

**ULSTER COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL
Technical Committee Meeting**

DRAFT Meeting Summary
August 15, 2012
SUNY Ulster, Stone Ridge, NY

Members

Present:

Alan Adin	City of Kingston
David Bolles	Ulster County DPW
Mark Boungard	Trailways
Joel Brink	Town of Ulster
Andrew Emrich	Ulster County DPW
Glenn Gidaly	Barton & Loguidice
Paul Hansut	Town of Lloyd
Liam Kahn	Town of Woodstock
Herb Litts	Town of Lloyd
Patrick McConnell	New York State Thruway Authority
Kelly Myers	Town of Saugerties
Richard Peters	New York State Department of Transportation
Edward Pine	Ulster County DPW
Kristen Resnikoff	New York State Thruway Authority
Sue Ronga	Ulster County DPW
Michael Smith	New Paltz Regional Chamber of Commerce
Gregg Swanzey	City of Kingston
Ralph Swenson	City of Kingston
Kristen Wilson	Cornel Cooperative Ext of Ulster County

UCTC Staff

Present:

Sweta Basnet	UCTC Staff
Dennis Doyle	UC Planning Board/UCTC Staff
Brian C. Slack	UCTC Staff

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Dennis Doyle at 10:00am. Those in attendance introduced themselves.

CALL FOR CITIZEN COMMENTS

Mr. Doyle called for public comments. There were no comments from citizens.

APPROVAL OF MAY 10, 2012 TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY

Mr. Doyle asked for a motion to adopt the meeting summary from the previous Technical Committee Meeting. **Motion made by Mr. Brink; second by Ms. Ronga. All in favor; none opposed – motion carried.**

NEW BUSINESS

DRAFT RESOLUTION 2012-12: APPORTIONMENT OF FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR 2012 FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION (FTA) SECTION 5307 FORMULA FUNDS IN THE MID-HUDSON VALLEY TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT AREA (MHVTMA):

Draft Resolution 2012-11 is for distribution of the FTA 5307 funds in the TMA to the Public Operators within the TMA and the Inter-County Commuter bus services. The preliminary Ulster County share for the public operators is \$827,668 and the Inter-County Commuter bus services is \$1,543,108. These funds may change pending alteration of the 2010 UZA 89 Poughkeepsie--Newburgh, NY—NJ boundary, which now includes portions of New Jersey.

Mr. Slack stated that figures shown on the screen are accurate and have been updated. Mr. Doyle stated there was not rush for this because the grants for this program of projects are already in and can't be amended at this time. Mr. Doyle stated this money is whacked up between the three MPOs of Ulster, Orange and Dutchess. The source of the funding is transit funds that come from National Transit Database. Commuter carriers carry the bulk of this. Mr. Doyle stated the Transportation Councils in the region have agreed to a methodology for distribution to designated recipients in Dutchess, Orange, Ulster and MTA, as well as commuter operators based on preventative maintenance needs, which are filed under a 17A report. Mr. Doyle stated the councils have agreed to keep 10% back for open competition. There is \$3.2 million remaining in the competition pot and we will be going to competition for that money. Mr. Doyle stated that TMA met last week to discuss this and there will be a call for transit related projects by October or November. Mr. Slack stated a full description of the call for projects was on pages 4 and 5 of the agenda. Mr. Doyle stated \$18 million available. \$829,214 is available in Ulster County and for the commuter operators in Ulster County is \$1.4.

Barring no further discussion or inquiries, a motion was requested to forward the resolution to the Policy Committee for consideration. Motion made by Joel Brink; second by Susan. Ronga. **All in favor; none opposed – motion carried.**

b) DRAFT RESOLUTION 2012-13: DISTRIBUTION OF THE FFY2012 FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION SECTION 5307/5340 URBANIZED AREA APPORTIONMENTS ATTRIBUTABLE TO THE KINGSTON URBANIZED AREA:

UCTC proposes a percentage each designated recipient will receive concerning the allocation of FFY 2010 FTA Section 5307/5340 funds. The proposed distribution of FFY 2012 FTA Section 5307/5340 Small Urban funds between UCAT and Citibus has not been determined. The most recent proportion was 50/50, however earlier proportions were 60/40 (UCAT/Citibus).

