PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
Meeting Minutes
February 6, 2013

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Bill Anslow, representing Darrell Duncan, Albany County
Melissa Ashline-Heil, City of Cohoes
Brad Birge, City of Saratoga Springs
Frank Bonafide, NYS Department of Transportation R-1
Peter Comenzo, Town of Rotterdam
Ross Farrell, Capital District Transportation Authority
Steve Feeney, Schenectady County
Rocky Ferraro, Capital District Regional Planning Commission
Michael Franchini, Capital District Transportation Committee
Bruce Hidley, City of Watervliet
Steve Iachetta, Albany County Airport Authority
Joe LaCivita, Town of Colonie
Patrick McCarroll, representing Michael Loftus, NYS Thruway Authority
Barbara McHugh, Town of Clifton Park
Randy Milano, City of Albany
Mike Morelli, Town of Bethlehem
Ozzie Priotti, City of Rensselaer
Russ Reeves, City of Troy
Paul Reuss, Village of Menands
Joe Teliska, representing Wayne Bonesteel, Rensselaer County
Michael Valentine, Saratoga County
Chris Wallin, City of Schenectady

STAFF AND OTHERS

Anne Benware, Capital District Transportation Committee
Rob Cherry, NYS Department of Transportation R-1
Martin Daley, Parks and Trails New York
Lee Ecker, CHA
Christopher Desany, Capital District Transportation Authority
Fred Erickson, Town of Sand Lake
Karen Hulihan, NYS Department of Transportation R-1
Dave Jukins, Capital District Transportation Committee
Mark Kennedy, NYS Department of Transportation R-1
Teresa LaSalle, Capital District Transportation Committee
Scott Lewendon, Mohawk Hudson Land Conservancy
Sandy Misiewicz, Capital District Transportation Committee
Leah Mosall, Capital District Transportation Committee
Larry Mulvaney, NYS Department of Transportation R-1
Shirin Najafabadi, Capital District Transportation Committee
Chris O’Neill, Capital District Transportation Committee
Jeff Pangburn, Creighton Manning
Posca, Capital District Transportation Committee
Jason Purvis, Capital District Transportation Committee
Mark Pyshadlo, NYS Department of Transportation R-1
Jim Rivers, GPI
Ben Syden, Laberge Group
Barb Tozzi, City of Troy
Ed Wolk, Capital District Transportation Authority
VISITORS’ ISSUES

Steve Iachetta opened the meeting at approximately 9:35 AM. Martin Daley, representing Parks & Trails New York, expressed his interest in any discussion that can take place about the Strategic Transportation Enhancements Program (STEP) and the project selection process.

ADMINISTRATION

Previous Meeting Minutes – January 23, 2013

Members approved the January 23rd minutes.

DOT PRESENTATION ON THE TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT CENTER AND INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS

Mark Pyskadlo gave a presentation about the TMC. Mark explained the structure of the TMC and presented the various different operational components of the TMC. Frank Bonafide commented that the TMC provides the most cost effective way to address congestion.

ACTION ITEMS

2010-15 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AMENDMENTS

T66 (1823.01), Welfare to Work
T66A (1823.01, Welfare to Work in Saratoga Springs

Ross Farrell explained that CDTA has submitted a proposal to reprogram CDTA’s existing Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) funding to have greater benefit on mobility in the Capital Region. The amendment for T66 and T66A will maximize the use of JARC funding by more efficiently aligning activities with the goals of the JARC program and by not tying specific travel trainers to specific counties, creating economies of scale. The change will allow better service to be provided for commuting, especially for low income commuters to suburban office parks and retail employment. Members approved the proposed amendments for T66 and T66A.

S203 (1759.02), Van Vorst over Alplaus Kill: Bridge Replacement

A letter was distributed from Paul Sheldon of Schenectady County explaining this amendment (attached). Karen Hulihan explained that a BP-1 form was filled out, but it was determined by engineering staff at NYSDOT that rehab for this project is not cost effective.

Joe Teliska asked how this amendment would relate to over-programming. Karen Hulihan said that an offset is not required. Frank Bonafide explained that the STIP is balanced through the end of September and he is allowed to make moderate changes without offsets. Members approved the proposed amendment for S203.

DRAFT 2012 JOB ACCESS AND REVERSE COMMUTE (JARC) FUNDING APPLICATION AND SOLICITATION
DRAFT 2012 NEW FREEDOM FUNDING APPLICATION

Anne Benware explained that the Regional Transportation Coordination Committee or RTCC met in January and approved these two draft funding
applications for CDTC Planning Committee review and approval. These applications are for 2012 funds and are subject to the previous SAFETEA-LU rules for these two programs. With the enactment of MAP-21 several transit programs have been consolidated or eliminated. The JARC program was eliminated and projects eligible under JARC are now eligible under the 5307 program which funds CDTA's activities. Consequently, this solicitation for the 2012 funds will be the last for the JARC program. In the past, only CDTA has applied for JARC funds, but this year there has been interest from an additional potential applicant. The New Freedom program has been consolidated into the 5310 program which is now known as the Enhanced Mobility for Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities. So, this New Freedom solicitation for 2012 funds will be the last for this separate program as well. The consolidated 5310 program will still require consistency with the region's coordinated plan and the RTCC will continue to meet. Members approved the JARC and New Freedom applications together.

**UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM (UPWP) ADDENDA**

Mike Franchini explained that the UPWP is a two year program, and this is a mid-year correction. Mike reviewed the addendum. For the mid-term update, four new activities are proposed: increased support of the New Visions long range plan update; support for new modes of transportation including car sharing programs and bicycle sharing programs; purchase of new congestion management data; and new computer hardware and software. Members approved the UPWP addendum.

