigger and this uh atlas really gets at what it shows and so we have now created another update to this atlas and i just want to click through here hopefully i can advance my slides here we go so this is a picture from the previous atlas as well just again showing how you can see the broad development patterns of the region at a glance.

So on to the newest version and this is not the whole entire atlas so I encourage you to go to our website and look at the atlas and utilize it so not only utilize it to be able to look at the region and understand the big picture of the region um but also you can download any of the individual maps you can insert them into powerpoint presentations you can insert them into reports um and you can use them and insert them into grant applications and CDRPC uses this data for our technical assistance program for our water quality planning and for all the planning that we do when we need to develop maps. In addition, we utilize these data sets at different scales to be able to complement whatever planning work we are doing. Therefore, this is a satellite image of land cover that shows the broad land cover within the Capital Region and I am just going to pop through these just to give you a sample comment on some of them. This is an example also derived from landsat satellite imagery of the impervious surface areas of the region, so really contrasting the developed areas with those that are undeveloped and this is useful for looking at things like green space and water quality planning.

We have tax parcel data that we utilize for a variety of different things this is an example of utilizing the property class code to develop land use a land use map of the region this is an example of just extracting Certain characteristics from the parcel data to be able to look at patterns like commercial development so when you just extract commercial development in the region it shows a distinct kind of pattern that might be a little bit obscured when you just look at all of the land uses at once and you can see the highway-oriented commercial development in the patterns of the major state roads and development along Those roads this is an example from the tax parcel data as well of snapshot over time of just single family residential development so this is looking back at a 10-year period of resident single-family residential development where each uh little purple dot represents one single-family home and you can start to see some of the patterns of how we're developing as a region when you look at a map like this you can see essentially a spread out pattern.

You can see certain areas where there's more intense development taking place for example all the dots that in that you see in half moon as one example but it's showing the overall pattern over a 10-year period of residential development this is an example also extracted from the parcel data of um what we work here at CDRPC on a variety of programs and one of the programs is a promotion for heat pumps and so it is a clean heat and cooling program um that we call heat smart capital region and this is an example of all of the homes that use fuel oil as a fuel source which are then um really there's a good value proposition for these homes to switch over to heat pumps and it's a much cleaner uh and less expensive way to heat your home and better for the environment and particularly for climate change and reducing co2 emissions this is an example of a little bit of an older map but we included it because we have not had the opportunity to secure funding to do a new greenhouse gas inventory of the capital region.

But this is an example of the previous inventory that we did that was community specific and it shows the overall greenhouse gases of that each of the communities is emitting and you can see some pretty clear patterns here when you look at this for in particular you can see how the denser the area is the more urbanized it is the lower the carbon footprint and that conforms with a lot of the research that we've seen in other places in which you've got multi-story buildings you've got shared walls you've got a compactness that lends itself to a transit orientation and a more walk able existence and you see that reflected here in

in this map we have lots of environmental characteristics that we show and can utilize with different studies.

Therefore, this is just an example of state regulated wetlands and hydric soils that are an indicator of federal wetlands. This is an example of flood maps and in the region this is an example of watersheds and we've got different hydrologic unit code levels that we can show and do analysis on for different watersheds we have lightar data and uh other kinds of digital elevation modeled data and this is an example of that where this is a combination of an analytical hill shade with elevation to show the topography in the region this is an example derived from census data and we have a lot of census data maps that are thematic maps this is a choropleth style map in which ranges are shown for in this case population density this is a graduated single map that's based on population over time so this is one that looks back to 1960 and then goes to the 2010 um that's the period of 2010 and that census we'll be getting new data soon for the 2020 census but this uh 50-year snapshot um shows one of the key dynamics in the in the capital region which is a loss of population in the urban areas.

Because you can see in red those areas that lost population and the size of that symbol is proportionate to that loss and then you can see in blue the areas that gain population and again the size of that symbol is proportionate to the population gain and the actual number of new residents is or the growth in residences is shown also in that symbol this is a look at the population estimates just for this census decade up until 2018 so an eight year snapshot and we'll get the actual census numbers um within the next year and we will be able to see uh this specifically for the 10 10-year period. But eight out of those 10 years is certainly a pretty close indicator to the trend and what we expect and that is that we are losing population again in the core cities of Albany Connecticut and Troy and Rensselaer and some suburban towns that are actually losing population as well and uh and ships where you see growth in half moon instead of traditionally Clifton park.

And so this is an overall dynamic of what we're seeing and if you look at the total number at least by the population estimates 2018 it was only uh a little over 13,000 new people so we'll see when the numbers come out but we don't expect anything probably greater than 17,000 more likely fifteen thousand uh new people over a ten year period which is dramatically different than the expectations a number of years back um those have been around for a while know that we with CDTC and CDRPC and others did analysis of potential growth scenarios with the new chip plant coming at the time and we were expecting potentially so-called hyper growth and we heard all about how we're going to turn into Austin Texas because of all of that and you know during that previous uh census decade we gained so the previous census decade we gained 44,000 new people or so and um now that we have the chip fab plan we're only gaining about maybe 15,000 new people.

So not only didn't we turn into Austin Texas but we've dramatically dropped in population growth in in the Region this is an example of building permits, which is another indicator of where the development is going this is an example of household income so it shows the distribution of household income and you can see a definite pattern in our region and this is a pattern that keeps showing itself in the capital region in which the higher income areas are the surrounding suburbs of the traditional cities um which a lot of that exodus of course went to those areas and so it was not just overall numbers that left the cities but it was a higher income population that left the cities this is another map that shows a similar phenomenon of just poverty in the poverty areas and you can see the concentration the highest concentration areas are in the cities and the and there is also rural poverty as well indicated in this map.

If you look at the location of the minority population it's concentrated primarily in the in the traditional urban areas in the surrounding inner suburb areas if you look just at the black population highly concentrated highly segregated if you will in the urban areas a trend that we've seen for a long time so one of the things that is definitely an indicator in the new atlas is the ongoing continuation of the patterns that were first indicated back with the 1990 based data from the first atlas so it's there's not been a lot of change in terms of the patterns the demographic patterns there's been primarily a change in the continued exodus and spread of residential development in the outlying areas this is an interesting map to me because this is an indicator of where people who did not live in the country prior to 2010 uh moved which are primarily the urban areas and it gives the overall number of immigration into the capital district since 2010 which is around 17,000 uh persons.

And so if we look at a potential growth in the region of only 15 to 17,000 new people and then 17,000 new immigrants basically what this is saying is that if it weren't for immigration that basically we would not be growing at all in the capital region we'd actually be losing population and the cities in particular would be losing even more population this is a distribution of the educational attainment in the region and there's a high correlation with the higher income areas and the higher level of educational attainment this is a map of housing value again based on census data on ACS. Data and you can see the values are mostly higher in the areas that have the newer level housing and the and in the suburban areas.

Uh some exceptions in Saratoga Springs and here's an example of the year built of housing and you can see the gradation from where the older housing uh was in relation to the newer housing that's being built and which communities are getting rich this is a map that shows rental housing and in this case it's a density map where one dot equals 50 units of rental housing primarily concentrated in the city but it's mattering throughout suburban areas. In addition, this complementary map just shows apartment buildings uh regardless of how many units are in those buildings and you can see the concentration of apartment buildings where and where they are located in that pattern. This is the concentration of vacant housing in the urban areas that has highly indicated in this map, there is a most of the urban or the vacancies are in the urban area. Therefore, in this case, a dot equals 20 vacant units and there are a total number of vacant units of over 40,000 so we have got over 40,000 vacant housing units and primarily the urban areas.

And again not a good indicator of community health this is a map of commuting patterns and it shows where somebody commutes if they commute inside or outside of their own county uh and by municipality so you can see the clear indication of the commuting pattern out of Rensselaer and Saratoga counties into Albany county this is a map that shows public transit commuters in the concentration of those which is of course highly concentrated in the traditional cities and urban areas and that's where the most robust transit service in fact exists and this is another indicator of likely transit use, which is no vehicle households and again highly concentrated in the urban areas so just to take off this. I was asked to do a presentation that I had done um to the uh-quarterly group that meets the planner's forum.

And so I was asked not only to hit on the atlas but talk about some of the development patterns and I'm just going to touch on a few key indicators um as well in this uh presentation and so this is an older satellite image from a previous study in which i had compared uh change over time with different satellite images over an 11-year period extracted the areas where the new growth was taking place uh analyzed it by land use and so what we attempted to do with this particular study is to update it with parcel level data so first before i show you that the results of that update i want to just go through the parcel level data of just single family residential development over time by decade because it's an interesting indicator just of the sprawl essentially in our region so each purple dot is a single family home and of new development. During the period, so it is not all the single-family homes that exist it is just the single-family homes built during in this case of the decade from 1945 to 54. and then I'll jump up in decades and continually show the new development during the east subsequent decade so up to 74 84 94 2004 and then up to 2015. Therefore, you can see a considerable amount of spread of residential development over that period.