Mr. Doyle stated the draft resolution is for the urbanized area responsible for formation of the transportation council, the Kingston urbanized area. Kingston also receives 5307 funds and 5340 funds. FFY 2012 just published for these monies. We've been having discussions with the two designated recipients, UC & Kingston, regarding amount of funds distributed to each. We have no agreement between 2 designated recipients on how this will be divided.. Typically the Council will accept what the recipients agree upon. We would like to move this to the Policy Committee for consideration and are hoping to have an agreement by that time. The agreement portion is blank, in the past it has been 50/50. Mr. Slack added that the formula has ranged, it is not always 50/50. Mr. Doyle stated there has been some discussion on changing the formula for distributing the money, but we do not have the final agreement.

Kelly Myers asked who serves on the Policy Committee? Mr. Doyle stated the current committee has permanent members from communities that make up the urbanized areas (City of Kingston, Town of Saugerties and DOT), and other members are scattered towns and villages from around the county and serve on a rotating 2-year basis. Mr. Slack stated he had a roster and list of voting members is also posted on the website. Mr. Doyle continued that we also have a representative from the very rural towns who is selected by the Supervisor's Association. The Policy Committee is the approval body of the Transportation Council.

Barring no further discussion or inquiries, a motion was requested to forward the resolution to the Policy Committee for consideration. Motion made by Rich Peters; second by Joel Brink. **All in favor; none opposed – motion carried.**

c) MOVING AHEAD FOR PROGRESS IN THE 21ST CENTURY: AN OVERVIEW OF MAP-21: MAP-21 extends current law (SAFETEA-LU) for the remainder of FY 2012, with new provisions for FY 2013 and beyond taking effect on October 1, 2012. Funding levels are maintained at FY 2012 levels, plus minor adjustments for inflation. The funding level maintains the existing 80/20 split between highway and transit programs – \$40.4 billion from the Highway Trust Fund (HTF) for FY 2013, and \$41.0 billion for FY 2014; \$10.578 billion for transit in FY 2013 and \$10.695 billion in FY 2014. A comprehensive overview of the legislation will be provided by UCTC staff.

Mr. Doyle stated the Transportation Council operated for almost 11 years under transportation authorization known as SAFETLU. Congress has passed a new authorization for transportation funding. Not so dramatic changes– some relate directly to transit. It's a 2 year authorization with an 18 months to make rules. The bill is authorized for 2 yrs and the agencies have 18 months to issue rules in which to use it. There are many unanswered questions, but there are some changes that are key to the bill. Mr. Doyle asked what happens to small MPOs? He continued that there were discussions on establishing larger MPOs. This bill continues the UCTC as it is. There is a 200,000 population threshold.

Mr. Slack stated he prepared about 30 slides. The law MAP21 was signed by President Obama on July 26th. Since then we have been sifting through the details to determine what does this mean for our constituents. Mr. Slack has been involved in webinars and conference calls to discuss.

Mr. Slack stated we wanted to give credit to Rich Perrin from the Genessee Council. There have been biweekly conference calls with all other MPO Directors and this has been a major topic of discussion.

Mr. Slack stated that SAFETLU was originated by Congress in 2005 and expired in 2009. The new MAP21 (Moving Ahead for Progress) is supposed to last 27 months up until Sept 30 2014. Mr. Slack stated the majority of provisions are not effective till Oct 1, 2012. There were a total of 10 continuing resolutions under SAFETLU so we are pleased to have a new bill in place. Mr. Slack stated that a number of non-transportation provisions were added to the law such as ext of a low interest rate for student loans and reauthorization of the flood insurance program, but for the most part this is a straight-forward transportation bill.

