

**GTC PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**Rochester City Hall – City Council Chambers**  
**August 19, 2004**

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

James Brady, Wayne County  
Joan Dupont, NYSDOT – Region 4  
Michael Garland, Monroe County – At Large  
Richard Garrabrant, NYS Thruway Authority  
Kristen Mark Hughes, Ontario County  
Paul Johnson, Monroe County Planning Board  
Scott Leathersich, Monroe County – At Large  
Charles Nesbitt, Jr., Empire State Development Corporation  
Terrence J. Rice, Monroe County  
George Stam, City of Rochester  
Larry Stid, Rochester City Planning Commission  
William Sullivan, Rochester City Council  
David Zorn, G/FLRPC

ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT

Richard Beers, FHWA, representing Robert Griffith  
David Cook, RGRTA, representing Mark Aesch  
Heather Hogarty, Livingston County, representing David Woods  
Jeff Lurie, Monroe County, representing Wayne Zyra

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

Bret DeRoo, Wayne County  
Deborah Elliott, GTC Staff  
Erik Frisch, GTC Staff  
Richard Perrin, GTC Staff  
Bob Scholl, NYSDOT – Region 4  
Rob Slaver, Jr., NYSDOT – Region 4  
James Stack, GTC Staff  
John Thomas, City of Rochester

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT AND UNREPRESENTED

Philip Brito, FAA  
Glenn Cooke, Seneca County  
Timothy Hens, Genesee County  
Fred Humphrey, Wyoming County  
Tracy Logel, Monroe County Supervisors' Association  
Kenneth Rush, Orleans County  
Clara Wallace-Douglas, FTA  
(Vacant), Yates County  
(Vacant), NYS Department of Environmental Conservation

**1. Call to Order & Introductions**

Kristen Mark Hughes called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. Members, Alternates, and others present introduced themselves.

**2. Public Forum**

No one from the public spoke during the Public Forum.

**3. Approval of Minutes**

**Terry Rice moved for approval of the minutes from the July 15, 2004 Planning Committee meeting; Charles Nesbitt seconded the motion. The minutes were approved as submitted.**

**4. Reports and Action on Old Business**

a. Reports on UPWP Projects and Other Activities

*GTC*

Richard Perrin reported:

- GTC staff has continued the development of the GTC Strategic Plan. A meeting with the GTC Executive Committee is being scheduled for September to gather feedback on progress to-date
- GTC staff is reviewing the inventory of in-house resources for the clearinghouse component (ARTIC) of the Rural County Resource Development Initiative and will begin documentation of other agency resources
- There is no progress to report on the Transportation Safety Information Analysis
- An update on the Long Range Transportation Plan will be provided later in the meeting
- An update on Air Quality Planning and Outreach will be provided later in the meeting
- There is no progress to report on the Transportation and Industrial Access project
- A scope of work for the Greater Rochester Transportation Operations and Management Organization Feasibility Study will be developed later this year. GTC staff is evaluating a current funding opportunity through FHWA. Note: the FHWA funding opportunity requires a substantial non-Federal match
- GTC staff is continuing work on the Regional Rights-Of-Way Study utilizing already completed tasks relevant to the Long Range Transportation Plan
- The Non-Emergency Medical Transportation Study (NEMS) is complete. James Stack, GTC staff, will give a presentation on the study to Lifespan and its partners

