

**ULSTER COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL
Technical Committee Meeting**

Draft Meeting Summary

December 12, 2011

SUNY Ulster, Stone Ridge, NY

Members

Present:	Alan Adin**	City of Kingston Engineering Department
	David Bolles	UC Department of Public Works
	Joel Brink	Town of Ulster
	Jimmy Bruno	Town of Saugerties
	Vince Bruno**	Village of Saugerties
	Barbara Budik**	Town of Saugerties
	Ray Costantino	Town of Lloyd
	Bob DiBella	UC Area Transit
	Gerald Gavin	City of Kingston Engineering Department
	Jack Hohman	NYS Thruway Authority
	Toni Hokanson*	Town of New Paltz
	Joe Katz ⁺	Town of Gardiner
	Bruce Loertscher	Town of Plattekill
	Patrick McCarroll**	New York State Thruway Authority
	Richard Peters**	NYS DOT Region 8
	Ed Pine	UC Department of Public Works
	Jim Quigley*	Town of Ulster
	Sue Ronga**	UC Department of Public Works
	Clyde Russell	Town of Hurley
	Mary Sheeley* *	Village of Ellenville
	Ralph Swenson	City of Kingston
	Alex Wade	Village of Saugerties

Others

Present:	Kathy Nolan	UC Trails Advisory Committee
	Anne Noonan	New York Trailways

UCTC Staff

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

⁺Permanent Voting Member

*Current Voting Member (Until June 4, 2011)

** Voting Member Proxy

[^]Non-Voting Advisory Member

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 asked if there were any citizen's comments. There were no citizens' comments.

APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 19 TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY

Mr. Doyle asked for a motion to adopt the meeting summary from the previous Joint Policy and Technical Committee Meeting. **Motion to approve by Mr. Katz, seconded by Ms. Ronga. All in favor.**

NEW BUSINESS

Update of the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2011-2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP):

(4:15)

Mr. Doyle noted that one of the major reasons that the Technical Committee has been convened is to update where UCTC is in terms of FFY 2011-2015 TIP, particularly in light of the funding for that program going forward. Mr. Doyle then read a portion of a letter regarding reduced funding sent to NYS MPOs from NYSDOT Commissioner Joan McDonald on November 8, 2001:

“The regional planning targets on which the current MPO TIPs are based were distributed in December of 2009. At that time, NYSDOT believed that Congress would pass a new multiyear surface transportation bill to replace SAFETEA-LU, which expired in September of 2009. The December 2009 planning targets reflected increases to funding that has historically been received in previous federal transportation authorizing legislation. To date, Congress has not acted on long-term reauthorization legislation...”

Mr. Doyle noted that there continues to be no Congressional action to date and that we would not expect action probably until the end of this year or until early January. He continued:

“...federal funding has remained flat at Federal Fiscal Year 2010 funding levels. Federal funding may not grow significantly over the next several years. The previous planning targets issued in 2009 for FFY 2012 are 23 percent higher than this flat level and by FFY 2014 [those planning targets] are 61 percent higher than flat levels [now being considered]...it is clear that the planning targets that were used to develop the current TIPs are not likely to be funded. As a result, TIPs based on these levels need to be adjusted downward.”


With that as an introduction, Mr. Doyle then began to turn the floor over to Mr. Richard Peters (NYSDOT) to allow him to discuss some approaches to addressing the need to adjust TIP levels downward. Mr. Doyle further explained that NYSDOT's guidance on approaching this task uses an approach that focuses on “preservation” of the transportation system as an overarching goal, along with other principle goals, such as safety.

(7:00)

Mr. Peters reiterated that we have indeed taken a loss of approximately a 35% over the next five fiscal years, understanding that Legislative and Executive actions adjusting taxes, capital expenditures on the State highway system, and other actions will certainly impact this estimate and come to bear directly on the final outcome in one way or another. He noted that NYSDOT has also been asked if it has any projects that could possibly be advanced by one year, so NYSDOT is trying to consider that request when determining figures as well. He further stressed again that his explanation of the fiscal situation over the course of the next five years is subject to changes based on any new information that may become available or other action by the Legislature.