Mr. Slack stated that funding levels are maintained at 2012 levels with an approximate 5% increase for inflation. Annual funding is roughly \$52 Billion Mr. Slack stated that over time, SAFETLU averaged about \$51 Billion, TEA21 in 1998, was \$34 Billion per year, therefore funding has been consistently increasing, but we are hitting a plateau. Mr. Slack stated while there is a slight increase in funding it is unclear if it will be enough with an aging transportation system and will keep up with inflation. Mr. Slack stated the split is roughly 80 for highways and 20 for transit, which equals roughly \$40 Billion for highway and \$10 Billion for transit. Mr. Slack stated the Bill contains no earmarks and most discretionary programs are eliminated, which is a major change from SAFETLU. (17:31)

Mr. Slack stated that under MAP21, 92.6% of appropriation funds are by formula, as compared to 83% under SAFETLU. He stated there is a new approach to funding for allocations and apportionment formulas. Mr. Slack stated that prior to MAP21 each apportion program had its own formula for distribution and each state's total was the lump sum of all those formulas combined. Mr. Slack stated that the MAP21 approach to distribution is based on the amount of funds each state received under SAFETLU. The bill includes more flexibility on how states can spend money. It also consolidates 80+ programs down to 30+ programs. Mr. Slack stated in order to make this happen \$18.8 Billion was transferred from the general fund, as part of appropriations for 2013-14, and \$2.4 Billion was transferred from LUST (leaking underground storage tank fund) to the highway transportation fund. Motor fuel taxes and tire taxes have been extended through 2016 and heavy vehicle use tax have been extended through 2017. (19:34)

Mr. Slack stated there were pension funding stabilization offsets, new tobacco products offsets, and modified rules for financial institutions.

Highway program

Mr. Slack stated there are four core formula programs: national highway performance, surface transportation, highway safety improvement and CMAC program. (20:45) Also Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP), which is in large part the former TEA program and Metro Planning Program.

(22:30) Mr. Slack stated the National Highway performance program - \$3.264 billion over 2 yrs are funds dedicated to NYS allocated 2013-2014, through a formula system to the MPOs. This program consolidates interstate maintenance, national highway system and the highway bridge program. The Fed transportation dept stresses much more flexibility in how the money is spent. One significant change is the expansion of the national highway system to principle arterials, strategic highway network, and intermodal connectors. It adds several highways to national system. US 44 Lloyd, 44/55 WAW to NP, 299NP to Lloyd Ulster Ave, Flatbush Town of Ulster. Increased design standards...Mr. Peters explained level of fed appr that if there is a project on the natls hwy sys over a million dollars direct fed review of it.

Mr. Slack asked if there were design standards. Mr. Peters answered not really. (25:25)...someone asked Mr. Slack how the projects were selected. He answered that Sweta Basnet created & maintained a list that is kept in our database. Functional classification is volume of traffic that roads can handle over time.

A member asked how far out on 32 does the Flatbush go Mr. Slack stated it connects up to Route 199 through the town & city.

One other standard included throughout are new performance measurement standards the state and MPO will have to abide by which will mean more reporting for state & mpos. Annual obligation report already in place, shows how well spending federal dollars.

Surface transportation program cont flex funding for fed aid hws plus safety and bridges on any public roads. We eligibility for transportation enhancements such as rec trails ferry boats, safe routes to school but will there be money for this compared to the needs of the system. Changes dist allocation from 62% to 50% - but it equals more money coming to mpos. Rural provisions are enhanced and 15% of rural sub provisions may be spent on minor collector roads. Mr. Doyle clarified that rural enhancement Has to be for federal aid highways.

Highway safety improvement – reduced fatalities – must implement safety plan – keeps rail/highway grade crossing set aside. Removes the high risk rural road set asides unless a safety statistic worsens on those roads. Law states any roadway functionally classified as a rural major or minor collector or a rural local road where fatalities exceeds statewide avg they will continue to rec funding. Mr. Peters clarified that the high risk rural road was a good idea when they came up with it, but did not apply well. Most money was never spent. Continuation of same thing from SAFETLU.