Um and a considerable amount in the outlying areas outside of the urban core outside of where there's transit service so to look at that a little more closely what we did uh several years back is to then show just a single family parcels over a 20-year period okay from 1995 to 2015 and this is the whole parcel this is not just the dot which is contrasting with those uh previous maps which just showed a dot for the centroid of the parcel in this case it's the entire parcel and this was these were all of the residential parcels for single-family homes alone that's how during a 20-year period in the capital region you can see a considerable sprawl across the region here's some numbers just some of the numbers of that development during that 20-year period there were over 35 000 new single-family homes a 20 increase The total acres developed was 55 almost 56000 which was a 38 increase during that same period of time

That 20 year there was only a 55000 uh a little over 55000 new people added to the region so only a seven percent increase so we were consuming land just for residential growth at over five times the rate of population growth. So thinking back to a Brookings institute study that coined the term sprawl. Without growth uh many years ago and this is uh the uh this is an indicator of that very phenomena and And so we've got um when you add commercial development when you add all other kinds of besides residential we're actually consuming that at a much higher rate than population growth of five percent Therefore, we developed out of these uh of this analysis community uh growth profiles for each of the communities in the capital region and for each of the counties and this is an example of what these look like.

Where we have some population and housing union information some greenhouse gas uh information and then we created a land use map to complement this for each community and also then show those parcels during that 20-year period that were developed in each of the communities and then also showed the new roads that were developed during that same period of time we analyzed the new parcels we looked at ortho photography and uh we then showed where what new roads were developed during that 20-year period of time and not only showed if where new roads were being built but showed whether the new road included a sidewalk or not and so then for so for each community we have that information.

So this is a look and this is really super imposing two things here that the new parcels during that 20-year period but also all of the sidewalks from CDTC sidewalk inventory not just the new sidewalks to show the relationship between uh where we're building residential homes and whether we're putting in sidewalks or not on where sidewalks exist and you can see from this map that there's a concentration primarily in the older urban areas of sidewalks but there's a general lack of them in in most of the other areas in the region.

And so we continue to build residential developments but uh omitting sidewalks in in the majority of the cases so this is just a closer look we can zoom in and compare where there were sidewalks in contrasting with where there was new residential development this is just a look right in between Albany's connecting Troy and Colonie and Guilderlin this is a look at southern Saratoga county and Clifton park Halfmoon and I should qualify this this does not include multi-use paths in this particular view so there are some of Those particularly in Clifton Park that can be used for walking the interesting contrast when you look at for example Niskayuna and Schenectady and you can just see how we just essentially stopped putting in sidewalks at a certain point in time when we were building residential developments and you can see that throughout the region and you look at big development outside of mechanic bill and no really attempt to kind of connect these up or developments in half moon that are comparable almost an area to a whole city and without any sidewalks.

In addition, you can see some efforts here in Bethlehem to be able to string some areas together with some new sidewalks and so i just want to end here with a just a look where we can zoom down it's not included in the atlas and the atlas again looks at the bigger picture but we start to look at those residential developments those new residential developments and we start to look at air photography with them and uh of them and dissect their particulars you see this you know a common pattern. I think that we're used to maybe when you start to extract it and look at it in total it becomes more stark and that is these this just disconnectedness of things the cul-de-sac model the lack of sidewalks the you know the lollipop nature of just pot and what i suppose we could call podification of a lot of the suburban areas and these are areas that are really difficult to navigate outside of a car these are areas that use a lot more infrastructure than would really be efficient and they're not really serviceable by transit in any efficient way.

And very difficult to try to connect up in any fashion because of the dead-end cul-de-sacs with houses on the end how do you add on to that or extend this in some fashion it's a it's a very uh disaggregated pattern that that is not the ideal for really trying to create walk able bike able transit-oriented sustainable Places and so this is the last image and I just wanted to hit on that uh before i end it so I'll end right there Then be glad to take any questions if anyone has them

>> Steve lachetta: Let us see excellent thank you very much Todd good overview executive summary this is very useful data in all our project applications. Uh grant administration and excellent resource updated

and thanks for starting with our favorite infrared land sat image that's a favorite of mine as well any other questions for Todd on this overview of the atlas and always remember it as an excellent resource for our four county region any questions remember to unmute and remute we can move into our action items if there's no further discussion are you ready mike item four on the agenda is a running story our fiscal constraint discussion tip summary table 4 and the budget estimate update please refer to your advanced agenda and the table 4. Most up-to-date version was is also on the website Michael

>>Mike Franchini: yeah I mean we've seen this before as Steve said the table four is the fiscal constraint table you can see that there have been some changes since the last one uh we've had some rollovers we're going to talk about more about rollovers and uh other moves that in the tip when we when we get to the STIP performance section but this is the impact of some of those rollovers and some of those changes on the table for an effort of you know to make full disclosure to ensure full disclosure on the back page of the packet uh is a list of changes that we've made that are made through project selection that we make with the approval of DOT and the project sponsor and that's just to make sure that the committee understands and knows that we do make some small changes that do not get approved by the planning Committee so that's included on that page there and that's about it Steve if there's any other questions we're available for questions

>>Stave Iachetta: the floor is open any comments highway administration is deeming the sufficient Michael it has been communication of concurrence from FHWA

>>Mike Franchini: well we're still in the process Glenn we're still in the process of making some of these changes or does this this reflect all the updated changes

>>Glenn Posca: okay the stiff performance changes have all been made can you hear me okay

>>Mike Franchini: yes

>>Glenn Posca: okay all right

>>Mike Franchini: so this is this then Steve to answer your question and this kind of demonstrates some of the some of the conflicts between uh trying to maintain fiscal constraint at the same time improve step performance the planning funds move with the project so that's what's happened in this table to in other words to get to uh better step performance we've moved projects and we've moved their funding into for into other years that has resulted in some changes to the percentage of over programming and under programming I'm not sure there's any way that we can address that and still maintain tip performance um Bob Rice do you have any comments about that

>>Bob Rice: uh not really Mike I mean obviously as a planning exercise we got to try to balance the checkbook by fund source by state fiscal year and federal fiscal year and uh as well as deliverables and milestones for the project so you know it's sort of an ongoing activity as i say it doesn't diminish a commitment by the body to a project it's just sometimes we got to say we got to balance the checkbook

>>Mike Franchini: right and in the end I mean if you look at the four years that doesn't change the total so we're still we're still balancing the checkbook it's just that you know by year we have going a little bit over you know the over under the percentage

>>Glenn Posca: uh mike I would like to interject something here and that is that this table is from 925 you are looking at table four in the mail out correct

>>Mike Franchini: yes

>>Glen Posca: all right that is from September 25th the project selection changes that for STIP performance that moved projects from the second year to the third year had not yet been made and so they were made after this mail out after this was sent out or at least after this table was put in here so the

the table 4 right now looks significantly different it's five percent under programmed in 2021 and 19 over in in year three

>>Steve lachetta: 19 wow okay so it's just a five-year period are we still on or one percent under and is that the focus of FHWA is for the five-year uh or four-year period

>>Glenn Posca: Yes, all these changes were all these changes were made within the four years so the total for the four years is not going to be any different

>>Steve lachetta: balanced okay

>>Glenn Posca: it is just moving from one year to another

>>Steve lachetta: understood any other questions from the committee hearing none we can move forward to item five our tip proposed amendments uh mike valentine's on the line to give executive summary for Saratoga 297 state pin 1760.46 items 5a is Michael there

>>Mike Valentine: Yes, this is uh this is a bridge replacement on Ashtown road done by the county uh it is in the Boston lake area and it is over the cp rail and um this was um the amendment comes about primarily because of force account involving the uh the rail company construction this triggers a tip amendment not just a 500 000 increase in construction and construction inspection uh but a 27 uh cost increase overall so that triggers the tip amendment requiring planning committee approval but the construction cost is increased by 440000 and the inspection costs increased by 60 000 and those are primarily uh results of cp rails force count uh their estimate which uh increases construction costs but also increase the duration of the construction and uh increase the inspection cost so um the amendment this amendment comes about um prior to the submission for pse package and request for federal authorization to advertise so in that trigger.