**INCORPORATING NEW 2013-2014 LINKAGE STUDIES INTO THE EXISTING UPWP**

Sandy Misiewicz reported that four submissions were received for new Linkage projects. She explained the evaluation process. The Green Island proposal was screened out because designing a roundabout is not an eligible activity for the Linkage program. After evaluating the remaining three submissions against the selection criteria, the evaluation team recommended the Saratoga Springs, New Scotland and Stillwater projects for funding. Members approved the recommendation of the evaluation team.

**2013-18 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM UPDATE**

**CDTA Proposed TIP Programming**

Ed Wolk presented the CDTA proposal for TIP programming, including the fixed route fleet, Park and Ride Lot Set Aside, Travel Demand Management Program, BRT Implementation, Section 5310 Vehicles for Elderly and Handicapped Transportation, and other projects as described in the mail out package. Members approved the CDTA TIP programming as proposed.

**Next Steps - Approval and Public Comment Period**

Mike Franchini explained that the next step is to bring the draft TIP to the Policy Board and ask their approval of the draft for public review. After that approval, there will be a 60 day public review period. After the Planning Committee reviews the public comments and addresses them as appropriate, the Policy Board will be asked to approve the final TIP at their June meeting.
DISCUSSION ITEMS

STRATEGIC TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENTS PROGRAM (STEP) PROJECTS SOLICITATION

Two handouts were distributed: an application form for the STEP program and a list of suggestions for the STEP submission by NYSDOT Region One (both attached). Mike Franchini explained that this new program comes with a February 28, 2013 due date for project applications. There will not be enough time for the Planning Committee to review applications.

Frank Bonafide said that he is only able to submit five projects from the whole NYSDOT region. He said that he will form a committee with CDTC staff, A/GPTC staff and the two rural counties represented. Mike Franchini will represent CDTC. Frank Bonafide said that the list of suggestions handed out was just a starting point for conversation.

Mike Franchini said that statewide there is $470 million per year in the last four years of the new TIP. There is no rating system but there are criteria in the DOT guidance document. There are examples in the back of the application, which include the recent Fuller Road project.

Mike Valentine and Mike Morelli commented that the time frame for submitting projects is too short. Mike Valentine commented that it may make sense to go with projects already programmed on the TIP.

Frank Bonafide said that the Washington/Western BRT project fits many of the criteria of the STEP program.

Rocky Ferraro asked if we could take a project from the Cleaner Greener initiative. However, Mike Franchini suggested that projects which had been vetted through the TIP would be more competitive. Rocky stated that the deadline is unrealistic and unreasonable. He asked if projects could be selected from the New Visions Plan.

Mike Morelli suggested consideration of the Helderberg Rail Trail as a regional project. Rocky Ferraro suggested considering the Regional Economic Development Council criteria.

FFY 2014 HSIP SOLICITATION

Sandy Misiewicz distributed a memo from Robert Limoges that described the statewide solicitation for Safety (HSIP) projects for federal fiscal year 2014 (attached). She explained that page two of the memo described the changes since the FFY 2013 solicitation. March 30 is the deadline for the Region to submit HSIP projects, so projects should be received by the Region one week prior so that the Region can have time for the selection of projects to submit. Mike Franchini said that anyone who is submitting HSIP projects should go to Sandy Misiewicz for help.

STATUS OF CMAQ PROJECTS

Glenn Posca reviewed a number of changes from the status report in the mail out. Design for R279 is not done. A consultant has been hired for S188, but PE is not finished.
NYSDOT PROJECT DELIVERY SCHEDULE

Frank Bonafide explained that a handout was not available this month. He reported that results for local projects are not very good. He asked that for the period April 1, 2013 through March 31, 2014, consultants should submit conservative and realistic dates for project schedules, especially with respect to right of way and environmental analysis.

STATUS OF PLANNING ACTIVITIES

CDTC

Jason Purvis reported that an RFP from NYSDEC, the Hudson River Estuary and the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission has been released. They were looking for proposals that address sea-level rise, storm surge and flood adaptation planning for estuary shoreline communities. Proposals are due on March 26th. Notification of awards is expected on April 16th.

Mike Franchini reported that staff is working on the urban area boundaries and preparing for a future Planning Committee presentation.

CDRPC

Rocky Ferraro reported that community sheets updated to reflect 2011 data are available.

NYSDOT

Rob Cherry reported that the NYSDOT Highway Data Services Bureau will be holding a pavement condition and traffic monitoring workshop at the Gideon Putnam March 18.

CDTA

Ross Farrell reported that CDTA is looking to hire a manager of scheduling.

Albany County Airport Authority

Steve Iachetta reported that the Albany County Airport Authority is working with the FAA to explore the possibility of leveraging funding for the Exit 4 Connector project.

Linkage

Sandy Misiewicz reported that the Town of Malta just approved, to our knowledge, the first comprehensive form based code in New York State implementing its Downtown Master Plan. Brad Birge commented that Saratoga Springs has form based elements in their code.
Sandy said that Clifton Park will be looking at revising the zoning in its town center to implement the Town Master Plan.

**Safety Task Force**

Sandy Misiewicz said that she would like to schedule a presentation on the Safety Task Force at a future Planning Committee meeting.

**UPCOMING MEETINGS**

Steve Iachetta reviewed upcoming meetings. Mike Franchini said that he appreciates the great attendance and participation through a difficult process in developing this year’s TIP. Chris Wallin asked that the Planning Committee be kept informed about the results of the STEP project selection.

**Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:50 PM. The next Planning Committee meeting is scheduled for April 3, 2013.

Respectfully submitted,

\[Signature\]

Michael Franchini
Secretary
January 30, 2013

Mr. Michael Franchini
Executive Director
Capital District Transportation Committee
1 Park Place, Main Floor
Albany, NY 12205

RE:  TIP Amendment – S203 (1759.02): CR39 (Van Vorst Road) Bridge over the Alplaus Kill:
Bridge Replacement
Town of Glenville, Schenectady County

Dear Mr. Franchini:

We are submitting the proposed amendment to the 2010-15 TIP for consideration by the Planning Committee at its next scheduled meeting.

The amendment is proposed due to the following:

- X Scope Change
- X Cost Change
- □ Schedule Change
- □ Other

A meeting with Creighton Manning (design consultant), NYSDOT and Schenectady County was conducted on June 13, 2012 at the project site to discuss the work that would need to be completed on the bridge.

It was determined that replacing just the deteriorated fascia beams and completing a deck replacement would not address the other issues the bridge is experiencing such as, severe steel corrosion and paint deterioration of the interior stringers or the scour vulnerability at the abutments as they are not founded on piles. The bridge is also located on a non-standard horizontal curve which would also not be addressed with a deck replacement project.

A complete bridge replacement would address all of the concerns including the deteriorating superstructure, improve the horizontal and vertical alignment, and improve the scour vulnerability. It would also allow us to widen the shoulders along the bridge where there are currently none now to safely accommodate pedestrians in the area.
A Beyond Preservation Project Review submittal was made to NYSDOT for the complete replacement of the Van Vorst Bridge. The submittal was approved by NYSDOT on November 9, 2012.

We are requesting an increase to the TIP of $1.131 million.

It is our intention to complete construction during the summer of 2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current TIP Data</th>
<th></th>
<th>Proposed TIP Data</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund</strong></td>
<td><strong>Amount</strong></td>
<td><strong>Source</strong></td>
<td><strong>Phase</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBRR</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>Prelim. Des</td>
<td>11-12 (Commit’d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBRR</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>Detailed Des.</td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBRR</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBRR</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>Const. (w/ Cl)</td>
<td>13-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0.701 (current total)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Construction funding for this project includes inspection (supervision):

_ yes _X no _ NA (please check one).

If you have questions or need further information, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Paul J. Sheldon, P.E.
Director of Engineering

PJS/ps

Cc: Joseph Ryan, Schenectady County Director of Public Works
    Steve Feeney, Schenectady County Planning Department
    File
Region One NYSDOT suggestions for the Strategic Transportation Enhancement Program submission

Route 9, Lake George gateway improvements, Town of Lake George, Warren County $6.0 million.

R195 PIN 175459 South Troy Industrial Park Road construction, City of Troy, Rensselaer County $7.0 million.

A435 PIN 175663 and RG109 PIN CDTC18 Washington/Western Ave. ITS and BRT implementation CDTA/City of Albany partnership, City of Albany, Albany County $9.5 million.

S96/SA108 PIN 108531 Route 146, Rexford Bridge replacement and operational improvements, Towns of Niskayuna and Clifton Park, Schenectady and Saratoga Counties $20.0 million.

SA 88 PIN 109618 Route 50 reconstruction, City of Saratoga Springs, Saratoga County $26 million.

PIN 138329 Route 73 repairs and/or reconstruction from the Cascade Lakes to the Village of Lake Placid, Towns of Keene and North Elba, Essex County $28 million.
Strategic Transportation Enhancements Program
Project Overview and Context Submission Form

Project Name & Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date: mm/dd/yyyy</th>
<th>Region: Select a Region</th>
<th>MPO: Select an MPO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Municipality (town, village, city):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County:</th>
<th>Municipality (town, village, city):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Project Name:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIN:</th>
<th>BIN(s):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Route Number(s) or Road Names:

State Project
Local Project

If this is a Local Project, has the sponsor completed transportation projects using federal transportation funding sources?
Yes
No

Project Phase at Submittal:
IPP
Scoping
Preliminary Design
Final Design

Project Phase for Which Funding Is Requested (check all that apply):
Planning
Design
Right-of-way
Construction

Expected Letting Date: mm/yyyy

Sponsor Contact Information

Sponsor Name:

Sponsor Address:

Contact Name:  Title: (Project Manager, Program Manager, Designer, etc.)

Email:  Phone: ( ) -

Project Budget

Total Amount of Funds Being Requested:

Total Project Cost:

List Project Funding Sources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Funding Source List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*To update totals, place cursor in front of '0' and press F9.
Strategic Transportation Enhancements Program
Project Overview and Context Submission Form

Form: STEP-1

Coordination/Partnerships/Leveraging

Describe (no more than one page) major coordination efforts and any partnerships that have been formed in support of the project. For example: Is there documented community support for the proposed improvements? What other federal, state, or local agencies or private sector partners are involved? (List partners and any formal agreements reached.) Does this effort support a Regional Economic Development Council goal or project, a New York Works project or Cleaner Greener New York project? Also, describe how the proposed project leverages resources beyond construction, including maintenance issues (sidewalk snow removal; plantings, bus shelters, trail head signs, information kiosks upkeep, etc.) that may be needed after construction.

Success Measures

List and describe (no more than one page) project measures that will be used to demonstrate successful project outcomes. Performance measure examples include: jobs created/supported, percent increase in the number of people traveling via more efficient modes of transportation (walking, biking, transit, carpooling, clean vehicles, rail, etc); increase in public transit trips or ridership per capita; improved level of service/travel time reliability; accidents reduced; reduced flooding or other measures that will demonstrate project success.