in September

- Priority Trails Advancement (PTA) has three sub-projects: The Canandaigua Rail-with-Trail final draft report is being reviewed by the City of Canandaigua and will be finalized shortly. A public meeting for the Auburn Corridor project is scheduled for September 9 and the final report will incorporate comments received at the meeting. The City of Rochester Neighborhood Connectors project is complete. All three projects are expected for closeout at either the October or November Planning Committee meetings. The Regional Trails Initiative Steering Committee has recommended three new projects for funding allocated for FY 2004-05 which will be presented later in the meeting
- There is no progress to report on the On-Street Bicycle Facilities Opportunities Review
- GTC staff is continuing work on the Congestion Management System (CMS) focusing on completing tasks relevant to the Long Range Transportation Plan and for conformity determinations of the LRTP and TIP
- The GTC summer intern made significant progress on Transportation Information Resources which has two components: Rural ITS and Context Sensitive Design/Solutions. GTC staff are finalizing both components for posting to the GTC website
- A conference call was held with the consultant for the TIP Management Enhancement Study on August 13. GTC Staff expects to receive draft recommendations for review in the second week of September. The draft recommendations will be forwarded to the TDC for review

Terry Rice asked if the results and recommendations will be presented to the Planning Committee. He also asked if the results and recommendations will influence the upcoming TIP development cycle.

Richard Perrin responded that the results and recommendations will come before the Planning Committee to recommend acceptance by the Board as evidence of completion of the UPWP task. He noted that if there is tacit concurrence from the Planning Committee on the recommendations prior to Board approval of the final report then they can be used in the upcoming TIP cycle.

#### *G/FLRPC*

David Zorn reported:

- The final report for Regional Land Use Monitoring will be presented for closeout later in the agenda
- Draft figures for the Regional Development Projections went before the G/FLRPC Planning Coordination Committee at their last meeting
- There is no progress to report on the Preparing Village Main Streets for Planning project

- The scope of work for the Optimizing Transportation Infrastructure through Effective Land Use project will be developed later this year
- Final edits to the Regional Atlas are underway. G/FLRPC is seeking sponsors for reproduction

#### *Livingston County*

Heather Hogarty reported:

- There is no progress to report on the Horizontal Alignment Safety Study

#### *Monroe County*

Paul Johnson reported:

- The final report for Monroe County Land Use Monitoring will be presented for closeout later in the agenda
- The Monroe County Parking Study is progressing with the continuation of parking counts for seasonal uses. Counting should be complete by Labor Day weekend. Analysis will be done this fall

Terry Rice reported:

- Data collection for the Monroe County Traffic Count Collection project will resume in September 2004
- The consultant for the Pedestrian Activity Safety Study is continuing data collection
- The consultant for the Ballantyne Road Corridor Study is continuing data collection

#### *Ontario County*

Kris Hughes reported:

- The Route 332 Corridor Management Study is progressing
- The Routes 5 & 20 Corridor Study is complete
- The consultant for the Canandaigua Regional Transportation Study is summarizing land use and traffic monitoring information

#### *City of Rochester*

John Thomas reported:

- The Street Condition Rating Update Study is complete

- The scope of work for the Port of Rochester Transportation Evaluation and Support Study has been approved and consultant selection will begin
- The scope of work for the Neighborhood Traffic Calming Concept Design and Implementation Study is being developed and will be presented later this year
- The final report for the Highland Park/Canalway Neighborhood Connector Trail Study was tabled at the July 15 Planning Committee meeting pending further review
- A consultant has been hired for the City's portion of the RGRTA/City of Rochester ITS Implementation Plan. An "ignition" meeting is being scheduled

#### *RGRTA*

David Cook reported:

- The consultant for the Security and Safety Plan for Public Transportation is reviewing current policies and interviewing staff
- The Route Analysis Information System project is complete
- There is no progress to report on the RGRTA/City of Rochester ITS Implementation Plan (RGRTA component)
- There is no progress to report on the Gates-Chili Transit Study
- There is no progress to report on the Area Wide Job Access and Reverse Commute Plan
- There is no progress to report on the Strategic Plan for Public Transportation Service to Universities and Colleges
- There is no progress to report on the Alternative Fuels Technology Study

#### *Seneca County*

Richard Perrin reported:

- Information for developing the scope of work for the State Route 96/State Route 318 Rural Corridor Study – Phase I has been forwarded to Seneca County Planning and Development

#### *Wayne County*

James Brady reported:

- There is no progress to report on the Cluster Development Enhancement Project Feasibility Study