Uh county dpw looked at the numbers and as i said the out of that 500000 of 335 was uh the force account estimate 60 000 was the inspection but the inspector the construction cost increased by a hundred and five thousand uh over two-year-old construction cost estimates some of those construction cost estimate and but we're involved in the removal of the uh the existing bridge the new steel or steel for the new superstructure uh concrete costs from new decking and new bridge rail so overall uh 105 000 of it is construction costs related the rest of that uh that 395 000 is related to cp rails force account increases Glenn i do not know if you have any comments regarding that at all no guess not that is all i have then Steve

>>Steve lachetta: great thank you Michael appreciate the overview we are accustomed to hearing challenges on railroad projects and dnh being no exception here any other comments around the table this is a standalone item for voting i believe so we'll need a motion in a second to move this uh cost increase of a half million mostly attributable to the dnh force account um was there anything else to add on that force account Michael just to explain 395 000 portion of that

>>Mike Valentine: not really just based on what the what cp rail what they did submit on their uh their tabulation was uh project and construction management site supervision was 91 000 out of it and then then it says includes that flagging and automatic flags that was 240 something thousand

>>Steve lachetta: wow

>>Mike Valentine: These costs were not in the original uh cost estimate for the project

>> Steve lachetta: the single annual auditors will have fun with this but everything's documented so um anything further are we comfortable to vote I'll need a motion

>>Chris Wallin: Steve I will make a motion a second

>>Steve lachetta: thank you all in favor please say aye raise your hand all right be abstaining or opposed hearing none 5a is hereby adopted thank you for your support uh thank you mike Franchini we didn't need to vote on our fiscal constraint discussion right backing up to uh item for the prior item on the agenda that was not voting is that correct

>>Mike Franchini: that is correct Steve

>>Steve lachetta: thank you all right we are ready for 5b on our agenda is a t134 Washington western bus rapid transit phase 4. This is exciting progress for our regional transit company and Ross is on the line Ross are you ready to give us a summary remember to unmute hello ross anybody from CDTA you were there he was on a phone line right Michael

>>Mike Franchini: yeah it is yes

>>Steve lachetta: so what's going on with the phones should we come back to this item if ross is not there yet okay uh we'll table item five and

>>Carrie Ward: sorry to interrupt but Ross um put in the chat asking if we can unmute him and i think i saw that Jen is a host now

>>Jen Ceponis: Yeah so, where is Ross?

>>Jen Ceponis: the four six eight six phone number

Um

>>Jen Ceponis: it is at the bottom on my screen I am looking sorry Ross um my only option is to ask to unmute but i cannot actually unmute him

>>Steve lachetta: then Ross has to unmute himself is that Correct

>>Jen Ceponis: yes

>>Steve lachetta: All right, we can come back to this item 5b use the chat room to please discuss And give guidance if we can assist Ross with unmuting um right Michael uh yes we'll take table 5b Momentarily and i believe Ross will be with us shortly but we'll move to five Charlie and this is uh t125 state pin 1824.62 oh this is also bus rapid transit rod the next three items Charlie and delta are all CDTA of course

>>Ross Farrell: Steve can you hear me now yes thanks very much all right we got three items for you to give us executive summary on that's b5b Charlie and delta should we vote on all three together are they separate items i think that the first one is uh is a separate item and then uh the next two are together so I'll start with uh t134 um uh sorry about that everyone uh my desk phone wasn't working for whatever reason um the background to this project i think everybody knows about uh it's the Washington Western BRT.

Uh we were announced uh funding in uh may of this year um this is phase four which is the phase that is attributed to uh the small starts funding uh which is the capital investment grant program from the federal transit administration um as you can see from the last table as part of this uh this agenda item uh this is uh the largest portion uh let's say the main portion of the brt line uh due to the fact that we've had the brt set aside uh in the past we were able to break out phases and implement them uh in advance uh but this is the largest phase again with small starts funding we don't have a grant agreement yet that's really the last step in the in the process and to get to the grant agreement we need to put uh the project on the tip so that's what we're looking to do today and then we hope to start construction in 2021 uh and roll out at the end of 2022 or early 2023 so again this is just to put the project on the tip

>>Steve lachetta: thank you ross appreciate the overview any questions on item five bravo uh on adoption of this Washington western on the tip uh it's not a fiscal constraint increase but it is uh would you say 70 can you clarify the 77.7 million number Ross did you do that

>>Ross Farrell: uh the 77.7 is the is the overall uh project uh of this phase the overall funding while the federal portion is the 60. Uh eight or 60.9

>>Steve lachetta: okay any questions for us for the discussion t-134 and this will go to the policy board Next meeting remember to unmute if you have any discussion please are we comfortable voting on item 5b for tip adoption of t134 the next phase of brt Washington western phase four are we ready to move it committee you hear me

>>Bradley Birge: I will make the motion Bradley

>>Steve lachetta: thank you Bradley okay and a second bye

>>Bob Rice: Second

>>Steve lachetta: thank you bob excellent thank you for your support all in favor please say aye or raise Your hand aye

Aye

>>Steve lachetta: all right any abstention or opposition to adoption going once going twice hearing none Welcome to the tip five bravo t-134 is on okay next is Charlie and delta Ross you're going to give us an overview of these two action items all right so

>>Ross Farrell: so this is related to actually phase three, which is outside of the funding for um uh the small starts portion uh the funding we actually drew down from the brt side and created t125 a few meetings ago but after discussions with the FHWA the eligibility of using before we were using nhpp now we're switching and using stp flex uh the reason why there's sort of two actions and of this is because the money has to go back into the brt set-aside um rg 131 and then back out using uh to the t-125 using stp flex in addition we did increase the amount for the project by a hundred thousand dollars um after we received contractor uh quotes for elements of the project um so again this is more of an administrative uh action but we're just switching the funding for t125 from an hpp to stp flex

>>Steve lachetta: yeah thank you for that overview ross uh discussion at this time any questions for ross on the two items 5c and 5d it's t125 and regional 131.

>>Chris Wallin: Steve

>>Steve lachetta: yes

>>Chris Wallin: this is Chris is this the STP flex that's in table four or a different STP flex that's Held for CDTA

>>Ross Farrell: This STP flex was put into the rg 131 the brt set aside to begin with um so there's no change in the overall uh amounts of stp flex with this action related to the tip it's just merely moving it from rg 131 into t125

>>Glenn Posca: that is accurate however, it does show in table four, but as Ross pointed out it is a wash because it is going back

>>Chris Wallin: it is going from one project to another project or one fun source

>>Ross Farrell: 8it's going from one funds are going between rg 131 the set-aside and t-125 the draw down on the set-aside so the money was already programmed during the tip update that's why it doesn't affect table four but it does come but it does it is fun source it is a fun source from table four

>>Chris Wallin: okay all right as long you know i just I always try to keep an eye on if we're taking away stp flex and giving back nhpp because it's really hard for most of us on this call to use nhpp so that's why if it's if it's just a wash and it was already earmarked that's fine i just wanted to know

>>Steve lachetta: excellent clarification thank you Chris appreciate that full disclosure in all aspects so it's a balance um this does not go to the policy board and our action will be considered final is there any other discussion before we vote on both items c and d any other questions hearing none i may have a motion to adopt these items uh to further clarify the brt advancement

>>Bradley Birge: motion by Bradley Birge

>>Steve lachetta: thank you brad in a second bye

>>Bob Rice: I will second again

>>Steve lachetta: see well thank you bob all right good tradition rolling is everybody comfortable ready to vote everyone in favor please say i or raise your hand

Aye

>>Steve lachetta: nice of course, very good and any abstention or opposed? Going once going twice we carry our consensus forward thank you very much. All right uh that concludes the tip items next item six on our agenda is stick performance changes and there was an enclosure in our advanced agenda and we'll have an overview by Michael with support by Glenn and Greg great w uh Michael

>>Mike Franchini: Sure, we will start uh as Steve said there is a pack there is an item in your package Agenda item Roman numeral 6. Which gives a quick summary of why we are making these changes to improve step performance? Then behind that, there is a table of the STIP performance, the proposals and change proposed changes that we are asking the committee to approve. Uh today, if you look at the table well first of all, uh this has been a priority pretty much every year this isn't something new that FHWA has just started to look at. This has always been a concern I think it has been a little bit more concerned as they monitor the progress or not the progress that we're not making in any case it looks like we're going to be doing this pretty much every year, making these adjustments to make sure that we improve STIP performance as much as possible. Therefore, that said you know what we have done in what we have done here is, we have met with dot early on. Uh we went over all the projects and all the schedules and we use a lot of the information that we get from the sponsors when it comes to the project updates and the Project status based on that information.

Uh DOT and CDTC came up with uh-proposed changes. Uh we sent all those proposed changes to The sponsors by email, all the sponsors returned uh responded back and returned their um their opinions and their thoughts on those changes. In addition, after those changes were reviewed and analyzed DOT again and CDTC came up with a table. You see in your package where you see approximately 30 different local projects are being changed or changed or pushed further out into the construction. Of those projects are being pushed further out uh two projects in that list are not being changed at all. Therefore, a lot of input from all the sponsors a lot of coordination between CDTC and DOT resulted in that table. Um we have again we are confident that these you know these changes are doable. Um I would leave it open to Bob or Greg to make any other comments about it.