SSUST Project Recommendation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Recommended</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Not Recommended</th>
<th>SSUST Evaluator Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/31/2013
Corridor/Modal Benefits: Concisely (no more than two pages) describe how the project is integral to the corridor context and the project's enhancements to modal options and markets/destinations being served.
Strategic Transportation Enhancements Program  
Project Overview and Context Submission Form  
Form: STEP-1

### Project Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Tier:</th>
<th>Select One:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tier 1 (Projects &lt;$10M)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor Type</th>
<th>Identify corridor type, check all that apply:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location Context:</th>
<th>Select One:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide a project map. In addition to site location, the map should show project context and links. This includes major employment centers, hospitals, schools, tourist attractions, scenic byways, general land use, other destinations that influence transportation, and other modes such as bus routes, bike routes, trail ways, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Demand/Corridor Context:</th>
<th>What travel markets will this project help serve? Check all that apply:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit (Bus, Rail, Subway, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AADT: | Year Last Counted: | % Truck: |

20 Year Projected AADT:

### Project Need and Benefits

**Project Description/Title (Briefly describe this project - what is being built):**

**Project Need (Briefly describe the primary transportation concern being addressed):**

**Project Benefits/Sustainable Solutions:** Concisely (no more than three pages) describe how the project is unique and exemplary in addressing the identified problem in a way that balances economic, social, and environmental considerations within the context of the project's location.
Strategic Transportation Enhancements Program (STEP)
Call for Projects

Program Purpose

The New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) is accepting applications for strategic investments through transportation infrastructure projects that promote economic competitiveness, livability and system connectivity to optimize the State’s multi-modal transportation system.

Program Focus

While NYSDOT’s highest infrastructure investment priority is to preserve the functionality of the existing transportation system, the Department also recognizes that strategic investments to the State’s multi-modal transportation system can improve critical mobility linkages to markets, businesses, jobs, educational facilities, critical human services (hospitals, government, etc.) and can help shape communities. This call for projects is intended to provide for investments in transportation infrastructure beyond demand response, preservation and renewal. To facilitate these multi-modal enhancements, NYSDOT will consider direct investment in the transportation system which supports economic productivity and/or improves community quality of life by integrating sustainability’s “triple bottom line” (economic, social and environmental) considerations into the project. Such investments should occur along “corridors” (state, regional or local) that provide access to critical destinations. Strategic enhancement project proposals will receive priority consideration if they leverage investments from other public and/or private sources on, or adjacent to the transportation system.

The program’s intent is to:

- Support the economic vitality of New York State.
- Provide community and quality of life benefits.
- Improve mobility and reliability of the transportation system.
- Leverage and support multi-modal benefits.
- Ensure environmental benefits, as appropriate: protect and enhance the natural environment, cultural heritage and community appearance, and promote energy conservation.

Project Eligibility

- Projects submitted for this call must be eligible for capital funding under programs administered by the Federal Highway Administration (23 USC) and/or the Federal Transit Administration (49 USC) and must be eligible to be funded using SDF, NHPP, or STP funds, or with funds transferred from these sources.
- All phases of work are eligible, including planning, design, right-of-way acquisition, and construction.
- Project submissions must demonstrate how the proposed investment will facilitate balanced transportation solutions within the context of the project’s location that support and enhance the economic, social and environmental vitality.

1/31/2013
• Project submissions should take into consideration the goals detailed in the local Regional Economic Development Council (REDC) strategic plan.
• Project submissions that leverage additional public or private resources in or adjacent to the transportation system will be given priority.
• Project submissions that can move forward to construction or service implementation within the TIP/STIP period (by September 30, 2018) will be given priority.
• All project costs above the approved amount will be the responsibility of the project sponsor.
• Project submissions that support a priority corridor or corridor management strategy or initiative as described in Appendix A will be given priority.

Appendix B provides additional guidance on criteria to consider. Appendix C provides Project Type examples.

Project Review & Types

Projects funded under this program may range from small neighborhood oriented projects to broader community or regionally oriented corridor projects. As there will be a range of project size and scope, projects will be evaluated on two tiers as detailed below. Additionally, each project submitted under this program will need to include a measure or measures of the project’s successful outcome. The Department expects to work with the project sponsor to evaluate the projects before and after conditions.

Tier I Projects

Tier I submissions will not seek less than $200,000 and will not exceed $10 million in funding, and are expected to demonstrate and document clear sustainability benefits that will exemplify comprehensive and corridor-based approaches. Submissions may also include a program of similar types of actions. Examples of Tier I projects include, but are not limited to:

• Integrated, context-appropriate solutions that support connectivity and access to important destinations (e.g., jobs, educational and health facilities, retail, etc.) using more efficient transportation modes (including walking, carpooling, public transportation, bicycling, etc.)
• Mobility improvement projects that expand or enhance transportation facilities (bus pull offs, new, improved and/or expanded park & ride lots, ADA accessibility, etc.).
• System optimization projects, such as innovative use of signal timing or ITS-oriented transportation system safety projects.
• Economic vitality improvements such as main street or boulevard projects.
• Projects that reduce the vulnerability or aid in the resiliency of the transportation system to extreme weather events.
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Tier II Projects

Tier II projects are those requesting more than $10 million. The Tier II projects are expected to demonstrate and document clear sustainability benefits that will exemplify comprehensive and corridor-based approaches. Examples of Tier II projects include, but are not limited to:

- Projects that address critical corridor mobility and infrastructure needs, and support economic and/or community vitality.
- Establishing new or improving existing Bus Rapid Transit facilities or implementing projects which fill transit gaps.
- Projects which repurpose existing infrastructure such as converting controlled access highways to multi-use roadways.
- Freight related improvements which facilitate the shift of truck shipments to rail or water, or improve connections to ports and airports.
- Comprehensive system optimization projects, such as adaptive signals, ramp metering, and other IT solutions.
- Major projects that reduce the vulnerability or aid in the resiliency of the transportation system to extreme weather events.