### *Wyoming County*

Richard Perrin reported:

- Wyoming County has been in contact with the consultant to determine if they are planning to complete the project or if other arrangements will need to be made

### *Yates County*

Richard Perrin reported:

- The consultant is continuing development of alternatives for the Route 14A Corridor Study for Steering Committee review. A steering committee meeting is expected late summer or early fall

### *Other Agencies*

Richard Perrin reported:

- The Regional Traffic Count Collection project is a four-county collaborative. Ontario County is progressing their portion of the project in-house. Wayne and Livingston counties will be retaining a single consultant to progress their portions. Monroe County is deferring data collection until 2005

### b. Any Other Old Business or Announcements

Since the last Planning Committee meeting, GTC has received the following appointment:

- Livingston County – Heather Hogarty designated as Alternate to David Woods

GTC Staff has completed Pavement Condition Monitoring for 2004. The associated maps are approximately 90% complete.

An opportunity to obtain technical assistance for trails planning is available through Parks & Trails New York. The deadline for applications is November 15.

1. Recommendation to GTC Board concerning Accepting the report, *Highland Park/Canalway Trail Planning and Concept Design* as evidence of completion of UPWP Task 6520/Proposed Council Resolution 04-31

John Thomas suggested that the Planning Committee table the report pending further review.

**Terry Rice moved to postpone consideration of Proposed Council Resolution 04-31; William Sullivan seconded the motion. The motion passed unopposed.**

**5. Planning Committee Action Items**

- a. Planning Committee Approval of project recommendations for Priority Trails Advancement funding

Richard Perrin discussed the next round of Priority Trails Advancement and the three projects proposed for funding by the Regional Trails Initiative Steering Committee. The RTI Steering Committee met immediately following the July 15 Planning Committee meeting and reviewed the eight project proposals that were received.

**Scott Leathersich moved to approve the project recommendations for Priority Trails Advancement funding; Michael Garland seconded the motion. The motion passed unopposed.**

- b. Recommendation to GTC Board concerning Accepting final project reports as evidence of completion of various UPWP tasks
1. Accepting the report, *Land Use Report for Monroe County (2003)*, as evidence of completion of UPWP Task 4210/Proposed Council Resolution 04-32
  2. Accepting the report, *2003 Regional Land Use Monitoring Report*, as evidence of completion of UPWP Task 5800/Proposed Council Resolution 04-33

Richard Perrin noted that these are on-going activities that have not been closed out through the Planning Committee in the past. He discussed both reports.

**Terry Rice moved to recommend approval of Proposed Council Resolutions 04-32 and 04-33; William Sullivan seconded the motion. The motion passed unopposed.**

- c. Recommendations to GTC Board concerning Various Amendments to the 2003-2008 TIP
1. Recommendation to GTC Board concerning Amending the 2003-2008 TIP by adding the Thruway Rehabilitation, Interchange 45 to 46 project/Proposed Council Resolution 04-34

Richard Garrabrant explained the need for the Thruway Rehabilitation amendment to the 2003-2008 TIP.

Terry Rice asked what had made the conditions so inadequate and if improved products would be used in the future. Richard Garrabrant discussed the previous design. He noted one issue is “wet spots” and drainage which affects the life of the pavement. In addition, pavement rehabilitation processes have evolved since the previous treatment. Richard said the Authority is working more closely with NYSDOT to develop a longer term plan.

Joan Dupont noted that truck volumes are high and growing faster than those for cars.

**Joan Dupont moved to recommend approval of Proposed Council Resolution 04-34; Richard Garrabrant seconded the motion. The motion passed unopposed.**

2. Recommendation to GTC Board concerning Amending the 2003-2008 TIP by increasing the total cost of the Preventive Maintenance project/Proposed Council Resolution 04-35

David Cook explained the need for the Preventive Maintenance amendment to the 2003-2008 TIP. David discussed RGRTA funding sources and strategies for cost reductions. He noted that the three primary funding sources (FTA, mortgage recording tax, and fare box revenue) are currently flat and/or may decline. RGRTA wants to reduce cost without reducing services. This adjustment will allow the Preventive Maintenance project to coincide with the RGRTA budget.