>>Bob Rice: you know again like our previous discussion it does not reflect the commitment To the project you know as Maria has said on previous calls you know we're pretty heavy in the one

year and for the purposes of balancing the fun sources in the years this sort of table made sense but at the same time if there's a sponsor that has the ability to bring something forward we'll have that discussion as well i just like i said and we just needed the balance by fund sourcing year

>>Mike Franchini: so I think that is it Steve unless there are questions from the committee we'd like We would like their approval on these on these changes

>>Steve lachetta: very good thank you all are there any questions or discussion on the step performance update and this is a voting item as Michael indicated

>>Bradley Birge: so uh I would like to move it if we're ready

>>Steve lachetta: Bradley Birge all right brad you are doing well

>>Steve Feeney: uh second bye I will second it Steve

>>Steve lachetta: hey Steve Feeney oh great Steve thank you very much all in favor please say Aye all right

Very good any abstained or opposed go once twice hearing none consensus carries. That's item six Item seven is the dot performance measure with target approvals it was also an advanced enclosure and Michael opened it and dot will further clarify for item seven performance measures go ahead Michael

>>Mike Franchini: sure just to give again just to give some historical perspective uh you know since map 21 the federal surface transportation bill and then and further endorsed in the fast act there have been Federal performance measures and federal performance targets that have been required of all the mpos. In addition, all the state DOTs I think this is the third time that we have approved safety performance targets. I do not know there is in your package the same format with the blue headings that show the progress that we have made as a state and dot's proposals are to continue making that progress. Um so that's about all I have DOT do you have any comments on these targets

>>Bob Rice: yeah my I mean our main office colleagues generate these. In addition, you know Certainly looking for a trend in the number of fatalities in a reduction in the number of Fatalities. In addition, with the requirement to have state standards and goals out there I think it was done. So we collectively that all the mpos in the state could have you know a singular set of goals rather than having to do it individually. I cannot say I completely understand the methodology behind the numbers how they are derived but you know certainly the intent is you know to reduce the number of fatalities and continue that trend.

>>Steve lachetta: thank you Bob. Um so we see as a planner's overview a lot of negative single digit numbers uh as both uh forecast modeling five years moving average trend lines uh negative uh between four and eight percent. The rounded cap to be applied is around negative two percent from bringing it right and uh so we can see that data uh there was prior committee discussion on this. As to how it is casting our mpo versus other mpos, Michael is there any anything from your view of the mpo association. How do we fare and compare on a comparative basis uh with the other regions

>>Mike Franchini: well compared to other regions I mean, I think we compare pretty well to other similar regions like Rochester, Syracuse, and Buffalo. New York City being unusual. Uh it is not like most of us in this in the state so we do not compare well to New York City. Sandy I see you are on the line do you have any comments about that yeah.

>>Sandy Misiewicz: um in as part of the New Visions update we did calculate. Um based off the most recently available data, which goes through, was complete through 2018. The federal law actually requires that the ficality data be based off the federal database called Fars. So that is the last year of complete data in Fars on our fatality measures we are doing um we are on par with what the state is on. Our injury we are not faring as well as the state so we do have more work to do in our region.

>>Steve lachetta: good information any questions from the committee uh this is a voting item so we will uh Steve yep go ahead I am just

>>Chris Wallin: real quick I don't know if we're not going to know this for two years if we're looking at 2018 data but you know the region's been essentially on pause right since March. Therefore, I have to imagine that

Vehicle miles and everything is down. I mean are we anticipating, or is anyone anticipating that we are going to see uh an anomaly and a large dip.

>>Sandy Misiewicz: this is Sandy. I have been pulling crash data for this year already there is absolutely a noticeable decrease statewide in our region. In overall uh crashes um interestingly fatalities have stayed largely the same, um injuries have gone down property damage only have gone significantly down. Um so, how it plays out and filters out over the course of the year will be monitoring um in terms of the methodology that the department used to create these 2021 targets. They did not consider covid so keep that in mind.

I think it'll be very interesting to see nationally how this all plays out over time, um it creates a little bit of a tricky situation uh because it may make us look you know I hate to say a little artificially better um because of the Covid crisis. However, we will have to wait and see.

>>Mike Franchini: the other issue yeah the other issue was that uh you know as the as a result of the covid we did see a decrease in vmt but we also did see some speed increases on our highways Because there were fewer cars on the road so, the speeds went up and then that might be the reason why we are seeing more fatalities or the same amount of fatalities because speeds did go up pretty Much you know statewide.

>>Sandy Misiewicz: and just very quick related to that point. Um we pulled ticket data um from all of the police agencies for the first six months of this year. Um and for their own safety obviously police were not ticketing uh significantly at all in the months later March and into April. Um they are back on the road now but Mike's absolutely right without that enforcement component there was a perception that I could do Whatever I wanted on the roadway. In addition, you know we saw a lot of uptick in speeding

>>Steve lachetta: excellent point's thank you sandy Michael Greg and all are we ready to vote uh endorsement of the proposed performance five-year measures um any further discussion i may have a motion to adopt

>>Chris Wallin: motion

>>Steve lachetta: who is that?

>>Chris Wallin: Chris

>>Steve lachetta: oh thank you Chris and second bye

>>Steve Feeney: I will second it Steve

>>Steve lachetta: Oh, thank you Steve. Second, all in favor please say aye raise your hand. Any abstained or opposed going once going twice hearing none uh consensus carries up to agenda item eight is the draft public participation plan update and approval to release the final draft tip to the public when the enclosure went out this is Michael and Jens Ceponis Michael

>>Mike Franchini: short introduction, uh you know this is we have always had a public participation plan. I think the covid uh pandemic has really caused us to look at our plan in a different light and to improve it in many ways. Uh we really spent the effort Jen and staff has done a great job on this plan. I think it would uh compare favorably with any plan uh in the state. Uh we really did a great job of getting virtual

participation. Therefore, with that Jen has a short presentation because we do need approval for this plan and it will be it will go to the policy board in December, thank you Jen

>>Jen Ceponis: thanks Mike. Um so, as Mike said you know we in coordination with the New Visions plan updated our public participation plan um what is in it. Therefore, you can find the draft on our website and there was a summary that went out in the mailing. there's in the plan we talk about the purpose of our public participation plan what our strategy is there's a toolkit that's mostly for staff but if communities are interested in using it that would be that's great. It talks about our continuous participation opportunities and how we are constantly interfacing and communicating with the public. Then it outlines major CDC products and our public participation roles for each of them and suggests recommends a way for us to continually assess our public participation and our reach in the public. Therefore, we want to create a seamless and integrated process of communicating with the public on transportation planning initiatives and providing continuous opportunities for the public to provide feedback. Therefore, this is not just when we are doing a region-wide study, project, or plan but being able to communicate with the public regularly on all the different initiatives, issues, and policies that are important to us.

Here in the region our goal is to establish a thorough inclusive process that uses creative approaches to offer the public continuous opportunities to shape the region's transportation system. We are going to measure our progress both quantitatively you know how many events we have press release releases meetings but also by quality. In addition, often you know asking the public how we are doing checking in making sure that they feel that we are accessible that our platforms and the information we release are user-friendly and that we are reaching people. We are also proposing that we develop and strategize public participation through an equity lens uh to improve planning decision making and resource allocation. So not just having equity is like a step in the process but really looking at everything through equity and how we can do a better job.

So scanning for ega populations and introducing questions while we are developing a scope for a project or plan the public participation part that you know that helps us identify what the equity issues and develop better strategies focused on that. So the notable changes from the 2015 um plan update again is we prioritize equity in the development of scope and not as a separate required assessment.