Project Delivery

Tier I projects can have anticipated letting dates beginning October 1, 2013. Tier II projects must have an anticipated letting date on or after October 1, 2014.

Projects should demonstrate that ongoing maintenance and operations (e.g., streetscape improvements) have been addressed.

Project Submissions/Selection Process

- Each Region may submit up to five projects for consideration, regardless of sponsorship/ownership.
- Each Region will be limited to no more than four Tier II project submissions.
- Submissions will be accepted through February 28, 2013.

Regional Offices will submit their projects to the Statewide Sustainability Team (SSUST) for review and evaluation. Projects will be rated as follows:

- Highly Recommended – Project demonstrates it meets the program’s stated intent; fully addresses the eligibility requirements and demonstrates innovative, exemplary and/or unique methods to optimize and/or enhance the transportation system.
Strategic Transportation Enhancements Program (STEP)  
Call for Projects

- **Recommended** – Project demonstrates it generally meets the program’s stated intent; includes most - but not all - of the stated strategic enhancement objectives and/or may not be innovative or unique.

- **Not Recommended** – Project does not meet the stated program intent and/or address the strategic enhancement objectives.

Once reviewed/evaluated by the SSUST, projects will be forwarded to the Comprehensive Program Team (CPT) for additional review/consideration.

**Timeline**

- January 31, 2013 — Call for Projects is distributed to RPPM’s and MPO Directors.
- February 28, 2013 — Submissions due to Statewide Sustainability Team (SSUST).

**Project Applications and Process**

For each project, a complete Project Overview & Context Submission form (STEP-1) must be submitted. Incomplete forms will not be evaluated. Additional supporting materials such as plans or photos may be provided as attachments; however, any attachments must be supported by the project narrative.

Regions are encouraged to work with their Regional Sustainability Teams. Questions regarding the program details or process should first be directed to the Regional Sustainability Team leaders. If they cannot answer questions directly they will reach out to the Statewide Sustainability Team Leaders for guidance. The Regional Sustainability Team Leaders are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Regional Sustainability Team Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>George Hodges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sharon Heyboer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Patty Coultart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Jon Harman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Frank Billittier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tom Markel / Sandra Rapp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Al Ricalton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dan Coots / Jessica Andersen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>James McKenna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Joel Kleinberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Edward Mark</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A – Corridor Background and Definitions

While the capital program is made up of individual projects, these projects must consider the transportation system as a whole. To address the needs of system users and society, NYSDOT is considering projects in the context of its contribution to, or improvement to the larger transportation system. For this project call, the project needs to address how it supports a corridor approach. Criteria to consider for describing a project within a corridor context:

- Corridors vary in size and scope within the context of the region/area. For example, a “corridor” may be a larger interstate corridor, or it may be a localized corridor within a specific community. A corridor could also be defined as a collection of assets that provide access to specific important destinations such as a tourist destination, employment center, business, critical facility, market or community.
- Corridors should include the multi-modal assets that support access to identified destinations of importance (e.g., markets for goods, communities, tourist destinations, etc. to enhance business opportunity that maintain and support the economy).
- Corridor investment should consider a range of corridor strategies, and could encompass activities including but not limited to integrated corridor management, bus rapid transit (BRT), managed use lanes, operations innovations, improved access to local, regional and statewide trail systems, travel demand management (TDM) techniques, travel corridor unit management planning (such as Adirondack Travel Corridor Unit Management Plan – TCUMP), habitat connectivity, and advanced mitigation planning. Safety will always be an overarching consideration.
- Corridors could cross geographic boundaries. The transportation system does not end at regional or metropolitan boundaries. For corridors that cross such boundaries, strategies should work across jurisdictions and boundaries to ensure continuity, connectivity and coordination.

For the purpose of the STEP submission, a “corridor” is defined as a collection of transportation assets or an integrated transportation system which provides access between specific important origins and destinations. Where a specific destination clearly dominates the transportation use, a corridor can be placed into one of five (5) main categories: Trade, Intercity, Commuter/Local, Tourism/Recreation, or Emergency as described below.

- Trade corridor: a geographic representation of multimodal transportation facilities which support the movement of high volume/high value goods, commodities, and services to, from, within, and through the state.
- Intercity corridor: a multimodal transportation system that supports business and person travel primarily between urban areas within the state.
- Commuter/local corridor: corridors that serve personal travel at the local level, including movements between locations undertaken to conduct daily and routine activities.
• Tourism/recreation corridor: generally supports a high volume movement of tourists originating both inside and outside of New York State.

• Emergency corridor: generally serves as designated evacuation route during emergencies or as a primary emergency response route.

Corridors may fall into multiple categories where there is not a clear dominate destination or transportation use.

A “priority corridor” is defined as a corridor that provides:
• a critical link to a specific important destination(s) such as, business centers, commerce centers, educational facilities, public services (hospitals, government services, etc) and tourism;
• supports state, regional and local economic development and vitality; and
• has strong community support provided through financial commitments, regional or local planning efforts, and/or performance indicators that demonstrate significant public use or future use.
Appendix B – Strategic Enhancement Criteria

The list below includes criteria to consider in selecting strategic enhancement projects. While all of these criteria reflect some aspect of the “triple bottom line”, for this application, the project narrative should articulate how the project, as a whole, includes and balances all three areas. Projects do not need to meet a specific number of criteria. Rather, they should demonstrate key considerations that, taken together, will deliver an exemplary sustainable project.