Mr. Slack stated that CMAC continues to provide funds to states to reduce congestion and improve air quality. States can focus on targeted metro regions instead of across the state and has also been expanded to include particulate matter. Mr. Peters stated they were waiting on the rules on this. Right now can use CMAC for transit svc but only if new svc during first three years...would like to expand. Mr. Peter's stated that years ago there was a concern that UC would become non-attainment. The rules have changed now DC will be losing CMAC coming into the future. Mr. Doyle stated OC retains it on particulates. Mr. Peters stated it was determined that because they were adjacent they were non-attainment for particulates.

Mr. Slack stated the former TEA program paid for implementation for many projects and has been eliminated. We now have Transportation Alternatives Program that will supply \$56 million in 2013 and 2014 consolidates current programs within ROW of former interstates is a new component of the program. 30-35% in funding from what we had under TEA. 50% Money will be sub-allocated directly to MPOs and the other 50% is allocated to the state, they have the option to transfer those funds. Mr. Peters stated take \$56 million divide by 2, then divide by 11 regions around the state.

Mr. Slack stated he couldn't help but feel there was a catch-22 theme in Map-21, we are given more flexibility but there is less money to spend. Mr. Peters stated the Feds want to put more money into the Highway system. A member asked about surface funding for safe routes & trails but is that only on fed aid highways? Mr. Slack stated that remains to be seen. Mr. Peters stated that much won't be clear until the rules are written. He added that surface transportation funds can always be used for these types of projects. Sidewalks and trails are now in competition with collapsed bridges. Mr. Doyle stated that Safe

Routes to School used to be funded at 100% now is funded at 80%. Mr. Peters stated Safe Routes to School was a great idea, but the practical application was difficult. 42:40

Mr. Slack stated that metropolitan planning was staying basically the same and he added that there will be a new MPO starting in Watertown, NY in the next several months. Mr. Slack stated that one rule “written in there” is MPOS with transportation management areas must include representation by public transportation, which would include UCAT & CitiBus. We are not sure if they will have to be voting members or not.

Mr. Slack - New performance targets we will be asked for measurable goals, new trans plan due in 2+ yrs.

Mr. Slack stated that other notable highway provisions: transportation, infrastructure, financial & innovation act – large urban & rapidly growing urban areas have been looking at this and there continues to be funding and guarantees funding for complicated multi-modal where financing would normally be difficult (Tappansee Br)

TIGER grants – City of Kingston had an application –\$500million in 2013 only – no funding for 2014. This has made for some significant projects. There are new tolling and pricing provisions, emergency relief at \$100 million per year. National freight policy. New Performance management goals integrated throughout. USDOT will set goals for states & states will work with the mpos in gathering info & setting targets. No penalty for not meeting goals.

Transit – only figures for 2013 – focus on fed figures provides funding increase for inflation for fed transit progs. 10.5 b in 2013 10.7 bil 2014 - consolidation of programs across the board . Maintains existing 80/20 split between highway & transit. contains some changes to program funding. (48:12)J ARC program consolidated into urban area (5307) program. New Freedom prog consolidated into elderly & disabled program. Highway funding increased 3 to4%, transit increased 10 to12% for inflation.

Susan Ronga asked Why so much funding for buses, but no roads or bridges for buses to travel over? Mr. Slack stated that was a good point. Mr. Peters stated that transit systems in other areas of the country have expanded greatly. In our area transit needs are so great – NY Metro area – 30 or 50 % of transit in US. It is a benefit to us. Problem is they are not adequately increasing funding for transit or highways. There has been a slight excess of transit funding. In Orange Co they are transferring some transit funds to highway side to build park-n-ride lots. Locally working on figuring that out. DOT & MetroNorth running ferry which began with highway funds that were transferred, now using 5307 money with ferry discretionary funds. Amount of transit in Hudson Valley doesn't make much of a difference on roads and bridges.