They're very defined goals and the public participation toolkit is a notable addition the toolkit has 20 different participation ideas both virtual and non-virtual methods and given the importance and rise of virtual public involvement over the last few months it really talks about you know it provides guidance for integrating virtual public involvement into all outreach um processes but then also how to do standalone virtual public involvement methods like online surveys and stuff and then of course partner opportunities who are the stakeholders and partners in our in the region that we can work with that can help us reach more people so next steps we're asking the planning committee to approve the draft so we can to be released to the public December policy board meeting will be asking them to approve um a draft and then the public comment period uh is 45 days would end in January and we present the final plan for adoption in February and then to Policy Board in March

>>Steve lachetta: okay thank you Jen thank you Michael good plan and uh rolling with the daily and continuous challenges of global pandemic is quite unique but i think we're faring uh as best as can be expected good faith efforts all around kudos to every all the staff um so this is a voting item motion to adopt the participation plan as proposed

>>Bradley Birge: promotion motion to adopt by Bradley Birge

>>Steve lachetta: thank you brad second bye

>>Sean Maguire: so move Sean Maguire

>>Steve lachetta: Thank you Sean all in favor please say aye raises your hand

Aye

>>Steve lachetta: nice chorus any abstention or opposition hearing none go once going twice the Adoption is carried forward good consensus thank you everyone moving forward to the regional trail Feasibility study award approval and there's funding on this item nine honor agenda In addition, we are ready for a presentation by Michael and with Jen supporter's thank you

>>Mike Franchini: okay just quickly um in our last tip up I'm sorry in last upwp update we included this task it's the first time that we asked uh sponsors for applications for trail feasibility studies and the idea was to try to implement some of the recommendations in the trail plan the new trail plan that we developed about a year ago and the applications I just want i mean general go over in more detail but I just want to say that all the applications were extremely strong applications and we really appreciate everybody's efforts in in their submitting these applications all the projects were good and if you look at the handout in the package you see how close the scores were this was not an easy decision so that said Jen would you know go and look go into a little more specifics please

>>Jen Ceponis: okay so we received five uh proposals in total requesting over three hundred and Fifteen thousand dollars and like mike said they were all high quality very competitive proposals as you can see in the handout we included the score and the details for each proposal um the evaluation committee which consisted of DOT CDRPC and staff from the empire state trail evaluated all the projects and submitted comments and based on our evaluation and discussion we are recommending the Patroon Greenway study for funding because of its uh regional impact and the value of the project um and um it's you know one of the larger trail proposals from the capital district trails plan so we are suggesting uh moving forward with that point with that project

>>Steve lachetta: thank you Jen uh any discussion before you vote on this item it was very competitive yes

>>Mike Valentine: Steve i have some uh discussion points to make prior to the vote and then after the vote I'd like to make a general comment uh regarding linkage and feasibility but um in what my discussion points are i want to make it clear uh Saratoga county was one of the five my comments are not looking to say hey there was anything that uh for some reason Saratoga county's the judgment of their project was unfair or anything like that or that their sour grapes there i want to make an observation and process alone for the record um and there was a September 9th meeting of the planning forum committee group In addition, with that coming up part of the thing that was noted for their meeting was going to be highlights of current planning related solicitations.

Which at that point September 9th meeting i would assume the trail feasibility would have been one of them so on September 3rd I made an inquiry as to um would that planters form or something would there be a recommendation coming out of that group to the planning committee so September 3rd I got a response back that they were going to be just highlights of current planning related solicitations so September 3rd coming up to that September 9th meeting talk about those planning solicitations so status update on the ninth however there was a recommendation to be made to the planning committee they stated at this at this meeting.

So there would have been a recommendation to the planning committee on October 7th but on September 3rd we received a letter stating that the selection had already been made who was awarded and who was not awarded so that selection was made prior to the planners forum meeting when there was going to be highlights made of all of the project solicitations there was a decision made as of September third and notified to us that a decision had been had been made my question at that point was who made the decision who was authorized to make the decision when was the decision made and that never came to the planning committee for its approval so we are acting on something today on the agenda that has already been approved and authorized so the planning committee has become a rubber stamp body.

Um and I'm just looking at this and saying my thing is who made the decision when was it made How was it made and how was it made and approved without the planning committee's involvement?

>>Steve lachetta: all right thanks for your comments Michael valentine Mike Franchini should advise me on the scoring process we do always rely on expertise of technical and professional staff
As you see the five competing proposals were very competitive within a point of each other on the Top three and two points for the top all top contenders so um Michael cans you advise and respond to Mike Valentine's

>>Mike Franchini: sure uh you know this is the first time we've we did the feasibility the trail feasibility study proposal and we tried to follow the same process that we would do with a linkage study the letters that went out were probably misleading we should not have said that they were awarded we should have said that they were uh recommend the evaluation of the committee was that the city of Albany Patroon Creek trail was would be would be recommended so uh I agree that the letters were misleading We should not have said that uh in the end uh the evaluation stands and we do need the committee's approval uh just as if we would with any other linkage studies

>>Mike Valentine: so can I ask, whose recommendation was made when the meeting was until September 9th and the letter was September 3rd

>>Mike Franchini: the recommendation is the value was the evaluation committees made it By the evaluation committee that met and went over the applications uh and had a zoom meeting and decided on recommending that

>> Mike Valentine: when was that project when was that meeting

>>Mike Franchini: I would have to look back in the record

>>Mike Valentine: if you would

>>Mike Franchini: I do not know exactly when that meeting was

>>Mike Valentine: I would appreciate that information and tie the dates into this record of it yeah

>>Mike Franchini: we don't normally bring it bring linkage study recommendations to the uh community forum we talk about it with community forum but we don't ask them to vote on it the community forum the community forum like the other advisory committees are advisory committees they are not regulatory they do not approve projects they never have

>>Mike Valentine: but there was a there was a recommendation made by somebody some group or something even prior to the planners forum meeting

>>Sandy Misiewicz: Mike could I could I just clarify um since I run please sandy go ahead

>>Jen Ceponis: i think Sandy's internet or something cut out

>>Sandy Misiewicz: I am sorry

>>Jen Ceponis: I think your internet cut out

>>Steve lachetta: Sandy you are recognized please elucidates us on the evaluation committee process. Thank you

>>Sandy Misiewicz: okay thank you um the planner forum uh simply uh runs through each solicitation just gives a status update it is not did not make a decision and the status, as I knew it at that time was That a recommendation was being made and would be brought to the planning committee for approval in October

>>Jen Ceponis: right I think the evaluation i think the committee you're referring to is the evaluation committee which was assembled um by CDTC and consisted of DOT CDRPC and empire state trail staff and that committee had met at the end of august and was making um recommendations

>>Mike Valentine: That date is who I was looking for and the date so you are saying there was A decision made by that group in august which led to the September 3rd letter is that correct Jen

>>Jen Ceponis: um I think that is what you are referring to yes

>>Mike Valentine: okay so I hope it's evident what I'm saying is I think there's a I'll go to the word there's a miscarriage of process all right Mike that's my point here there was competition among five projects I understand that okay I think this was carried out improperly and I just want to make that clear that that has been in all the emails and phone calls back and forth between you and us that's the point

>>Mike Franchini: yeah Mike I guess we strongly disagree with what you just said uh the evaluation committee is made up of representatives from regional agencies they look at these projects just like they have in the past and they come up with their recommendations um we're abiding by the evaluation committee's recommendations and we're bringing it to the planning committee

>>Mike Valentine: what I'm saying is there was a decision made prior to this board this committee sitting here today and that decision was made and five sponsor projects they were notified that they either were going to be awarded or they were not decision made September third letter and we're meeting today and we've told the process was that the decision determination would be made at an October 7th meeting but the awarded project had been already been notified they were four others were told they were not

>>Mike Franchini: and as I said the letter was misleading it should not have said that it was recommended it should not say that it was awarded it should have said that it was recommended by the evaluation committee that's the only thing that i mean the wording was incorrect in the letter we did not we did not award anything the planning committee awards and the policy committee awards

>>Mike Valentine: there is no greatness to that I am sorry to inform you that your proposal was not selected first funding by a committee that included whatever some committee already made that selection Not the planning committee of CDTC

>>Mike Franchini: no they made a recommendation they didn't make an approval they can't evaluation committees never make uh approval they make a recommendation

>>Mike Valentine: I understand it that is my major problem with the process

>>Liz Kormos: can I make a comment i think do you inform the candidates before the planning committee Approves yes the letter is I would think you would wait until after it's received full approval by whatever you know body has to approve before you would inform candidates just thinking of other types of grants and stuff they usually do not inform based on recommendations just as a pole just as a process you know comment

>>Steve lachetta: acknowledged and well uh protocol and procedures are very important and this committee is the approving body] for these programs and projects um any other comments before we vote on the recommendation of the dot empire state trail staff ncetc staff recommendation to award as noted um seventy five thousand plus a twenty five thousand local cash match completion within twelve months so it's a hundred thousand dollar consultants uh project any other questions uh any other notes It is noted that um uh you know staff will endeavor to improve upon communications to assure accuracy and communications always that is good faith efforts uh by all recognized any other comments Um let me ask a question what is the opportunity for the four projects the next solicitation for similar trail projects will be in 21 or 22. What are the upcoming opportunities to advance the other four projects? Any others

>>Mike Franchini: the next selection for this task would be uh toward the end of 21 because these are two year projects so for this particular task it would be about a year and a half from now these projects have the opportunity to compete for linkage studies which is our next item on the agenda the trail projects are part of are also linkage studies so all of these projects could reapply for linkage studies