The criteria below are divided into the three areas for considerations, economic, social and environmental.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC1 Project supports job creation and retention – advancing economic and community development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC2 Project is consistent with the goals defined in a Regional Economic Development Strategic Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC3 Project is located within an area that has been designated (or is considered) as a “priority corridor” or “priority location” – (Examples: transit corridor, tourism destination, “opportunity location”, provides access to key business districts, employment centers, major distribution links, educational centers, emergency routes, freight/truck corridor, port access, airport access, passenger rail access, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC4 Project leverages and coordinates with investments of local government, local transit providers, and/or leverages private sector or other state agency investment resources. (Local water, sewer, power, NY works, Cleaner Greener, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC5 Project promotes efficient system operations (e.g. through better uses of innovative solutions such as information technology, ITS solutions, HOT lanes, TDM strategies, signal optimization, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC6 Project used a Lifecycle Cost Analysis process to determine final design elements. If unique features are used, demonstrate how the maintenance costs will be covered by the owner (state, local, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC7 Other – Economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1 Project is consistent with or part of a current (within the last 10 years) comprehensive community plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2 Project has strong community/public involvement and support (e.g., use of web pages, community workshops).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3 Project improves the convenience, reliability or attractiveness of access to or connection to public transportation, or promotes modal choices other than personal vehicle use. (e.g. Park and Rides, BRT, Transit improvements, walking).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C – Project Type Examples

Project Examples:
To provide additional context, below are some hypothetical project descriptions that would meet this call for projects criteria.

Example 1:
Corridor Type: Commuter/ Local
Project Type: Pedestrian Improvement
Project Cost: $200,000
Project Tier: I

This project will improve pedestrian access to three small unincorporated village business districts and provide a safe route to a local school. The project will build sidewalks on existing state Right-of-Way’s (ROW) to link off-street parking lots to village business districts. Currently pedestrians must walk in the road. The project will also restripe the state highway in the business districts to include parking spaces on one side of the highway and add strategically placed “piano key type” crosswalks including appropriate ADA drop curbs. All other appropriate signage (speed limit, crosswalk, parking, etc.) will be added in the village districts. At one village’s edge, this project will connect existing sidewalk, along the state highway ROW, to a local elementary school entrance. This will allow students who live in the village to walk safely to school. An agreement has been reached with the local business associations and the school to keep their respective sidewalks clear of snow.

Example 2:
Corridor Type: Tourism/Recreational & Emergency
Project Type: Local Bridge Replacement
Project Cost: $850,000
Project Tier: I

This project centers on a restricted (soon to be closed) historic bridge in a small rural community. The bridge has deteriorated to a point where replacement is required. However, due to funding constraints the Department has not been able to progress the project. The bridge provides primary access to emergency vehicles within the community, and is at the nexus of bicycle paths, trail heads, and snowmobile routes. All these uses greatly contribute to the local economy and health. The Town has scoped the project and has local resident support; the community has developed a webpage which outlines project benefits, costs and news. The proposed bridge would include a sidewalk, keep to the natural and historic setting, provide access to locally critical tourist activities and serve as an important emergency vehicle route, all of which will improve the overall community economic viability.
Example 3:
Corridor Type: Commuter/ Local & Tourism/ Recreational
Project Type: Main Street Reconstruction
Project Cost: $2,675,000
Project Tier: I

This project centers on a downtown business district originally constructed in the early 1900’s. The town is growing, and supports significant tourism both directly and indirectly to local attractions (ski center, Water Park, B&B’s etc.). Although many downtown buildings have been renovated and modernized, much of the public transportation infrastructure is in poor condition and beyond its useful life. Obsolete traffic signals, failing utility infrastructure, and lack of basic pedestrian amenities in this key retail area contribute to poor safety and traffic congestion.

The proposed project would modernize outdated traffic signals, add dedicated left turn lanes at key locations, improve pedestrian crossings, and replace failing water, sewer and storm drainage utilities. (If timing works, project could potentially leverage HSIP funds since there is a significant safety component, and REDC funds for updating a waste treatment facility.) Modern traffic signals and timing will improve safety; reduce delay, congestion, fuel consumption, and greenhouse gas emissions without expanding the width of the roadway. Equally important, the project will provide improved pedestrian facilities, supporting local businesses and encouraging people to walk rather than drive. This project is supported by the community as the number one project emerging from the community’s downtown business district master plan. The community has completed several other projects supportive of these improvements, including constructing off-street parking, purchasing land and constructing other service buildings to support local economic development, but it lacks the funding for these vital transportation infrastructure improvements. This project, when completed, will provide the synergistic benefits called for in the community plan — safer travel through the community, while promoting community and economic vitality.

Example 4:
Corridor Type: Trade & Intercity
Project Type: Rail Access & Economic Development
Project Cost: $5,500,000
Project Tier: I

This rail access rehabilitation project is a smart growth project central to the adaptive reuse of a former military facility and is in alignment with local development plans. Nearly one million square feet of the facility is now occupied by private industrial users and the facility is expected to be expanded to include another two million square feet. Rehabilitation of the existing rail spur will increase and improve freight rail access between the site and the existing rail network and will significantly improve capacity, providing the ability to increase rail freight service levels. This expansion will remove a significant number of trucks from the interstate, thereby improving mobility and reducing congestion and greenhouse gas emissions. The project protects local
water bodies by using steel railroad ties instead of potentially toxic wooden-treated ties, and enhances the local habitat by installing wildlife crossings. Many state agencies have collaborated on this project and have developed a multi-government funding solution. If awarded, the funds from this grant will allow the project to move forward, leveraging funds secured through NYSDOT, NYSERDA, FHWA and other federal and state grant processes.