What is the philosophy behind this? It's a public policy shift – rural relies more on public transportation than cities. As a rural community we need roads and bridges, we need transportation as well seems that more money going to transportation but we need roads and bridges fixed too. Mr. Doyle stated if you look at the country a majority lives in an urbanized area, take that with Mr. Peter's comments . If you are local you will pay for local infrastructure yourself.

Denning or Hardenburgh – no state highway – not functional classified – on your own. Mr. Doyle asked what this means on the bridge side. Mr. Peters all federally owned bridges are still eligible on the

stateside. There are a lot of bridges and not enough money to fix them all. So it must be decided which bridges need it most. Many bridges built in the 1960s – makes them 50 yrs old – bridges have a 50-yr lifespan. \$25-40 million to fix – trying to keep them painted. Mr. Peters used the Wurt's Street bridge as an example. There is not enough money from fed & state perspective to fix all.

State DOT taking a much larger part maintaining local roads & bridges? Mr. Peters stated there isn't enough money to maintain the state highway system. State contributes to local, chips & some multi-modal, doesn't really cover that much. Fixing fiscal problems by passing costs down. Mr. Peters added that he didn't see anything dramatic happening in the near future. Bridges are a concern, hard to predict when they will fail.

Mr. Herb Litts noted that we have a unique situation coming up with Replacement of Tappenzee Bridge – putting up 12-16 sections designed for 75-100 yr life. When they build the new bridge these will be scrapped. Should bring up to mpo. 2000 panels most are 50 footers except for 6 that are 100-footers. Ulster County could benefit from these instead of them going for scrap. Talk to Erie county who will be taking advantage of the Boston .. project.

Mr. Slack stated there was some good news - project streamlining can be categorical exclusions– category of actions that do not cumulatively or individually have an adverse affect on the environment. exDon't need eis or environmental assessment. Highway resurfacing, restoration or rehab, adding shoulders or lanes.

National goals or performance measures will be promulgated at federal level and trickle down. National freight policy but no associated funding. National freight strategic plan & network.

Conclusions – overall effort to streamline is encouraging but it appears the funding is inadequate – falls short of expectations. Large project funding. Funding is not guaranteed. Propped up with general fund dollars. End of 2014 we will be in a tight situation. General consensus – bill is falling short and fails to move the country forward. Better than nothing. Looking for guidance in next 18 mos. New summary positions coming every month. Oct 1 no more SAFETLU – will become MAP-21. Large documents avail to view. These will be available on our website along with today's presentation. Mr. Peters stated that on Oct 1st we have all the old fund sources and all the new ones – what do we do with them? Automatically convert old to new. We'll go under old rules until we get the new rules.

Mr. Glenn Gidaly commented on the Asset management planning component. He stated that almost every component requires asset management plans to show they are looking at bridges, etc Potentially positive part of this.

d) UCTC FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR (FFY) 2011-2015 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) UPDATE:

UCTC continues to revise its TIP document based on resolutions and administrative amendments made in 2012. Progress with regard to document revisions and project updates will be reviewed and discussed. Implications with regard to Unobligated FFY 12 project funds and NYSDOT's Beyond Preservation Justification process as it applies to new and ongoing projects will also be discussed

Mr. Doyle stated that we continue to amend the TIP. Some communities may have gotten letters from the region concerning Beyond Preservation – state’s move to look at preservation beyond preservation. A couple bridges from DPW, sidewalks for Town of Shawangunk and Tillson Ave project in Town of Lloyd. He asked how many responded to that?

Mr. Peters stated the dept adopted preservation as main emphasis in this program. They also looked at local program & identified projects as beyond preservation. When update was done in 2011 – filled out forms for state projects & did draft for local projects. Forms with questions were sent back to municipalities for clarification. A committee in Albany office will determine if project is good for this. (gets Marchiselli funds) if not good project the dept will not participate. Mr. Doyle stated assuming M funds avail what will they do ? Peters – not enough M funds for all projects. Trying to do preservation. An attempt to steer everyone towards preservation. Mr. Peters used Abeel St as an example of preservation projects that need to be done. It was so far along in the process it wouldn’t make sense to say not to do it. Also – can we do other things to get 10 more years besides replacing a bridge. Need to identify safety problems. May have problems that aren’t clear.