>>Mike Valentine: do you do you mind if I throw another comment, in which I was going to after the vote but part of this Mike Steve

>>Steve lachetta: it is breaking up Michael mike valentine can you repeat your question

>>Mike Valentine: um I just wanted to throw another after the vote let me throw another comment in regarding linkage and feasibility like

>>Steve lachetta: I am not hearing your comment mike valentine can you repeat your comment please

>>Mike Valentine: I will hold off till after the vote Steve

>>Steve lachetta: all right okay thank you um all right in the interest of good order uh may have a motion to adopt the recommendation evaluation committee for Patroon Creek Greenway as presented agenda item nine is there a motion

>>Steve Feeney: I will move it Steve Feeney

>>Steve lachetta: Steve fine thank you and second bye

>>Chris Wallin: Schenectady seconds it

>>Steve lachetta: thank you Chris grateful uh all in favor please say aye and raise your hand Abstaining and opposed

Abstain staying

>>Steve lachetta: that was Mike Valentine and who else

>>Andrew Kreshik: Andrew Troy

>>Steve lachetta: thank you uh noted for the minutes uh Carrie Ward taking our minutes thank you very much just making sure recording it is uh a rare event to not carry full consensus but the abstentions are noted by Saratoga and troy uh are we ready to we did we did vote so that is recorded next is the linkage planning program for 2021 and 2022 small but important consultant projects always and this will be an overview by Michael's intro and sandy Misiewicz take it away mike

>>Mike Franchini: Steve I think Mike Valentine wanted to make a comment after the vote all right so mike You still want to make that comment

>>Mike Valentine: if you don't mind that and I think it was noted before that this was the Mike you had mentioned this is the first time that feasibility studies were being proposed with funding uh like this and I know we've had discussions as a committee before um about the difference between rural versus urban small versus larger towns municipality and I'm wondering as we look at feasibility studies in the future and end possibility of linkage studies uh with Linkage studies we looked last time in the awarding about new municipalities coming in and we pulled some villages which we've tried to before but we've had some villages awarded um in this the look with the feasibility study there was a predominance in the numbers of urban type projects and I'm wondering as we and I don't need an answer now I'm not I'm not looking for that I'm throwing out the possibility of discussion about two funding sources there are two ways of looking at both linkage and feasibility studies.

Dividing them into urban linkage urban feasibility studies versus suburban rural the criteria that are involved in judging both projects by whatever committee is reviewing them there are different criteria and there are also different outlooks as far as what would be a value to overall the CDTC and overall to the participating municipalities particularly a lot of emphasis and stuff like that comes up with the urban areas or the cities as opposed to some of the say rural urban rural suburban communities I just throw it out as a possibility of looking at a different approach as we go into uh the next solicitation of linkage and Then a future solicitation for feasibility studies and I just I do not want to take time off discussion now leave it for something for consideration later all right

>>Steve lachetta: all right thank you Michael uh good food for thought there um as your chair I would be open to further consideration um suburban could go either with urban or rural is a larger land area obviously we could do it based on the regional planning commission data or other options but with that I think we can move forward is that right everyone comfortable moving forward to item 10 is the two-year 21-22 linkage program solicitation are we ready Michael

>>Mike Franchini: I think so

>>Steve lachetta: very good take it away

>>Mike Franchini: okay uh just brief introduction uh every year we do solicit for uh linkage studies um one concern that we've had this year i mean I'll pass this off to sandy our program manager but one concern we did have this year with some of our solicitations was the ability of sponsors to participate Um some of our solicitations earlier this year some of the studies we received fewer applications and we changed the application process to a rolling uh deadline instead of just a deadline and on from there so with the pandemic we all know that members are being stressed out their budgets their resources are all being stretched. So you know with that in mind we're trying to we are trying to make it as easy as easy as possible for our members to participate and that I will say I will stop and hand it over to sandy please

>>Sandy Misiewicz: thanks Mike um for the 2021 solicitation for the linkage program uh we did adjust The match requirements you know we are encouraging and certainly making it known that we would prefer that the 25 match be provided in cash however if a community cannot achieve that in cash we are allowing the sponsor to provide up to um 15 of that 25 as in kind service support provided but we were hopeful that this might alleviate some concerns on the part of local governments in terms of being able To access these resources in 2021 knowing that there could be some big fiscal crunches At the local government level along with that change, we have updated our documents our solicitation To reflect the New Visions 2050 plan it did not really alter the overall eligibility criteria we did remove Because now that we have a joint technical assistance program with CDRPC we did eliminate the technical assistance option.

We used to have a technical and only technical assistance non-consultant folks will be referred to the technical assistance program if they are looking for something very small scale like that We also updated the evaluation criteria to more strongly reflect based on the demographics of your particular study area how a sponsor plans to engage what we're calling disadvantaged populations which could be anything from minority groups low-income groups to senior citizens to folks with disabilities um again dependent on the demographics of your study area but the point being is how are you going to get these folks to be part of the planning process and ask you to provide some information on that.

Excuse me um we still plan on funding up to three projects for next year at the same budget levels, we have had the last few years so 175 000 in federal funds is available for consultant um the final thing I would say is you know remembering the spirit of this program is the connection between land use and transportation proposals that hit those points the strongest are going to be selected first so I just want to make sure that folks understand uh the spirit of the program that doesn't mean that other types of projects are not eligible they certainly are but we want to make sure that that connection is being made through this particular program, which is the underlying spirit of the linkage program I think those are the highlights Mike if there is any other questions I would be happy to answer them

>>Mike Franchini: one other quick comment uh opening up the local share to in-kind contributions uh it does add a little bit of a risk to CDTC and our finances it's really critical that if you if you as a sponsor uh propose the use of in-kind resources that you are able to document those in-kind resources and the estimates of those resources should be reasonable um you know I mean it's not easy to estimate how much time and effort you're going to spend on study but as best as possible those estimates have to be reasonable so just keep that in mind if you are proposing in-kind uh local share thank you.

>>Sandy Misiewicz: and one final point um we are still going to keep a deadline for this first we'll call it first round of December 16th uh which is a Wednesday um with the idea being let's see what the interest is if we don't get a number of applications then we will consider shifting to a rolling so i just wanted to make that point as well

>>Steve lachetta: thank you for your excellent staff leadership on the linkage program and other work sandy and mike this is a voting item as proposed for release of the solicitation outlined in our advanced agenda with all the electronic website and other uh options available for seeking assistance call sandy or the CDTC linkage at cdcmpo.org site focusing on this program so motion to adopt the linkage Solicitation

>>Mike Valentine: motion

>>Steve lachetta: Do not move who is that

>>Mike Valentine: Mike

>>Steve lachetta: thank you Mike and uh second bye

>>Liz Kormos: second

>>Steve lachetta: thank you Liz uh well in favor please say aye

Aye

>>Steve lachetta: any abstaining or opposed hearing none going it is going twice item 10 is hereby adopted then we move into uh discussion items thank you for your support and consensus uh item 11 is the CDTC project delivery update um is that Jacob

>>Jacob Beeman: yep thanks Steve thank you um so I do not have a project presentation this month um so I kind of just wanted to take this opportunity to kind of reinforce the importance of the updates uh that we get from everyone um because you know I have seen kind of a delay in in getting the updates on the monthly requests and I suspect it has something to do with kind of Covid and the shifting of resources and limited staff time and I do understand that so you know if you do get an update request from me And you know it's uh the timing is tough or there's not a lot of staff resource feel free to let me know and you know get it to me when you can I do ask for it within a month but um we're certainly flexible um you know we use these updates to kind of just overall keep an idea of the progression of the tip um we do use it um you know at the end of the federal fiscal year for the STIP performance stuff just to kind of keep uh-general tabs on that.