That said, NYSDOT is in the last stages of doing a program update for the Department that goes from April 2012 through March of 2017: five state fiscal years. In doing that, NYSDOT looked at how much money the Department had relative to what the Department had previously, and that equates to an approximate 35% reduction, so NYSDOT had to remove about 1/3 of its program, which means that the local programs need to be adjusted downward by about 1/3 as well.

Starting in August, NYSDOT worked with four MPOs on developing an approach to reducing the program. The agreement that was reached was based on the 6-8 month time period that was required last year to make similar adjustments. It was therefore decided that NYSDOT would reduce the program down by the appropriate amount and then after the update is done – (it is now complete) – come back, and fix the projects that NYSDOT is carrying on PSS (PSS is NYSDOT's internal accounting system, which differs from the TIP framework that is used by MPOs). The adjustments made on PSS would then dictate the necessary adjustments that would have to be made to local TIPs. These adjustments will therefore be used to adjust local projects and/or re-prioritize local projects based on new funding levels.

(11:00) 

Mr. Peters then submitted a 2 page spreadsheet detailing what was reported by the PSS system as a result of NYSDOT's update. It is approximately the amount of money -- ~\$25m – to give members an idea of what is being carried in PSS at the moment. It provides the Council with a basis from which to adjust.

Mr. Doyle asked a question: what is the significance of the projects that you're carrying in PSS relative to state approvals, departmental policy and federal interactions?

Mr. Peters responded that PSS is used to track all the projects, both state project and local projects. It is used to interact with the Federal Highway Administration to request them to obligate funds, etc. that amount to changes in the program. It is an internal system only. What NYSDOT tries to do is make the TIP and PSS match as close as possible; invariably at times they do report different figures. This is because PSS tracks daily changes to projects; NYSDOT only adjusts the TIP when changes to projects are necessary to obligate money. In this instance, PSS has been adjusted just to bring the amount of money in state and local projects down to the new funding levels, being careful to carry through and match both the state fiscal year and the funding sources. Over the five years everything has to balance out; the handout reflects that balance for the projects identified from PSS for Ulster County. The first few years should be relatively close to what was originally programmed; it is the last two years where more significant changes to projects are likely to become apparent.

The exercise for UCTC now that it has been provided a funding box is to make sure the priorities in there match what it is the MPO wants to do.

(15:07) Mr. Katz (Town of Saugerties) inquired about a sidewalk project in the Town of Gardiner. Mr. Peters noted that because the project is on a state highway it is counted as an 'on system' project.

(15:26) Ms. Basnet inquired as to what the abbreviation codes in the column titled "Fund Sources" stand for. Mr. Peters did not recall precisely what all of the abbreviations referred to but did not that 'E' stands for 'earmark' projects and 'B' stands for 'bridge' projects, etc. Ms. Basnet further inquired as to what the column "PSE Date" referred to; Mr. Peters responded that this is the date that the 'plans, specifications, and estimates' are anticipated, which is typically 3 months in advance of the 'letting' date, which is the date that the project can go out to bid. Some of these dates may have changed and are generalizations.

(17:03) Mr. Doyle asked how Technical Committee members can look at their projects and understand the relationship between 'PSE' and 'letting date' verses detailed design or preliminary design, obligation date, and construction inspection. Mr. Peters responded that such a report would be much more detailed and larger report therefore he did not want to print it. 'PSE Date' is generally synonymous with 'completion of design' while 'Letting Date' is synonymous with the date in which the municipality can open the project to bids.