George Stam asked for clarification about the source of additional funding. David Cook responded that it is unallocated FTA Section 5307 funds. George asked if the amount of FTA Section 5307 funding programmed in the TIP is lower than the amount of available FTA Section 5307 funds. David replied that FTA has provided more recent figures of available FTA Section 5307 funds.

Joan Dupont explained the TIP funding is a best estimate of what is available by fund source. She noted that Section 5307 is unique in that RTS is the only organization in the region eligible for it and RGRTA works directly with FTA for these funds.

Terry Rice noted that it looks like RGRTA is proposing to use a flat line projection of the funds in FFY 2003-2004. David Cook agreed.

David Cook added that RGRTA is just getting into its annual grant application cycle so they are reconciling different projects with the most current amounts of FTA Section 5307 funds available. George Stam asked who RGRTA is applying to. David responded that he was referring to the FTA grant application cycle.



David Cook noted that FTA Section 5307 allocations are set by formula. If there is a year that RGRTA does not need all of the allocated funds then they don't apply for them. These funds stay on account with FTA so they are available when RGRTA has greater needs, primarily for buses that have reached retirement age.

**Michael Garland moved to recommend approval of Proposed Council Resolution 04-35; Richard Garrabrant seconded the motion. The motion passed unopposed.**

Kris Hughes suggested that items 3 and 4 be considered together since they are inter-related.

3. Recommendation to GTC Board concerning Amending the 2003-2008 TIP by decreasing the total cost of the Lift Line Bus Replacement project/Proposed Council Resolution 04-36
4. Recommendation to GTC Board concerning Amending the 2003-2008 TIP by increasing the total cost of the RTS Bus Replacement project/Proposed Council Resolution 04-37

David Cook explained the need for the amendment to the 2003-2008 TIP regarding the Lift Line Bus Replacement. He noted that the Lift Line buses originally planned for purchase are no longer manufactured. Lift Line is running two lower cost vehicles on a trial basis and is happy with the performance. RGRTA would like to use the cost savings to buy additional RTS buses.

David Cook then explained the need for the amendment to the 2003-2008 TIP regarding RTS Bus Replacement and the advantages of the new buses.

**David Cook moved to recommend approval of Proposed Council Resolutions 04-36 and 04-37; Terry Rice seconded the motion. The motion passed unopposed.**

5. Recommendation to GTC Board concerning Amending the 2003-2008 TIP by increasing the total cost of the Broad Street Tunnel project

George Stam discussed the Broad Street Tunnel project and the need for the amendment to the 2003-2008 TIP. The project encompasses a major regional structure that is in deteriorating condition and has been on the TIP for more than a decade. Through the design process, it was determined that the most cost effective (life cycle basis) approach was to fill in the abandoned tunnel. There was significant community concern about this option.

The tunnel continues to deteriorate. The City has worked to update the engineering study and has reconfirmed its original conclusion.

George noted that the current TIP shows the project cost at approximately \$16 million with the source being HBRR funds.

George stated that the City has looked for the most feasible way to accomplish this difficult project. Discussion with utility companies and other issues indicated that maintaining the tunnel is not desirable. Rather, abandonment and filling the tunnel is the best option. Reasons for the cost increase include: inflation, structure removal, utility relocation, accommodation for potential future uses, and additional geometric and signal issues. He noted that the increased project budget includes a 25% contingency – this level of contingency is warranted at the planning level for such a complex project.

George noted that the TIP Development Committee did not recommend approval of this amendment and the City is here to appeal directly to the Planning Committee. He feels the City is being upfront about its due diligence and seeking funds to complete the project.

