

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PLANNING BOARD
TOWN OF COLONIE

COUNTY OF ALBANY

THE BOGHT ROAD TRAFFIC STUDY

THE TAPED AND TRANSCRIBED MINUTES of the above entitled
proceeding BY NANCY STRANG-VANDEBOGART commencing on
May 12, 2009 at 7:20 p.m. at the Public Operations Center
347 Old Niskayuna Road, Latham, New York 12110

BOARD MEMBERS:

JEAN DONOVAN, CHAIRPERSON
ELENA VAIDA
MICHAEL SULLIVAN
THOMAS NARDACCI
GEORGE B. HOLLAND, JR.
CHARLES J. O'ROURKE
TIMOTHY LANE
PETER STUTO, Jr. Esq., Attorney for the Planning Board

Also present:

Joseph LaCivita, Director, Planning and Economic Development
Kevin DeLaughter, Planning and Economic Development
Mark Sargent, Creighton Manning Engineering
Joe Grasso, Clough Harbour & Associates

1 CHAIRPERSON DONOVAN: This is Joe Grasso and he
2 is one of our town designated engineers. We have been
3 having an ongoing traffic study out on the Boght area
4 on Route 9 and Joe is just going to give us an update
5 tonight on where we are.

6 MR. GRASSO: It's been a little bit over a month
7 since we were back before the board when we responded
8 to comments that the board and the public had provided
9 us, Creighton Manning, the engineering consultant
10 working on the traffic update. Because it's been over a
11 month, we though that we would be back before you with
12 some definitive decisions to make. We just want to
13 provide an update in terms of what we've been working
14 on and establish some new time frames that we're able
15 to commit to.

16 At the last meeting back in March there were some
17 good comments and questions raised by the board
18 regarding some of the intersections that we had
19 evaluated and that included the Route 9/9R intersection
20 where our short-term improvements were able to keep the
21 levels of service at a relatively acceptable level. It
22 was a level of service C.

23 In the long-term when we take it out to the year
24 2020, we had some levels of service at some specific
25 approaches that were going to be levels of service F.

1 There were some concerns raised by the board
2 regarding those so following that last meeting we had a
3 meeting that included representatives from DOT and CDTC
4 and we talked about the concerns and we wanted to look
5 at what were the triggers for that degradation in
6 levels of service F at those approaches. We wanted to
7 see if there were other things that we could consider.

8 What we determined is that there is one parcel
9 that is planned for development which is a long-term;
10 it's parcel 28. It's further out on Route 9R which
11 based on right now our prediction is that it could
12 develop up to 9,000 square feet. That parcel at that
13 level of development is having a significant impact on
14 the long-term operations of that signal.

15 We previously talked to the board about the
16 possibility of looking at allowable land uses through
17 the corridor to see if the town wanted to look at those
18 land uses and basically reduce the allowable density
19 that's currently allowed out there for the zoning. We
20 think it would reduce the traffic through that
21 intersection and keep it at acceptable levels of
22 service.

23 But we also wanted to look at the options. Are
24 there physical improvements that we can make to that
25 Route 9/9R intersection to keep the levels of service

1 away from approaching F? That's what Mark Sargent has
2 been working on and at least one of the things that
3 he's been working on so I'd like him to touch on that.

4 The other intersection that we focused on was the
5 Dunsbach Ferry Route 9 intersection where our approach
6 to addressing traffic operations there is just to
7 monitor it. We understand that it is expected to become
8 a level of service F. Our recommendation at the time
9 was just to monitor that and review the safety of that
10 as development continues to occur before we actually
11 looked at implementing specific improvements there.

12 One of the reasons that we took that stance is
13 because we didn't think that DOT, in previous
14 conversations, would be supportive of making physical
15 changes there until they thought that it was actually a
16 safety problem. It's a level of service F and the board
17 had concerns with that. We wanted to drill down and
18 look at why it's an F.

19 That's an unsignalized intersection and a level
20 of service F for an unsignalized intersection is
21 actually a different barometer than levels of service F
22 at a signalized intersection; like the previous
23 intersection that I was talking about. So, I wanted
24 Mark to just explain what that means in terms of the
25 capacity at the intersection and why we don't feel like

1 it's a safety issue. Also, we wanted to provide some
2 opportunities or some alternatives that we think that
3 the board should consider as recommended improvements
4 that we can build into this whole transportation thing.
5 So, I'm going to ask Mark to touch on that.

6 Thirdly, there is an intersection that was not
7 part of our original update study area and that's up at
8 Route 9 and Boght Road. When we did the final analysis
9 and we did all the traffic modeling updates, changing
10 over from what was previously proposed including the
11 extra lanes on Route 9 to what our current levels of
12 improvement are, there was that intersection and some
13 thresholds that we felt needed to be mitigated. That's
14 something that we hadn't discussed with the board yet
15 so we wanted to make you fully aware of what's planned
16 there because there will be a cost allocation for those
17 improvements as well.

18 The fourth item is just what I touched on before.
19 The way we culminate all this work is a resolution in
20 front of the Planning Board which will formally amend
21 the statement of findings for the Boght Road study
22 area. The Planning Board is the lead agent.