We also use the information kind of on day-to-day tasks in the office and some of our individual programs one of those I guess for instance would be our complete streets programs we like to go out and document completed infrastructure in the region so we can highlight that whether it's in our newsletter or in some of our internal advisory committee meetings so we really do use this information on kind of a variety of fronts and appreciate all the information that U.S sponsors and consultants give us as well so kind of with that again feel free to give me the updates when you can and if there's any issues let me know and we can work something out uh this month I'm going to be reaching out to Saratoga county uh city of Saratoga springs and the village of green island for updates on your individual projects

uh so keep an eye out for those emails and again for anyone else on the call whether you're a project sponsor consultant we always post our project tracking worksheet on the planning committee materials so each month feel free to take a look at that it's by no means a complete and up-to-date list of project updates so you know any information that that you feel you can provide us feel free to reach out to me and send me those updates I know I get some random updates coming in from sponsors and consultants as well so I really appreciate that that's all I have on the project
Delivery Steve

>>Steve lachetta: thank you very much Jacob excellent planner's tool for us any questions for Jacob that's item 11 next up is the dot project delivery with Greg Wichser and Bob Rice Greg were you going to lead us on your overview of project delivery

>>Greg Wichser: I was I do have something to share if it is possible to do that if not i can email it around everybody and somewhat just talk through what i have

>>Steve lachetta: okay um staff do you have the ability to

>>Jen Ceponis: yeah I just made Greg the host got you

>>Greg Wichser: cool all right perfect thanks Jen um that one here we go so uh yeah here's our current letting program for the state fiscal year we're in a lot of things have already been let um you know I-90 over fuller is in construction and going to get a some work done this fall to because I-90 over fallers in rough shape so to get that through the winter we're getting some work done now um route two over the posts and kills is to be let in a couple weeks uh north way we continue marching up the north way with another preservation project coming in December going to get after our interstate overhead sign structures that are pretty dated a lot of that work's going to start really in the box you know 787 90 87 and then our Carmen road project had a pretty good public outreach uh in the virtual world and that's headed to design approval and construction this winter so that's the DOT projects of note in the Area uh any questions

>>Steve lachetta: thank you very much Greg good update as always very important Northway's looking great we're all uh getting excited about the peak of the foliage and the traffic is uh definitely increasing we are watching that closely and uh very excellent um maintenance of the wear horses out there um any other comments for d.o.t on item 12. Item 13 is next uh CDTC planning activities and each of the staff in a half dozen oh seven areas will give us a brief uh maybe two or three minute Update on their uh area of leadership Michael you want to open this up item 13.

>>Mike Franchini: yes thank you Steve uh you know just in an effort to keep the committee is as informed as possible as to what staff is doing and where the status all these projects are I ask staff to give a very short summary verbally before that happens I just want to mention that two weeks ago we did receive the results of our certification our federal certification review from the FHWA and FTA we passed with flying colors we received seven commendations we received uh 12 recommendations and no corrective actions so that's all good news and we appreciate all the participation and input that we receive from committee members and our chairs of our both the planning committee and policy board so that's good news and with that uh the first project we're updating is the Albany bicycle pedestrian master plan I think Carrie's up

>>Carrie Ward: thank you um so the this project is updating the 2009 um bicycle plan that the city already had and it's also creating a new pedestrian plan right now the team is working on the draft but i did want to note that all of the public participation for the project was scheduled after march so the meetings we switched to the online meetings those were well attended but they were not evenly well attended among all of the neighborhoods in the city so what we did to try to ameliorate that um was that we used the two demonstration projects that were already planned in the um as part of the project to collect general input in addition to specific input about the whatever the demonstration was and we also worked with catholic Charities to talk to people who were waiting in line for food distribution we were able to talk to over 100 people doing that and we called people on the phone who live in common council awards that.

Were underrepresented in the online meetings to try to conduct the survey that we had put together over the phone with them that's all I have my

>>Steve lachetta: thank you Carrie excellent overview on the bike and pad 13b is the Boston spa pedestrian bicycle master plan and Jacob will give us a quick overview

>>Jacob Beeman: thanks Steve yep so villager Boston spa pedestrian and bicycle master plan just getting started on this project and we're setting out to uh implement a as the project indicates bike and pad master plan for the village and develop some recommendations uh for new bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and also some connections uh potential connections to the zim smith trail so we started uh coordination with the village back in May after the mou was signed I've developed a project scoped in REI And released that for uh consultant advertisement in august we received eight consultant submittals For the project which are currently under review and we have a meeting uh this Friday with The review team uh to hopefully finalize uh the consultant for the project and move forward from there

>>Steve lachetta: that's all I've got thank you Jacob any questions on the Boston spa pet and bicycle master plan improvements coming um grateful for that uh 13 Charlie is who's a hillside study with Rima are you ready

>>Rima Shamieh: yeah all right so the who is killside study is very near completion um started last Year uh took a little hiatus in the spring due to Covid um we were supposed to be doing our final public engagement um in the summer and so hit pause just to see how things were going to shake out and when it looked like we weren't going to be able to do something in pro in person we pivoted to do a virtual pre-recorded presentation and um really sort of blanketed the neighborhood area To really get the word out so that people knew that they could turn to their computers and their phones to Do an engagement so we actually had good engagement for the final public engagement piece something like 66 surveys submitted and dozens of comments in response to the presentation on the recommendations for the project.

The project really focuses on the neighborhoods on either side of lower husk and looking at ways to better connect those neighborhoods that have been sort of a little bit disjointed for a couple of decades and looking at sort of street improvement ways and connections for mostly for bike and ped on other side so that project is going to be wrapped up by the end of this month

>>Steve lachetta: thank you remember any questions for Rima the who's a killside study next up sandy Misiewicz on the CDTC regional planet commission technical assistance program funding good sandy are you ready

>>Sandy Misiewicz: I am thanks Steve um so CDTC and CDRPC are currently partnering on four technical assistance projects uh the first one is in the town of Glenville uh which is a comprehensive plan and zoning code analysis so essentially the town passed a comprehensive plan adopted a comprehensive plan um and CDRPC and CDTC have been evaluating it in relation to the route 50 you know the potential for integrating new um transportation and green infrastructure um regulations for the town uh code review committee presentation of recommendations is slated for mid-October or November much of the work has been completed already and the final report uh is currently being drafted on that one uh the second one is in the town of Westerlo.

It is a comprehensive plan essentially the town is somewhat just starting and initiating a comprehensive Planning process so they asked for some help in terms of how to pursue that so to date uh CDRPC has completed a survey analysis summary report and provided mapping uh there is an existing conditions report um and all of that material has been delivered to the uh the towns conference of plan committee for review and approval the next one is in the town of east Greenbush um on Gilligan road um Gilligan road is a town-owned road in which one of the schools is present they're looking to install a multi-use path or other bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure our staff has provided an existing conditions assessment of the study area and is trying to develop with a talent consultant um a more detailed plan for how to um install um the multimodal facilities in that very narrow corridor

Um-complete streets recommendations are being made uh the target date for the deliverables from CDTC and CDRPC is December and the final project that's currently in motion is um in the town of Clinton park you may recall it the town of 15 20 years ago now which attempted to preserve open space in the western part of town while also managing traffic and other and other conditions in the western part of town that plan needed to be updated and in our assistance from CDTC and cd-rpc is including a data inventory and analysis which has been completed CDRPC has updated the town's community fact sheets provided an analysis of housing and population changes

Um and we're working with them to sort of develop a public process and provide and all of that is in process right now so those are the four that have been funded. The technical assistance program is still accepting applications for funding so if you are interested um please visit our website where the application material lives and you can reach out to myself or Mark Castiglione from CDRPC if you have questions or you would like to propose a project and that is all I have

>>Steve lachetta: excellent thank you Sandy any questions on the ever important tap technical assistance a great new initiative been in place with a couple years now one and a half for two years uh next up is 13 echo local bridge study by Andrew

>>Andrew Tracy: Yes, good morning everybody thank you uh the local bridge preservation study update is getting underway the purpose of the study is to fully update the prior 2015 study of the same purpose uh the study developed treatment recommendations and cost estimates for uh maintenance and preservation treatments on all 371 locally owned bridges in the CDTC planning area the consultant selection process is wrapping up we reconvened the local bridge project steering committee from the prior study which was comprised of engineers from four counties from cities of Albany and Schenectady and staff from DOT as well.

We received four proposals and the top-ranked firm was CDM Smith which was the consultant for that prior 2015 study the committee spoke very highly of their work so they produced uh you know good deliverables uh and selected them to do the study update so the contract are being executed. In addition, I am going to be working with cdm smith and with all the local bridge stakeholders to arrange uh for a kickoff meeting soon probably October so if you are a local bridge stakeholder and you would like to participate in the study and be present at the kickoff please reach out to me and we will we hope to schedule the kickoff as I said sometime in October so that's all from me thank you

>>Steve lachetta: thank you Andrew very important area I believe all members are bridge owners right Thank you very much all right, any questions next item is uh f foxtrot trail feasibility study with Jen Ceponis go-ahead Jen hello

>>Mike Franchini: Steve uh we would like to pass on that one since we have had a long discussion on it already so

>>Steve lachetta: oh that is right Michael thank you all right uh last is item golf uh New York um New York seven freight and land use study with Chris

>>Mike Franchini: uh I am taking the place of Chris Bauer today he had to attend a meeting with rpi Uh regarding a study award that they were uh that they're working on now so very quickly the uh The New York seven freight and land use study is just that it concentrates in the area of the state route 7 and through an exit 25a and it deals with things such as truck parking land use conflicts and truck circulation the request for expressions of interest were you know was developed by CDTC along with the town of Rotterdam in the town of Princetown the REI is now being reviewed by dot new york uh state freeway authority in sync city county for their for their input and uh once the REI is finalized we will advertise with the you know for the consultant we're also assembling the study advisory committee

and we would just like to encourage any potential stakeholders who want to be on the study advisory committee to contact Chris Bauer and encourage people to you know encourage members to take a look at the project and be and participate in the project as much as possible so that's it on the freight study

>>Steve lachetta: yeah thank you Michael okay there that wraps up the CDTC report next item 14 on our agenda is the member status of planning activities first up is regional planning commission is that Todd are you ready

>>Mark Castiglione: do it this week Steve okay thank you Mr. chair so a couple updates from CDRPC Our fall webinar series uh is active uh we're offering a slate of um 11 sessions over the course of the Rest of the remainder of the fall into the early part of the winter that will help planning and zoning board Members fulfill their obligations to receive training each year so please spread the good news about that That webinar series more information at cdrbc.org we are anticipating um uh beginning the second iteration of our clean energy communities program led by Todd Fabozzi and our clean energy team.