George noted that when projects that have already proceeded to construction have cost increases they are not reflected in the TIP. He feels the City is being held to a different standard than others.

David Zorn asked about proper procedure since the TDC did not recommend approval of the amendment and wanted to know where the additional Federal funds would come from.

Richard Perrin responded that the TDC is an advisory group so the City can come directly to the Planning Committee with this request. He noted that the additional federal funds would have to be new discretionary funds to the region or from an offset on another project.

Joan Dupont discussed funding outside of the TIP. She noted that once a project receives final design approval and construction begins, it is outside the realm of the TIP. The TIP is and must remain a fiscally constrained program. When a contract is let, the bids may be over or under the project estimate. Projects also experience change orders as they progress. NYSDOT tallies all of the adjustments that occur and factors them into the funding allocations for the next TIP cycle. In the past, the net adjustments have not had a significant impact on new TIP allocations.

Kris Hughes asked for clarification as to whether the adjustments are made on a jurisdictional basis. Joan stated that they are first made at the statewide level then the NYSDOT region level; they are not made on a local basis.

Joan went on to explain that when the need for additional funding is brought to their attention, NYSDOT first looks for opportunities in the net adjustments.

When the increase cannot be accommodated, they ask the project sponsor to identify an offset from the other projects they are sponsoring. If there are no opportunities for an offset, NYSDOT has to look to other jurisdictions.

NYSDOT has not been able to identify sufficient funds to cover the increased cost of the Broad Street Tunnel project. NYSDOT has asked the City to consider delaying the Smith Street Bridge project to free up HBRR funds.

Terry Rice asked about the impact on the next TIP cycle if a project is deferred and whether a deferred project needs to re-compete for funds in the next TIP cycle. Joan replied that deferring a project allows one project to advance but impacts the funding available in the next TIP cycle.

Terry Rice asked when the last time this project was amended in the TIP. Richard Perrin replied that the project was added in the 1993 TIP. Since then, amendments were made as part of several TIP updates, never through separate amendment requests.

Joan Dupont noted that in previous TIP cycles, project costs were updated before new projects were selected.

Joan Dupont asked if George Stam had a cost history for the project. George replied that he did not have a detailed history with him but believed the project was at \$10 million in the 90's.

Richard Perrin stated that increases (and a decrease) had occurred since the project was included in the TIP, noting the original construction and inspection costs were \$8 million.

George Stam responded that the original cost estimates were not based on engineering studies. Since 1998, the project scope has remained stable.

Terry Rice recalled that during the last TIP cycle there was an issue of cost increases on existing projects. The TIP Management Enhancement Study was intended to address this issue. However, the results are not yet developed. He added that the Planning Committee spends a lot of time discussing the status of UPWP projects but not TIP projects that are of considerably higher values. Further, as a project is designed, the cost can grow but we don't reevaluate the merits of the project against the cost.

Richard Perrin noted that part of the problem is that we develop the TIP with best guesses of the project cost and that one option would be to approve larger projects on a contingent basis until detailed design is completed.

George Stam suggested that any new project in the TIP not get construction funding until the project sponsor has completed the design report and environmental assessment and received approval.

Joan Dupont responded the TDC has discussed this idea but it would be difficult to manage. It would require some type of set-aside in future years to accommodate construction when the project is ready to proceed. We would also need to manage expectations for when and if a project can proceed.

Joan Dupont noted that the Smith Street Bridge is not eligible to use HBRR yet due to federal criteria and that an option would be to postpone that project and offset funds to cover this project.

Paul Johnson asked if the City can proceed without the TIP Amendment. George answered that the City could not proceed without the additional funds.

Paul then recalled Joan's discussion of bids coming in higher than estimates. He asked if the City could proceed with the current estimate until additional funds are obtained. George replied that it is possible but the City would rather not proceed in that manner.

Paul Johnson asked if the Planning Committee is able to recommend amending the TIP as proposed. And, if so, what happens if the Planning Committee does not. Joan Dupont responded that NYSDOT – Main Office would reject the amendment.