Example 5:
Corridor Type: Commuter/ Local
Project Type: Community Gateway
Project Cost: $12,000,000
Project Tier: II

This project converts a major arterial leading to a thriving and growing suburban village to a boulevard. Currently, the pavements which begin at an interstate exit and lead to the village entrance are on the verge of needing replacement. Instead of simply replacing/repaving the road, this project proposes to:

- Convert the highway to a boulevard.
- Add center-lane turning and crosswalks in appropriate places, shoulders for bicycle and pedestrian use, and optimize signals.
- Extend bus service to emerging populated places just outside the village which will reduce congestion and green house gas emissions.

The boulevard concept is in alignment with recently developed village and county long range master plans and has community support. The local transit provider has agreed to fund and maintain any constructed bus shelters. Also, the village has agreed to maintain all plantings in the boulevard and keep the sidewalks clear of snow and ice.

Example 6:
Corridor Type: Commuter/ Local
Project Type: Economic Development
Project Cost: $14,500,000
Project Tier: II

Project Description:
Located at the crossroads of an expanding SUNY Facility, Technology Park, shopping mall, interstate highway interchange, and a state office complex, this critical intersection carries more than 48,000 vehicles each day. The project involves the reconstruction and reconfiguration of the intersection to reduce congestion, improve safety and air quality, and provide access for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit. The project is compatible with the development plans of the community as well as the development plan for the adjacent College and Technology Park.

This project provides a transportation solution that benefits all modes of travel while being consistent with the community’s vision and minimizing impacts to environmentally sensitive areas. Highlights include:
• Relocate the intersection with the construction of a bridge and roundabout. This relocation will facilitate a land swap that consolidates college land and preserve land into larger contiguous parcels.

• Non-standard roadway features will be used to minimize the overall footprint and impervious area. These features include; a reduced horizontal curve radius, reduced shoulder and median widths, and a fill type retaining wall to specifically minimize the overall footprint. All these combine to adding to green space.

• Early project coordination with the local transit agency will allow for the agency to provide transit service at this location where none previously existed due to safety concerns. Bus turnouts will also be included to facilitate the further expansion of mass transit.

• Sidewalks and paths will be extended throughout the project to connect pedestrians and cyclists to transit, schools, malls, parks and the technology park.

• Environmental improvements include removing invasive species, planting native species, providing excess native soil to a near-by preserve for habitat restoration and incorporated dry swales and infiltration ponds to better manage storm water runoff.

• Improvements at this intersection were recommended in two previous studies by the MPO and work with the MPO in developing Public and private partnership between the county, college, Tech Park and the NYSDOT for project funding.
MEMORANDUM
Department of Transportation

TO: Regional Planning and Program Managers
   Regional Directors of Operations
   Regional Traffic Engineers
   MPO Directors

FROM: Robert Limoges, Safety Program Management and Coordination Bureau

SUBJECT: Updated Guidance - Statewide Solicitation for Safety (HSIP) Projects FFY14

DATE: February 4, 2013

Attachments: Highway Safety Improvement Program Application Form (SP1)
             Regional Contact List
             Capital Recovery Factors @ 4% Interest Rate
             Benefit/Cost Procedures and Forms

Thank you for participating in the statewide solicitation of FFY13 HSIP projects. It’s a busy time for everyone and we appreciate the extra time and effort spent to complete the application process as we all strive to continue to decrease fatal and serious injury crashes in New York State. The program was able to fund some excellent safety projects in FFY13 and we look forward to the same in FFY14. The following contains some updated guidance based on the lessons we learned from the FFY13 HSIP solicitation.

All FFY14 projects (state and local) are to be submitted to the Main Office from the Regional Planning and Program Manager (RPPM) by March 30th. The projects should be reviewed by the Regional SSO teams and the RPPM prior to submission to ensure the top safety projects from each Region are submitted for evaluation and that the submissions are limited to projects that are eligible for HSIP funding. We are expecting to receive a higher number of projects this time around. As in the FFY13 solicitation, a cap for each region is suggested = 2 X Annual Regional HSIP allocation per year. The cap is used to limit the number of submissions; it is not a rigid standard and a Region will be able to exceed the cap if it is reasonable and justified.
Summary of Changes to Guidance

There are no significant changes to the HSIP application requirements. We essentially closed a few gaps in information and clarified some issues identified during the review process. A summary of the changes to the HSIP application are listed below.

- Additional data is requested on the application form including PIN, sponsor name and address, HSIP funds requested, other project funding sources, project schedule, and LOS and hours of delay improvements for capacity benefits.
- A vicinity/location map and a project map showing existing and proposed conditions is now required.
- Clarified that crash reductions in the application must be annualized.
- Clarified that costs and benefits used in Safety B/C should be limited to the project elements for which HSIP funds are being requested.
- HSIP Application Form was modified to identify elements required for site specific vs. systemic projects.
- The project should be delivered within the program period. Please note, in considering projects for FFY 14 funds, priority will be given to projects that can be let in FFY 2014. This means a PS&E should be ready no later than August of 2014.