And we are anticipating um hopefully soon an announcement from NYSERDA about new resources and grants available to communities to invest in green infrastructure technologies. Including eV charging and other clean energy technologies that could benefit local governments just as a reminder our capital region indicators website is still live and we are uh is undergoing improvements so please use that as your desk reference for census data and ACS data as you need it. Throughout the day features nearly 40 data points for each county city town and village in the capital district and in the greater capital district area as defined by the regional economic development council region uh I have that update from CDRPC thanks again for the partnership

>>Steve lachetta: excellent thank you Mark uh sorry I didn't recognize you first uh yeah nice certain has a great initiative there um any questions on regional planning i might ask a question any update on our U.S census for uh for the members in our region mark anything promoted

>>Mark Castiglione: it changes every day I heard there was another case in court today about stopping the count so you know you can just add that to the list

>>Steve lachetta: thank you very much any other questions or comments regional planning key area next up b is uh CDTA is it ross or anyone else ross are you there you may have lost ross anyone else from CDTA for a brief planning update go once going twice we'll move forward next come back on How is it going?

>>Ross Farrell: it's going well uh service uh for the river brt will start on November 8th uh so you're and if you're in a municipality while we're operating um it will you'll see the stations are up the final ones are being put into place our troy garage has been expanded to accommodate the additional vehicles um but yes service will begin on November 8th that's great

>>Steve lachetta: let's see how's ridership doing

>>Ross Farrell: well were uh we restarted our fare box uh once we were able to put up uh barriers for our drivers uh we reopened our front door and uh added the fare box so uh obviously once you Start charging for transit service ridership goes down um so we were down uh i think now roughly about uh 30 percent

>>Steve lachetta: better than airports any questions for us on the regional transit next up is DOT is it Bob or Greg

>>Bob Rice: yeah Steve just a few things we have entered we've officially entered federal fiscal year 2021 we're seeing authorizations and money start to move uh if you've seen the news the fast act was Extended the legislation through next September that said the obligation authority the money component of it the government was funded through this December so we will see where that discussion goes uh DOT continues to be actively involved in Covid response primarily transporting equipment

materials around the state the 25 working in the office continues uh the telecommuting working from home was extended with the unions to at least the first of the year.

The Troy Menands bridge the route 378-pell study based upon the proposals and the comments received we're looking to rework the scope of that and the contract type and we'll re-advertise that at some point in the near future of interest the Albany skyway the bids were opened a couple weeks ago and they were substantially over the estimate so we're working over reviewing our options and uh seeing how to go forward with that so that's all i have this morning without any questions that's my report Steve

>>Steve lachetta: excellent thank you bob good overview any questions for DOT

>>Joe Camino: Steve this is Joe Camino is it okay I am obviously not a member of the committee but just had a couple questions if that is all right

>>Steve lachetta: uh pleasure the committee i think its fine go ahead

>>Joe Camino: keep briefing bob um talking to others uh NPOs and regents and so forth um what is your take on uh marchiselli and bridge New York if you know anything at this point for next year

>>Bob Rice: yeah Joe I mean nothing it would be nothing but speculation you know at this point

>> Joe Camino: okay but none of them are none of them are moving forward at this point it's a matter of if they do or not is the question right a lot of them have been um acted on yet at the state level

>>Bob Rice: well you've got a couple different things and Marchellies different than the bridge New York program I mean the commitment is there still to the current bridge New York candidates and progressing those projects. You know the marcheselli is an annual budget item and you know that that has more I think sort of unknown still at this point

>>Joe okay thank you appreciate it

>>Steve lachetta: great good

>>Andrew Kreshik: hey Bob if I could just ask a quick one you were mentioning on the 378 bridge study a scoping change on that what uh is the highlight of the of the change

>>Bob Rice: I mean uh frankly I think we need to tighten up the scope a little bit Where the study the pell study really should be looking at the fundamental environmental hot spots and concerns for the corridor and then you know some high level modeling analysis and in terms of volume and capacity for Different alignments uh I think the way that it was put out before and the contracting mechanism looking For a bid, it left itself a bit open on how many hours for public engagement how many intersections we would be asking the consultant to analyze it. And then the comments we receive that resulting looking for a bid for something like that made them be conservatively high in in the pricing by not the uncertainty of the contract so I think we're going to go to a more traditional fee and scope be an expression of interest and then meet with some firms and then negotiate a price with agreed upon sort of number of hours As opposed to was the way it was put out there before

>>Andrew Kreshik: okay thank you

>>Steve lachetta: Hey, thank you bob anything else on d.o.t throughway authority is up next is anyone on from throughway authority mike

>>Tim Wainwright: good morning

>>Steve lachetta: Thank you Tim yeah goes ahead Tim how is it going there

>>Tim Wainwright: well good we're you know it's a busy time of year for us you know transitioning from summer to winter got a few projects where we're wrapping up uh the old state road bridge Replacement we're also doing some diamond grinding on the concrete pavement between 23 and 24 and then of course we have our uh all-electronic toll collection project that is moving forward as well uh As with DOT, you know we are supporting uh the state with our Covid response with moving material and um you know just as I said getting ready for winter any questions anybody

>>Steve lachetta: thank you Tim good overview um next up is the airport if you're ready uh for show and tell out the window as mentioned at our last meeting we're wrapping up four new uh 80 000 square foot hangers uh 80 000 square feet each times four for the next gen statewide emergency response you see them the new white roofs right out here I'm on the east end of our administration building most of the commercial traffic was in from the north and I don't have a clear view of that and they're turning off to the terminal before we get here today but uh this time of morning's fairly slow and it's a big push out every morning we're seeing still steady only 1000 passengers a day where 4 500 or so is the daily average uh five to six thousand six thousand weekly.

So the pandemic's definitely taking a toll state health uh staff are the meters and greeters here trying to gets information on quarantine from all the passengers coming from 34 states currently on the restricted and quarantine list per the seven day rolling average so it's definitely affecting interstate travel cargo is still holding strong military as you see a lot of black hawk traffic out the window here our capital program is continuing uh four passenger boarding bridges uh this uh over the wing bridge I'm sad to report is to be removed after 21 years of service we were the only airport in the western hemisphere with uh rear door jet boarding the dual bridges are going away unfortunately southwestern didn't buy in but they were cutting the turn time almost in half but that'll be a closing chapter on new technology that could have taken off but just didn't with a dual boarding passengers uh liked them there were some you know occasional mechanical issues.

There were electronic devices so that's another show and tell out the window here that's the dual over the wing boarding bridge soon to be removed um so that's a quick overview on airport traffic um so we're holding steady about a thousand passengers a day uh we're very grateful for dots uh excellent support the exit 3 and gateway improvements are just wonderful and a great entrance to our region we have our video board being upgraded we'll be updating some social media but that's a quick overview any questions on airport operations or capital program would be happy to answer and who's on from the port of Albany for the marine port.

>>Mike Franchini: uh no one is on from the port uh Tony Vassil called and he had several conflicts today so he could not make it uh

>>Steve lachetta: thank you Michael very good um so that's a wrap are there any other members around the table that would like to do a brief report on local planning initiatives or capital initiatives hearing none our upcoming meetings are bike pet on October 13th new visions 2050 learning series webinar on pedestrian safety in the region October 20th October 21st is another webinar on the cycling experience Cycle highways and methods for human centered bikeways very popular growing popularity and lastly our next planning committee see you again on Wednesday the 4th all right any other uh-closing motion to Adjourn old business new business thank you bob motion to adjourn second I will second that all in favor Please say aye and it was a great meeting thank you for your consensus we will carry it forward thank you Michael

>>Mike Franchini: thank you Steven thank you members