Dave Zorn asked if the GTC Board could pass the amendment with an overrun. Richard Perrin responded that all TIP amendments must come from reasonably expected funding resources (as stated in all TIP amendment resolutions) and that this would not be the case for this project.

Terry Rice noted that when a project is postponed, some money is freed up but the project is not lost. This issue needs to be addressed in the TIP Management Enhancement Study.

Bill Sullivan noted that the City Council added time to this project to address community concerns. He remembers concerns about cost overruns during the last TIP cycle. He agrees with those concerns on principle but voted against the motion because the projects affected needed to move forward. It now seems that the City is the first to be rejected in a new process.

Terry Rice asked for clarification on the obligation date for construction and inspection. George replied that it should be changed to December 2005.

George Stam distributed a draft Resolution to amend the 2003-2008 TIP by increasing the funds for the Broad Street Tunnel project. Kris Hughes allowed a few minutes for review and asked for discussion.

Terry Rice stated that clause seven could not be included because the increase is not within reasonably expected funding resources.

After brief discussion, Kris Hughes called for a motion.

**Richard Garrabrant moved to postpone making a recommendation to the GTC Board regarding amending the 2003-2008 TIP by increasing the total cost of the Broad Street Tunnel project; James Brady seconded the motion. The motion passed with 3 opposed.**

Joan Dupont and George Stam agreed to meet in the near future to pursue options to obtain increased funding for the project.

George Stam distributed a motion related to the TIP development process. He was presenting it for information and consideration by the TDC.

The motion called for delaying the programming of funding for construction of new TIP projects until after the project sponsor has completed the design and environmental reviews.

Richard Perrin noted that the TDC has had initial discussion in this direction but only for projects above a certain cost.

Kris Hughes referred the motion to the TDC.

## **6. Planning Committee Information Items**

### **a. Long Range Transportation Plan Update**

Alternatives along with associated cost estimates and revenue projections have been developed for consideration by the LRTP Development Committee (LDC) following this Planning Committee meeting. However, there were issues with the revenue projections and cost estimates resulting in the LDC meeting being cancelled. GTC Staff will make revisions and reschedule the LDC meeting.

A special Planning Committee meeting had been scheduled for September 16 to discuss the LRTP. Richard stated that this meeting may be unnecessary and alternative arrangements would be made for Planning Committee review of the LRTP.

b. Air Quality Update

The Interagency Consultation Group (ICG) comprised of representatives from NYSDEC, NYSDOT – Main Office, and EPA Region 2 met with Planning Committee members and GTC Staff on August 3 in Rochester. The ICG discussed the conformity process and agreed to further incorporate GTC into the process.

Richard Perrin reviewed important aspects of the conformity process and informed the Planning Committee that the GTC schedule of meetings (Board and Planning Committee) would be revised to insure positive conformity determinations of the TIP and LRTP.

**7. New Business**

The 2005-2010 TIP heads up letter was mailed on August 5, 2004. The call for project package will be mailed on September 7, 2004. Applications are due on October 15, 2004.

Terry Rice asked for the status of the Functional Classification update. Joan Dupont responded that FHWA has not signed off on the update yet. They will be meeting with NYSDOT – Region 4 next month.

George Stam noted he understands that Terry Rice proposed a funding set-aside for preventive maintenance type projects at the last TDC meeting. He feels that this would be beneficial to local jurisdictions. While he supports funding for preventive maintenance, he does not support the funding set-aside. Rather, he would like to see the TIP evaluation criteria emphasize preventive maintenance projects.

**George Stam moved that the TDC work to modify the existing TIP evaluation criteria to give preference to preventive maintenance projects; Terry Rice seconded. The motion passed unopposed.**

**8. Next Meeting**

The next Planning Committee meeting will be held October 21, 2004 at 10:00 a.m. at the Rochester-Genesee Regional Transportation Authority.

**9. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 12:20 p.m.