Mr. Doyle asked Mr. Peters to confirm what the goal is. Mr. Peters clarified that the information on the spreadsheet reflects the block of money (or perhaps a little less than the block of money) that the Council has. He is therefore asking the Technical Committee over the next few months to review the list and confirm that these projects are indeed what the Council wants on the TIP in the next two federal fiscal years. Otherwise, a full TIP update will begin next year and will be adopted by Oct. 1 2013.

(19:34) Mr. Doyle inquired as to when NYSDOT would like this completed. Mr. Peters responded that March 2012 is the preferred target date.

A general conversation then took place regarding projects that have an anticipated Letting Date in FFY 2012; the Hickory Street/Beerkill project in Ellenville appears to be the only project listed with a FFY 2012 Letting Date. Mr. Peter confirmed.

Mr. Peters noted that the Council should investigate whether it could possibly do more projects in FFY 2012 because NYSDOT reserved extra money due to large projects in Westchester County. Mr. Doyle reiterated that there is approximately \$10m that was in the original TIP; Mr. Peters noted that the amount is in fact \$8.5 to 9m that the Council should be spending in construction and through the obligation of other phases.

Rather than reviewing each project at this point in time, Mr. Peters suggested that a subcommittee be formed in order to review and confirm the Council's two-year priorities.

(23:00) Mr. Doyle asked if anyone had questions or issues with the PSS summary spreadsheet.

Mr. Ralph Swenson noted that on the Abeel Street project temporary easements have been acquired; these do have expiration dates. If construction dates are pushed back, these easements would have to be renegotiated. This is a potential problem. Further, if budgets are reduced, it compounds the difficulties of municipalities to plan for an make changes to projects. If projects are pushed back, would late penalties

invoked by other agencies be relaxed because those delays could not be attributed to the municipality? Mr. Peters responded that we would simply have to address these types of issues as they arise. In some cases, the perspective of funding agencies might be to simply complete a revision to the design report; in other instances, a more strict critique of local project progress might be their approach.

Mr. Peters noted that the other problem that we experienced was that there was a negative balance in STP FLEX funds, causing delays to any projects that required STP FLEX dollars. As programs are adjusted across the state, there will likely be more opportunities to reconsider local projects.

(31:00) Mr. Doyle asked for clarification from members: are the projects listed under the TIP for construction in FFY 2012 ready to go? Projects in Ellenville (Hickory Street Bridge) and Kingston (Abeel Street) were noted by their representatives as “ready to go” for this FFY. Mr. Doyle then inquired about sidewalk improvements in the Town of Saugerties. Mr. Bruno noted that he believe the project was ready for 2012. Mr. Doyle iterated that, if the information before the Tech. Committee is accurate, these projects are indeed ready to go. Mr. Peters was not in a position to necessarily concur with Mr. Doyle’s presumption until each project could be checked and funding sources confirmed.

Mr. Doyle asked how the Council best proceed at this point so that applicants have a clear idea if they can move forward with their projects. Mr. Peters recommended that the Committee prepare a list of projects that it presumes can go forward, submit that list to him, and he will double-check the accounting to confirm. Hickory St. Bridge, Abeel: Broadway to Dock, and Village of Saugerties pedestrian improvements appear to be those projects. Because Saugerties is an earmark project, it essentially can begin at any point.

Regarding Hickory Street bridge, Mr. Doyle noted that because it is not on the TIP due to an omission, will NYSDOT authorize it and not make the Council try to find an offset. Mr. Peters noted that he will have to take a closer look at that particular issue to confirm. He assumes that, because it is listed in NYSDOT’s program, it would be fine. Mr. Doyle noted that he would intend to add it to the TIP based on the resolution that approved the original TIP back in October.

(36:42) Mr. Bruno (Town of Saugerties) inquired about the connector road project in the Town associated with the RR, which is no longer on the list. Mr. Peters noted that this has been pushed out beyond the five year TIP calendar (SFY 2017). Mr. Doyle later noted that it would be difficult to move this up on the calendar due to the preservation framework underway.

(37:00) Mr. Katz (Town of Gardiner) asked about projects that are along state roads: how do members find out about those?