Mr. Peters - We got stuff on the TIP that people have worked on so we can’t say forget about it – the hard part is getting people to down scope. A member asked What if projects are being pulled off the TIP – what happens to money already spent? Mr. Peters answered if you are in the design phase the design report chooses the alternative that you will do & you won’t have to pay the Fed back. The Fed will be understanding as long as you have a good reason and document that decision.

Mr. Slack distributed a handout with tables that Mr. Doyle stated would be on our website. The 2014-2018 UCTC Trans Imp Prog – projects slated to be obligated in 2013. The final page is unobligated funds for FFY 2012. Local road proj – Rosendale Park-n-ride lots – tongore rd, Mr. Doyle stated we remain in negotiations with consultants for the rail trail project.

Mr. Slack stated to pay attn to 2nd pg Denning Rd – DPW project – construction – ROW? Made significant transfers. Still getting consultant signed. Dennis – transfer additional money? No contract from DOT? No. Has material been sent? Brian – reach out to Doreen to see where the contract is. Books close in 4 weeks – takes us 8 weeks to get through the county. Sue Ronga – in the process.

Shawangunk? No rep. present

Saug – have to talk to Alex Wade – Dennis thinks this is an earmark – do they go away? Rich will check. He said earmarks used to stay around forever but may be redistributed...

Schwenk Drive – ROW

I-587 – Rich – not gonna happen (pushed 2017...no design till 2015)

NP park-n-ride

Crossing at Grant Ave

Leggs Mills park & ride lot – pushed out

CSW? Rich Peters stated programmed by Albany office

Saugerties park and ride lot? Dennis said he spoke with Kootz? Don’t have a location

Brian – NYSDOT met with Trailways to see what has been done in the past in that area.

Unobligated 2012 projects

Mr. Peters stated the list from State TIP – extracted by MPO – list for UC – remarks show obligated but not showing as such on STIP – will need to check. Most are misc phases – if can be obligated in next month – great – can't change anything officially – stuck with what we got. Stuff that doesn't happen this year rolls to next year – we keep chasing offsets if we don't spend the money. Obligate as much as possible.

Mr. Doyle wanted to discuss the rollover issue so there would not be offsets.

Mr. Peters stated we will be doing a TIP update, by Oct 2013 we should be good again.

Mr. Doyle stated that project sponsors should be rewarded for their efforts. Mr. Peter stated they were entitled to go – they are on the STIP but not ready to go. Mr. Doyle stated if the state spent the federal dollars and the projects go elsewhere to spend those federal dollars, the region should get the additional allocation to get those dollars back from the regions that have dollars to spend and shouldn't have to find offsets.

Mr. Peters stated there are two sets of books. We are talking about the STIP – authorizing doc – if it's not on the STIP in the year you want to do it – then it will not get done. If there is a problem with the STIP you have to find an offset. It is a consequence of the way we do business. Mr. Peters stated DOT has lost one and are in the process of losing a second from the local projects unit and they may not be replaced.

Mr. Doyle stated the message to local sponsors was obligate projects when you are supposed to.

A member asked What are you supposed to do when something isn't obligated? Have been actively pursuing design reports. Mr. Doyle stated it was a portion that wasn't obligated. Mr. Peters – you don't have design approval so you can't obligate ROW acquisition Guy – should be on 2013 list. Mr. Peters stated it should be offset because it was supposed to happen this year. Mr. Doyle When we redo TIP in 2013 we will add ROW acquisition . Mr. Peters - You haven't chosen the alternative that you need the design approval for.

