

**ULSTER COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL  
Technical Committee Meeting**

**Meeting Summary**

May 10, 2012

SUNY Ulster, Stone Ridge, NY

**Members**

<b>Present:</b>	Joel Brink	Town of Ulster
	Jim Bruno	Town of Saugerties
	Robert DiBella	UCAT
	Andrew Emrich	Ulster County DPW
	Glenn Gidaly	Barton & Loguidice
	Jack Hohman	New York State Transit Authority
	Jill LaFera-Poppel	Town of Rosendale
	Herb Litts	Town of Lloyd
	Bruce Loertscher	Town of Plattekill
	Richard Peters	New York State Department of Transportation
	Edward Pine	Ulster County DPW
	James S. Quigley, III	Town of Ulster
	Kristen Resnikoff	New York State Transit Authority
	Sue Ronga	Ulster County DPW
	Toni Roser	Kingston Citibus
	Mary Sheeley	Village of Ellenville
	Gregg Swanzey	City of Kingston
	Alex Wade	Village of Saugerties
	Fred Zimmer	Town of Esopus

**UCTC Staff**

<b>Present:</b>	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. Mr. Greg Swanzey noted that the I587 and Albany Avenue study was recently unanimously endorsed by the Kingston Common Council. He also provided an update on the Washington Avenue sinkhole in the City of Kingston. He noted that this is a significant problem due to the volume of traffic that Washington Ave/Rt. 32 handles on a regular basis. The repair is likely to require a costly solution that may reach close to \$1million. The City is preparing an application for emergency Federal funding sources for infrastructure resiliency which may provide up to 80% reimbursement for the costs of the repair.

There were no further comments from citizens.

## **APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 9, 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 Joel Brink; second by Susan Ronga.** Mr. Bruce Loertscher mentioned that he believed a member from Plattekill was indeed in attendance at this meeting (staff review of the audio roll call and sign in sheet found no member from Plattekill present). No further discussion. **All in favor; none opposed – motion carried.**

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **a) REMOVAL OF PROJECTS FROM THE UCTC FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR (FFY) 2011-2015 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP).**

Mr. Slack reviewed the following PINs from the TIP that are recommended for removal. At the request of NYSDOT staff, PIN 817743 – Route 209/Rochester Creek Bridge Replacement Town of Rochester BIN 1040750 has been withdrawn; BIN 1040750 will be done under a newer “Maintenance by Contract” project. Total Federal Funding Change Requested from \$0.120m to \$0. 8TRU16 – Capital Cost of Contracting Grant for the Adirondack Trailways Bus System will also be withdrawn due to project redundancy. 8TRU28 – Purchase of Seven (7) 35 Foot Transit Buses With Low Floor For the Ulster County Bus System will be withdrawn due to lack of funding.

Mr. Slack asked Mr. Robert DiBella of UCAT to explain further the withdrawal of 8TRU28. Mr. DiBella noted that these are 5311 funds, which were never obligated. Mr. Jim Quigley asked Mr. DiBella ‘which agency has the responsibility to [obligate the funds?’ Mr. DiBella noted that it was an old grant that was submitted to the State of New York for Federal funds, but the grant was never approved.

Mr. Slack concluded by noting that these TIP deletions are part of an ongoing effort to clean up the FFY 2011-2015 TIP. Miss Susan Ronga asked NYSDOT staff if the funds from 817743 Route 209/Rochester Creek would be available for other projects in the MPO. Mr. Peters noted that it would returned back to the 7-county pot of money and it would not be available for local projects. Mr. Doyle asked if Mr. Peters could explain how additional funds were recently secured for a different local project, that of South Putt Corners Road. In that instance, the county was short of money for the preliminary engineering and design

phase, so DOT searched for funds to make the difference. Route 303 in Rockland County, which utilizes the same fund source, was altered in a manner that allowed funds to be transferred to the S. Putt Corners project. Mr. Doyle stressed that County DPW needs to be aware that this project will require a supplemental contract and that process should be initiated right away. Mr. Glenn Gidaly noted that there are several local projects that could benefit from offsets and if, in the instance of the Rochester Creek bridge, could those funds be reserved for other Ulster County offsets? It was explained that offsets are being identified on a region-wide basis, not on a county-wide or MPO basis. Mr. Doyle noted his concern that the Rochester Creek bridge is a concern due to the flooding and debris risk. Therefore, maintenance work alone may not be adequate to address the needs of this specific bridge, particularly due to the fluvial geomorphology inherent in the area. Mr. Gidaly asked at what point a community should request an offset from the MPO? Mr. Doyle noted that the sooner, the better; further, a TIP update will begin this summer and offsets can be programmed at that time.

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

**b) ADMINISTRATIVE MODIFICATIONS TO THE UCTC FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR (FFY) 2011-2015 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP).**

Proposed administrative modifications listed here are each for UCAT projects; the first is to add phases to 8TRU50 through FFY 2013 to accommodate new and existing 5311 grant awards. It was noted that the funding sources listed in the TIP strip in the agenda supplement should be revised to reflect 5311 as the source (from “FTA 5307” to “FTA 5301/5311”).

The project description of 8TRU61 would be revised to reflect the types of buses that UCAT plans to invest in the future (cutaway buses) and the obligation date of one phase would be changed to 5/12 to allow for phase obligation during FFY 2012. Mr. DiBella noted that this is in line with a near-term UCAT goal of downsizing the fleet. Finally, at the request of NYS Transit Authority, 8TRU14 should be “split” into two separate projects, one for Project Administration and one for Preventive Maintenance.