Mr. Peters noted that the two projects 44/55 should be listed but his query may not have yielded the proper results. He did not find it but noted that it shouldn’t have been moved. Mr. Katz noted that all Phase 1 design is in to NYSDOT and that they’re prepared to let as soon as approval is provided. This was an ARRA project which may account why it wasn’t listed. Project No. 878021 is one phase; a sidewalk enhancement project. The other phase needs to be identified.

Mr. Doyle reiterated that there appear to be four projects that are prepared for FY 2012: **Hickory Street Bridge; Abeel Street; Gardiner sidewalk enhancements; and Vil. of Saugerties Pedestrian Improvements.**

(43:00) Mr. Doyle noted that he would like Mr. Slack and Ms. Basnet to head this TIP subcommittee and asked for Council members to serve on the committee. **Susan Ronga (County DPW), Jim Quigley (Town of Ulster, and Ralph Swenson (City of Kingston) each volunteered. Rich Peters will also serve as a liaison to the subcommittee.**

Mr. Doyle asked all project sponsors to again review the TIP. The subcommittee will confer through conference call and review the information. Paper copies of the most recent TIP will be obtained from ESTIP and posted online and provided to subcommittee members. The subcommittee should be prepared to report back to the Council by the end of February. Sponsors with respect to those ready for 2012 should continue to move forward, pending NYSDOT verification of funding.

Mr. Doyle asked Mr. Slack and Ms. Basnet to work closely with local project people to determine where they are; a spreadsheet questionnaire should be developed in order to do so and clarify the situation. Mr. Doyle asked if there has been any discussion by members if they wanted to progress bridge projects as federally funded. Members responded that there has been no additional discussion on this issue.

(48:09) Mr. Doyle asked for additional comments and concerns. Toni Hokanson raised a concern regarding the Clinton Ave. bridge. At the time it did not appear to be a significant priority because there were two points of ingress and egress. After Hurricane Irene the bridge needed to be shut down and the second means of ingress/egress proved to be faulty due to surrounding land uses and poor access. Now it appears that it will be a considerable problem if this bridge is out of order on a permanent basis and the 2018 “push out” date is a significant concern.

(50:30) Mr. Doyle also noted the comment by Mr. Bruno regarding the connector road in the Town of Saugerties. Mr. Peters noted that anything beyond the 5 year TIP calendar is relatively indefinite at this point in time. Ms. Budik noted that the engineering report was completed before that period in time. Mr. Doyle noted that at the time several project were moved on the TIP but weren’t necessarily funded. If there was funding available, they could be addressed. That was not the case with this project. Mr. Doyle posed the question to Committee members that one way it could be moved up is through the safety provision that is guiding NYSDOT fiscal decision making. The guidance provided by NYSDOT with respect to preservation as it relates to bridges and detours stipulates that a 10 mile detour is acceptable under these tight fiscal constraints. Bridges would therefore not be repaired if there is an alternate route within a distance of 10 miles. Mr. Peters reiterated that NYSDOT is very much utilizing a preservation approach to repairs in order to simply keep the system functioning as best as possible.

(55:00) In terms of understanding the safety component of the preservation approach, Mr. Peters noted that it is important to understand that there are two types of safety: there’s safety from imminent structural failure versus safety resulting from the creation of a safe transportation system and associated roadway geometry and components. NYSDOT will therefore have to keep these issues in mind when it considers local projects.

(56:34)

Mr. Doyle asked if there is any kind of design guidance that engineers are considering that provides them with an indication as to how to proceed with a recommendation on, for example, a bridge.

Mr. Peters noted that as the MPOs move into the next TIP cycle (2013) there will be more of an emphasis on preservation and identifying projects where scopes can be reduced. There is no specific guidance that NYSDOT or engineers will be following to do so. Mr. Peters noted that smaller governments are indeed in a difficult position to make these determinations on local facilities by themselves.