Mr. Slack – moving forward with srts planning project – going over draft rfp issuing shortly for 2 munis in UC. Other projects include rail safety project on Boices Lane –Dennis added consultant approved currently contract at the county level – waiting for comments from Jim Rapoli anticipate by end of August we'll have the consultant under contract.

When 2012-2013 UPWP past we were working off est funds - \$27000 less than estimate – need to revise UPWP to reflect less money. Will be drawing from savings will not affect this years projects will need to amend..blahblah When we get into next year we will amend figures before we begin a new UPWP. Mr. Doyle stated that staff proposes – If we spend all UPWP there is 193K in savings we can draw from if we enter all the projects...

Glenn Gidaly requested clarification on safe routes to school He said that Ellenville has applied and hear the county planning dept will work with other munis to assist? Mr. Slack stated that we have had ? over last 2 yrs We work with 2 munis or school dist to do action plans: host of recommendations – 2 mile radius of a local school – sidewalks signage crossing – engineering component – look at programmatic side – see what school has ie: crossing guards, broader framework at dist level. Not associated with DOT

funding. When we complete these 2 programs it will put communities in strong ? for implementation. Will mail to high ? as well as ? to see if they want to participate in a program like this. Dennis coord ADA work required under law – signalized crossings – frustration with srts – but we need to keep in mind. Any one else applying ? Town of Lloyd. Not sure of Saug. c/o Kingston applying with CCE. Munis picked yet? Brian – no we are in a transitional phase – getting a consultant. Will do a mailing but it will take at least another month. WE have resources to work with 2 entities. Want to make it simple & straightforward. Mr. Doyle offered assistance if any community would like help understanding the project.

Next meeting in September – need a date from Mr. Peters. Brian said he would be in touch. Mr. Doyle stated the date of the Policy committee would be on our website.

OTHER/OLD BUSINESS

None provided

ANNOUNCEMENTS/PROJECT UPDATES

Mr. Slack stated these could be found on page 5. (Agenda item 6)

CITIZEN COMMENTS

1:52:18 Mr. Doyle asked if there were any additional citizen’s comments. Michael Smith of Town of New Paltz Regional Chamber of Commerce asked about the Carmine Liberta bridge. He added that route 299 crosses the 2 lane bridge and this bridge is key for commerce for New Paltz, Mohonk Mountain House and other economic activities in New Paltz. There is a heavy traffic flow and he would like this to be an urgent priority and wants the bridge to be in the system. Mr. Smith said he wants the bridge to be on the list for renovation or to add another lane. The bridge is central to everything. Mr. Doyle stated that bridge is not on the TIP at all and it is not R-rated and has not been listed as deficient. Mr. Smith said it is not just appearance –it’s really in need of work. He added that it’s not just cosmetic the bridge gets heavy volume of traffic and he is concerned of structural integrity. Mr. Doyle stated the council looks at R rated bridges (weight limit) and deficient bridges. He added this is a county bridge that crosses the Wallkill. Sweta Basnet said the condition rating is 4.16. The bridge had some work done November 2011 and was rated again in January 2012. Mr. Peters stated NYSDOT inspects public highway bridges every two years unless there is something wrong with them, and then they are inspected every year. Mr. Smith asked about looking at the appearance. Mr. Peters stated that would be a county matter, it’s a county road and touring route. DPW guy stated it’s in adequate structural condition and has been repaved. If the bridge were sand blasted and repainted it would close the bridge to one lane and would cost about \$300K, which is not in the county’s budget. Unless it affects the structural capability it has to be put aside. Sue Ronga stated it’s a choice between making a bridge look pretty or making it safe, then we will pick making a bridge safe.

Liam Kahn brought up Route 212 and stated they are still waiting for a response from Dot. Brian said right - SR212 Town of Woodstock – Supervisor wrote a letter to the region and we haven’t seen a response. Mr Peters said he saw a draft. Mr. Doyle stated if we see we will pass it along to the Supervisor. Mr. Kahn stated they are concerned about upcoming winter and are afraid Route 212 will have to close as it is a main back road.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at approximately 12:05

DRAFT