Approach

For FFY14, NYSDOT will allocate approximately $40M in available HSIP funds for centrally managed proposals to be selected statewide. This statewide solicitation will be used to support safety specific projects that direct safety funds where they are most needed by targeting locations, corridors, or areas demonstrating the highest benefit-cost ratios to reduce fatal and severe injury crashes. Funding will be awarded based on an evaluation of these projects to maximize investment in the most cost-effective safety projects. Successful proposals will be consistent with the strategies and emphasis areas identified in the NYS Strategic Highway Safety Plan. Both targeted and systematic projects will be considered.

As stated above, funding will be awarded for projects statewide that provide the highest benefit-cost based on safety evaluation criteria. The purpose of the program is to fund the most beneficial/important projects in the state. As such, there is no guarantee that every Region will receive funding.

Projects approved for an award must adhere to the following:
- Successful projects will need to be amended to the new TIP/STIP after 10/1/13 if it is not already included in this document.
- Provision of local matching funds and cost over-runs where applicable, will be the responsibility of the sponsor.
- Post implementation evaluation of the project will be the responsibility of the sponsor. Regions are responsible for entering project data on state projects into the Post Implementation Evaluation System (PIES). The methodology for local projects will be developed and communicated in the near future.
Program Goals

The purpose of this program is to facilitate the goals and strategies set forth in the Strategic Highway Safety Plan and progress the best transportation proposals that reduce fatal and severe injury crashes, regardless of ownership, mode (pedestrians, motorcycle/bicycles, grade crossings, etc.) or geographic restriction within the statewide funds available.

Evaluation/Scoring

Proposals are limited to 20 pages and will be evaluated against the broadly defined criteria outlined below by the NYSDOT Safety and System Optimization Team. This team will review each application and recommend a prioritized list of proposals to the Comprehensive Program Team (CPT) and to the Commissioner for consideration and approval.

Proposals for site specific safety improvements, as well as systemic safety improvements of Centerline Audible Roadway Delineators (CARDS) and Pedestrian Countdown Timers, will be considered for the FFY14 evaluation.

Minimum Criteria

The minimum criteria below must be met or the project will not advance for consideration and scoring.

- The project should be delivered within the program period. Please note, in considering projects for FFY 14 funds, priority will be given to projects that can be let in FFY 2014. This means a PS&E should be ready no later than August of 2014. See HSIP Statewide Solicitation Timeline below for FFY14 dates.

- Proposals shall include a completed SP-1 form to provide an overall description, location, traffic volume, cost, environmental process, permits needed, etc.

- The project must be clearly defined.

- The project must meet the funding requirements for the HSIP and align with the Strategic Highway Safety Plan emphasis areas. Project proposals should employ a data driven approach in selecting locations or programs and appropriate countermeasures.

Project Scope

Proposals shall explain if the project is part of a larger effort to improve safety along a corridor as well as quantify other benefits that may be gained from the project.
Benefit/Cost

Proposals will identify the potential return on the transportation investment by providing a detailed benefit/cost analysis such as that described in the Safety Investigations Procedures Manual (TE164a and TE204a). Documentation of this analysis needs to be provided on or with the SP-1 form. Specific reductions for fatal, severe injury and total crashes should be outlined. Costs should include project development costs (design, etc.) that have not been incurred yet.

General Benefit/Cost Guidance

- Method I or Method II from the Safety Investigations Procedure Manual are the preferred crash reduction methods.
- For reduction calculations, use DOT Crash Reduction Factors first, then the CMF Clearinghouse, then other studies.
- Crash costs should be from those published by DOT — "Average Accident Costs/Severity Distribution" Report.
- B/C Calculations should be done for Safety Benefits.
- Costs used in the analysis should include Construction, Real Estate, and Engineering costs.
- Service life should be based on the design life of major safety elements or Pavement Management System service life.
- An updated "Table 1. - Improvement Service Life" from the HSIP Procedures and Techniques Manual is attached and includes Capital Recovery Factors for a given service life at a 4% interest rate. Please use the updated Capital Recovery Factors when calculating cost.
- We recommend that the Regional Safety Evaluation Engineer review the accident reduction factors used on the benefit/cost calculations.
- An electronic version of the Te164a and Te204a forms are attached to assist with the benefit/cost calculations.

Additional Safety Benefits

If included in the project, the proposal shall describe measures that provide enhanced safety for special users. Features that could enhance safety such as addressing driver/user behavior issues or implementing educational campaigns should also be described.

Involvement of Safety Partners

Proposals should identify how external safety partners were engaged in the process. This could include involvement of local enforcement agencies, Traffic Safety Boards, local safety planning agencies such as MPOs, community groups or others to address education, enforcement and emergency services issues.
Process

As referenced above, proposals must be submitted to the Main Office by March 30 for FFY 14. Proposals must address the broadly defined evaluation criteria outlined above. The Safety and System Optimization Team will evaluate and score these proposals, and recommend a prioritized list of projects to the Commissioner for consideration. The Commissioner will approve the final list of projects to be funded.

**HSIP Statewide Solicitation Timeline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HSIP Solicitation Project Applications for FFY 14 due to Main Office</td>
<td>March 30, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSIP Solicitation Project approvals for FFY 14 are provided to the Regions/MPO's**</td>
<td>May 30, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** FFY 14 projects will be amended to the new TIP/STIP after 10/1/13

Application Submission

Please submit one joint, mutually agreed upon set of projects from your Region/MPO supplied by the RPPM's office. Send the completed SP-1 Application and all supporting materials to me by March 30, 2013 for FFY 2014.

RLD

cc: Comprehensive Program Team
    Regional Directors
    Todd Westhuis, Director - Office of Traffic Safety and Mobility