(1:00:00)

Mr. Doyle noted that it would not be likely that UCTC would issue a call for new projects given limited funds and those already scheduled. He concluded by inquiring about other types of special funding sources that the Council members should perhaps be considering, including Safe Routes to School, TIGER [Transportation Improvements Generating Economic Development], and other Transportation Enhancement Program (TEP) funds. Mr. Peters noted that TIGER projects are typically very large in magnitude; a number of NYSDOT's TIGER applications have not been selected in the past. He does not anticipate an Enhancement solicitation in the near-term; there are some indications that this program may go away. Safe Routes to School are the same; many of the projects awarded in the recent past are still being digested. Overall, at the moment, there do not appear to be any significant alternative grant funds available. There may be some possibilities of acceleration of state projects under new legislation that was recently passed out of the Governor's office, but no details have been provided to NYSDOT at this time.

(1:03:25)

Discussion of the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) for SFY 2012:

Mr. Doyle wanted to bring to the Council's attention that it will need to prepare a UPWP for next year. It is typically due at the beginning of March [2012]. We are presently implementing several of the projects within the existing UPWP. We have not yet begun to implement two of those projects. The proposed New Paltz intermodal center study (UPWP project 44.23.02-01) has not been implemented due to a recent change in local leadership; discussions with Village officials indicates continued interest in advancing this study as carry over funds in 2012. The other project is the update to the transportation model (UPWP project 44.23.01-01); implementation of this project hinges on new 2010 Census data as well as whether EPA is going to implement a revised ozone rule for the region. It is unknown if the EPA will implement this or not; if they do not, Ulster County would continue to be in attainment. The model update will likely begin around the March timeframe via carry-over funds.

The Ulster County Transit Development Plan (TDP) (UPWP project 44.26.14) is underway. Initial technical reports have been completed and some public involvement. Mr. Doyle asked Mr. Dibella (UCAT) was asked to comment on the consultant's progress thus far. He noted that the work that he had seen to date has been very good and he's been receptive to some of the initial suggestions that the consultant has proposed regarding increased coordination of UCAT and Citibus services in the future.

(1:06:24)

Mr. Doyle stated that he hopes that Council members have specific studies in mind that they would like to see initiated through the next UPWP cycle. Those recommendations can be submitted to staff.

Mr. Doyle then noted that he failed to mention the "bridge study" [Conduct a Cost Benefit Analysis of County Bridge Program and Priorities for Capital Expenditures – Part Consultant Study (44.24.01)]. We anticipate a contract for this project in early 2012. He noted that he is presently wondering if UCTC

should perhaps expand this project to consider the status of bridges in greater detail than what the original project description called for. If this is the case we will come back to the Council and have that discussion.

Mr. Doyle then returned to the subject of the Transit Development Plan. He noted that we have access to other types of funding, such as 5307 [Urbanized Area Formula Funding program (49 U.S.C. 5307) makes Federal resources available to urbanized areas and to Governors for transit capital and operating assistance] and JARC [Section 5316 Job Access Reverse Commute program], and the 5317 New Freedom Program [New Freedom formula grant program aims to provide additional tools to overcome existing barriers facing Americans with disabilities seeking integration into the work force and full participation in society]. The Council has not been able to spend this money in the past because of the lack of any significant proposals and the ability of local governments to find the appropriate match. The TDP process has convened a stakeholder group consisting of human service providers in Ulster County. This discussion focused on the need for transit options for youth, workforce investment board work, transportation to work and education locations, as well as the difficulty faced by their clients to get to their services.

(1:09:23)

Mr. Doyle continued that MPOs are required to prepare a Human Services Coordination Plan. It may be wise to expand the TDP contract to allow us to engage these stakeholders in a much more in-depth manner as well as to provide for a way to find necessary local matches as mentioned above. One example is the increasing costs of Medicare/Medicaid. Recent changes in coordination of transit services for Medicare/Medicaid recipients resulted in a significant drop in UCAT transit use (nearly 600% decrease according to Mr. DiBella). Transportation services are now provided by local taxi services on an as-needed basis by recipients at a significantly higher cost to taxpayers and also robs county transit services of dollars. Mr. DiBella further noted that taxi's are not typically handicap-accessible, as all UCAT busses are.