There were no comments or questions; items presented for information and discussion purposes only.

**c) 2010 CENSUS URBANIZED AREAS.**

Mr. Doyle noted that Census urbanized areas are important for a number of reasons, one of which includes functional class designation associated with urbanized areas affects the use of FEMA funds for emergency reimbursement. It remains to be seen how rural major collector roads will be defined under the new transportation bill with respect to project funding and emergency reimbursement.

The US Census Bureau recently released new Urbanized Area boundaries for the region. Mr. Slack provided a series of maps illustrating the changes between the 2000 and 2010 Census-delineated urbanized areas. He noted that the term “urban area” as used by the Census Bureau refers generically to urbanized areas of 50,000 or more population and urban clusters of at least 2,500 and less than 50,000 population. Criteria to identify urbanized areas are based on a set of factors including Census tract and block population density, count, and size thresholds, as well as other geographic, statistical and anecdotal information including: land cover, functioning airport with an annual enplanement of at least

2,500 passengers and is within 0.5 miles to the urban area; and clear, well-defined place names. Urbanized areas are eligible for Metropolitan Planning Organization designation when they reach 50,000 or more persons. Full definition of the urbanized area designation methodology used by the US Census Bureau can be found online at <http://www.census.gov/geo/www/ua/fedregv76n164.pdf>.

Federal Highway Administration urbanized areas are different from those defined by the US Census. SAFETY-LU stipulates that MPOs must as a minimum contain the urbanized area boundary delineated by the US Census; however, those boundaries can then be “smoothed” in order to more accurately reflect physical conditions on the ground and other conditions particular to the local transportation network. MPO/FHWA urbanized area boundaries should also attempt to consider anticipated growth over a 20 year time period.

Mr. Slack pointed out several notable changes on the map including: increases in Walker Valley; noticeable declines in Ellenville; and a small portion of the Kingston UA stretching into Greene County. The biggest change to the new Census 2010 urbanized area boundary is a large area that now stretches into Hurley up the Rt. 28 and Rt. 375 corridors into Woodstock.

Mr. Slack concluded by summarizing important MPO benchmarks with regard to the new boundaries. Existing MPOs are required to expand their Metropolitan Planning Areas (MPAs) to include all territory in Census 2010 UZAs before the next regularly-scheduled Long Range Transportation Plan update (scheduled to occur in 2015). The existing MPO FHWA urbanized area boundary based on Census 200 will continue to apply until a new one is submitted to the FHWA by the MPO and approved. The UCTC is responsible for designation/redefinition of the boundary in the Kingston urbanized area and the Poughkeepsie/New Paltz urbanized area. In the past, urbanized areas outside of these two primary urbanized areas are typically signed-off by local municipalities.

Mr. Doyle concluded noted that Census determinations do affect funding sources; to that end, we need to determine how the changes to these boundaries will be reflected in the FHWA’s programs and policies with regard to funding of roads and highways. Mr. Peters noted that the functional class of roads will be updated when boundaries are updated. Eligibility for federal aid may change at that point in time. (49:00)

**d) FFY 2011-2015 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP): New York Works Projects; NYSDOT Capital program update; FFY 2012 project status**

Mr. Peters began describing the New York Works program in the Hudson Valley; there are three components: bridge projects; highway resurfacing; and “signature projects.” There is only one signature project in the region and that is located on Spring Brook Parkway over Rt. 119 in Westchester County. Regarding roadway resurfacing, each region was given a benchmark of pavement lane miles to perform through the program which helped to establish the process of identifying candidate roads. In Ulster County, the NY Works paving program will include the following road segments (in addition to the regularly-scheduled paving program): Rt. 32 from Walkill River north to the City of Kingston; Rt 9W from Lloyd/Esopus to Clay Road; 9W north of Rt. 199 to Rt 32 in Saugerties; and Rt. 300 from Rt. 208 to the NYS Thruway in Orange County. These projects will begin approximately in May.

The selection process for NY Works bridge projects did not identify any structures in Ulster County. Regarding the paving project on Rt. 9w north of Rt. 199, Supervisor Quigley noted that the Town of Ulster was advised of this project within the last week. The Town is in the design phase of replacing 1,800 feet of sewer line on this portion of Rt 9w. Any work performed would invariably have to be removed again for the sewer work to take place. Mr. Richards suggested simply leaving this section of road out of the paving project. Mr. Quigley asked who the best person to coordinate these project with would be; Mr. Peters replied that the best thing to do is to send the Regional Director Gorton a note regarding the issue. Regarding the Rt. 9w project in Lloyd, Mr. Doyle noted that CSX will be doing work in the area. Any detours will have to be closely coordinated with CSX and local and county officials; there are few detours in this area.

Mr. Doyle noted that there will be a variety of detours associated with maintenance work to be performed at CSX crossings over the coming weeks; a master schedule will be circulated detailing anticipated timelines for the work.

Mr. Peters noted that the work will be a combination of “mill and fill” work and 3-quarter inch paving.

(1:01:00)

Regarding the 2012-2016 Capital Program update, Mr. Peters ...

#### **OTHER/OLD BUSINESS**

None provided

#### **ANNOUNCEMENTS/PROJECT UPDATES**

None provided

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at approximately 12:15

~bcs