Mr. Doyle would therefore like to engage social services at the state level to find ways to improve human service coordination. Overall, we may want to add \$20-25k to the TDP; Mr. Doyle has asked the consultant to prepare an estimate of costs associated with increasing the scope of services of the current TDP contract. Ideally, this would also play a significant role meeting the requirement of preparing a human services coordination plan, thereby maximizing the effectiveness of the additional expenditure.

(1:12:08)

Mr. Doyle inquired if Tech. Committee members had any thoughts on possible projects. A member requested a copy of the UPWP; Mr. Doyle noted that it is online. Mr. Doyle restated the question: can anyone think of any specific studies that they would like the Council to look at next year? Specific areas, locations, subjects, etc. If individuals do have ideas they should reach out to Mr. Slack [bsla@co.ulster.ny.us 845.334.5590] to discuss. In the past, NYSDOT has requested assistance on specific planning needs and UCTC has been happy to meet those needs.

One other issue that Mr. Doyle noted was the Ulster Avenue location and the discussion that has been had pertaining to the medical complex. This corridor has a succession of Priority Investigation Locations (PILs). The Council may want to consider analyzing PILs in this corridor to see what might be improved at that 209/199 intersection that merges with 9W. This area has been studied quite a bit but we may want to consider this corridor differently in the future.

(1:14:21) Transfer of FTA Section 5307 funds to CDTA:

Mr. Doyle stated that approximately 2 years ago the Council requested money from a competition fund that is set up between the three MPOs: Orange, Dutchess, and Ulster Counties – a portion of the transit dollars are set aside for these funds. In the past that money has been used to fund the Newburgh Beacon Ferry, bridge work by MTA on the Port Jervis line, and other transfers relative to the Poughkeepsie train station. The state and Trailways came to the Council and asked for funding to provide buses to operate commuter services within the region, particularly from Ulster County to NYC. We therefore transferred \$932k to the Council to purchase the buses for Trailways.

The process of purchasing buses and leasing them to Trailways is a complicated one which has caused some consternation among Ulster County legal staff as well as with some federal officials. This has been a 12 month process so far. In the past we have transferred dollars to meet Trailways' preventative maintenance needs. Money had been transferred to Capital District Transportation Authority for use under Capital Cost of Contracting which allows them to charge for the costs of the services through federal dollars. NYSDOT has requested that the Council do this transfer because it allows them to monitor a single organization rather than multiple organizations, creating an administrative efficiency. The process of capital cost of contracting allows commuter carriers to purchase buses absent federal rules, provide the service, and be reimbursed for that service based on the capital cost of the contract relative to the buses and other services. It is the thought of the Council that this can also be done to purchase the buses and to date consensus has been reached between the parties involved regarding this approach.

(1:18:43) The Council is therefore asked to authorize staff to transfer the federal portion of the funds received under Section 5307 to CDTA. CDTA will then enter into a capital cost of contracting agreement with Trailways for the provision of service of the two buses primarily within Ulster County and through the region to NYC. This is consistent with the resolution to transfer Section 5307 money to the Council; it is also consistent with federal rules. These are 2009 funds that need to be obligated before the end of this year. Mr. Doyle further noted that while this process is complicated it will ultimately save a significant amount of money.

A member of the Council asked Mr. Doyle how the action that is proposed here differs from the one that was approved at the last meeting. (Note: refer to the September 19, 2011 Meeting Summary "Draft Resolution 2011-09"). Mr. Doyle responded that it is a different source of money but the action is very similar.

(1:20:39) **Motion to approve by Ms. Hokanson; seconded by Mr. Swenson . No further discussion; all in favor. Motion carried.**

New Federal Legislation:

It was noted by Mr. Peters that there are a number of bills currently being discussed and revised by Congress and each one is relatively different; Mr. Doyle concurred. The current federal authorization -- Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) was enacted August 10, 2005, as Public Law 109-59 and originally expired in 2009; the last extension ended at the close of FFY 2011. The new legislation currently being drafted by Congress is called MAP-21: Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century.

Mr. Peters noted that the federal gasoline tax and other taxes were in the past able to fund the highway trust fund and other transportation projects. The tax rates have not been updated in approximately 20 years and in that time costs have increased and fuel efficiency has also increased, created a situation of less revenue and increased costs and needs. MAP-21 will ideally address some of these gaps but presently US Senate and House committees have only put forth draft proposals. It is unknown what the legislation will look like at this time. Mr. Doyle noted that the draft legislation that he has seen indicated that small MPOs will likely continue to exist, but the objectives of those MPOs may change. It may also require the Governor and the Secretary of Transportation to agree on their continuance and the ability to meet other specific objectives. The size of a Council for continuance may require a population of 200,000 or more. This may mean that that Council will need to make a special request for continuance. One other possible alternative may involve the merger of the three transportation councils in the region (Ulster, Orange and Dutchess) in order to meet the proposed requirement of a population of 200,000 persons. There are 13 transportation councils in NYS; four would meet that requirement.

(1:28:08) Mr. Doyle noted that it is therefore unknown what changes will take place but the Council may need to adjust to some changes pending the final versions of this new legislation. Mr. Peters noted that Region 8 would likely recommend that smaller MPOs in its region remain intact because they operate efficiently and effectively, particularly with respect to strong local representation and communication.

OTHER/OLD BUSINESS

Mr. Doyle asked the Council if there were any other issues to consider or discuss at this time. ther/Old Business. Mr. Quigley (Town of Ulster) directed a question to Mr. Peters. He referred to signage near the 9W Bypass/Ulster Avenue adjacent to the mall area. Approximately 6-7 years ago signage existed directing drivers to the proper lane for 9W or Ulster Avenue. An accident destroyed that sign and it was never replaced. A smaller sign exists adjacent to Hoffman Car Wash much smaller in size. This causes confusion among drivers in the area and is in need of improvement. Mr. Peters noted this concern and stated that he would confer with Mr. Quigley to gather more information on the location. Mr. Doyle noted that he also has a signage issue on that corridor associated with the medical complex and would therefore also like to confer with Mr. Peters and Mr. Quigley on the subject through email.

No other old business.

(1:32:30) **ANNOUNCEMENTS/PROJECT UPDATES**

Regarding the Traffic Monitoring Program, Ms. Basnet noted that counts have been returned to UCTC and are being reviewed. The final report should be available soon. Mr. Doyle noted that a classification count was conducted for Shivertown Road in New Paltz this year and will continue to be counted in the future.

Mr. Doyle also noted that if members of the Council have roads in mind that are not presently being counted, they should be submitted to staff for consideration.

Regarding Commuter Parking Lots Capacity Analysis and Needs Assessment, Mr. Slack noted that he did a brief follow-up to the 2010 report and visited the 10 park and ride lots in the county during the days in advance of the Thanksgiving holiday. Numbers were generally in line with previous years and

recommendations will likely remain the same. That update will be available on the website by the end of December.



Second Quarter Financial Report was circulated. Mr. Doyle noted that the Council is in good shape with the money available but it has quite a bit of work ahead that needs to be accomplished. There were no questions relative to the report.

Mr. Doyle took time to thank Sweta Basnet for her outstanding service to the Council over the past year. UCTC has been short-staffed during that period of time and Ms. Basnet did an excellent job keeping business on track.

Mr. Doyle again asked for citizen comments; no comments were submitted.

(1:38:06)

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 11: 38am.