23 What we've done is we've drafted that resolution
24 and I'm going to hand out copies tonight to the board
25 and the other agencies. I want you to review it and

1 understand the format that it's in. It has some blanks.
2 When you get to the end, it doesn't have the detailed
3 information regarding the costs of the improvements.
4 That's something that we don't want to include in this
5 until the board has heard and agreed to the
6 improvements that we're going to recommend for 2010 as
7 well as 2020. My expectation is that the next time we
8 come before the board, we will have addressed any
9 questions that you have on the format of this amended
10 statement of findings and we will have been able to
11 build in the cost analysis which is that last piece.
12 So, hopefully the intent is the next time that we're
13 before the board, we might be in a position to take
14 action on all of this. We will expect to be able to get
15 through with our technical work as well as reaching
16 consensus with the other agencies over the next two to
17 four weeks. So, that's when we'd be in a position to
18 actually schedule a time to come back before the board
19 to answer any other questions in a public forum, or
20 help the board take some action on this.

21 I'm just going to pass this out. I'm not
22 expecting to read it now. You can read it on your own
23 time and like always, feel free to e-mail me or call me
24 with any comments. Then I'm going to ask Mark to just
25 go through those other intersections that I briefly

1 talked about.

2 CHAIRPERSON DONOVAN: This is Mark Sargent from
3 Creighton Manning, which is a traffic engineering firm.
4 They are under contract with the town to do some of our
5 traffic studies.

6 MR. SARGENT: Thank you. Hi folks. I'm going to
7 start with Dunsbach Ferry Road.

8 As Joe said, the concern there has been that in
9 the short-term, we had predicted an unsignalized level
10 of service F. For those of you who do not know what
11 level of service is, it is simply a measure of delay.
12 It's how long you wait in your car at a stoplight or a
13 signal.

14 So, at a stop sign a level of service F occurs at
15 50 seconds of delay. Once you wait longer than 50
16 seconds you experienced, theoretically, a level of
17 service F which is unacceptable.

18 Now, traffic engineers are not always overly
19 concerned with unsignalized level of service F because
20 it doesn't necessarily mean that it's not safe. It just
21 means that you wait a long time.

22 What we have here on this chart is an example
23 under existing conditions. The delay at Dunsbach Ferry
24 is about 20 seconds for people waiting to get out of
25 Dunsbach Ferry Road. The volume of cars coming out of

1 Dunsbach Ferry Road in the peak hours are about
2 approaching 150 vehicles per hour. The capacity for
3 that movement is upwards of 300. So there are ample
4 opportunities to get those cars out. They wait about 20
5 seconds.

6 In the next couple of years with the amount of
7 development that's expected in the area, delays will
8 increase. They will actually increase over 50 seconds.
9 That's level of service F. However, the volume will be
10 less than the capacity. So, that's a situation where
11 we're still comfortable allowing it to operate with
12 stop sign control and allowing DOT who is doing a
13 technical study currently, to monitor the conditions.

14 It's not necessarily something that we need to
15 solve in the short-term. However, in the long-term if
16 nothing is done there, delays would be on the order of
17 5 minutes, volumes would exceed capacity and there
18 would be a problem that should be addressed. That's
19 when we started talking about the need for a turn
20 prohibition. DOT has said that they would consider the
21 turn prohibition that the town asked for at that
22 intersection. So, that's a possibility here. As an
23 alternative, what we're suggesting now is that you
24 simply widen Dunsbach Ferry Road to provide two
25 approach lanes; a short right-turn lane and a left-turn

1 lane so that cars can cue up side by side. Under that
2 scenario, in 2010, there would be ample capacity for
3 the volume. Even in 2020, volumes would be nominally
4 level of service F and volumes would be near capacity,
5 but it could be reevaluated at this time.

6 What we're suggesting is rather than recommending
7 turn prohibitions, which is something that we talked
8 about at the last meeting, that we recommend the
9 widening and then a long term monitor. So that is the
10 additional evaluation of that intersection. I don't
11 know if you want to talk about that now or if you just
12 wanted the presentation.

13 CHAIRPERSON DONOVAN: Go ahead with the
14 presentation and we'll go back.

15 MR. SARGENT: The other intersection is Old
16 Loudon Road. North is to the right on this figure
17 (Indicating). Here is Route 9, Route 9R and Old Loudon
18 Road. There have been some concerns about this
19 intersection failing in the long-term. We have a
20 short-term solution here that we're comfortable with
21 and the board has been satisfied with and that is to
22 provide northbound and southbound left-turn lanes on
23 Old Loudon Road without any additional widening. That
24 gets us through the short-term.

25 In the long-term, that doesn't solve the problem.

1 Delays would be on the order of several minutes and it
2 really doesn't work.

3 As Joe said, we talked with the technical
4 committee about the two approaches. One is how can you
5 scale back land use or what can you do that's a
6 reasonable level of additional improvement and how
7 would that operate? The technical committee said, see
8 how it would operate if you had additional auxiliary
9 lanes. Not additional through lanes, but additional
10 left-turn lanes and right-turn lanes and start with
11 that. Then if that doesn't solve it, then start looking
12 at the land use side of it.

13 So, we looked at providing right turning lanes on
14 each approach for conceptually long-term in the future
15 and actually that does solve or accommodate the horizon
16 year 2020 volumes at an acceptable level of service D.
17 Even with the build-out of this parcel. So, if the
18 scale of this improvement is too large, then you can
19 still consider a land use alternative.

20 The direction that we're going right now is to
21 suggest that we got an improvement here that fits and
22 could be incorporated into the funding mechanism
23 together; mitigation fees over the long term. So, that
24 is the status of the analysis of that intersection.

25 MR. GRASSO: Our recommendation is to assume that

1 improvement would go in under the long-term horizon and
2 allocate the cost of that in our collection of
3 mitigation fees. We're collecting for that improvement.
4 Knowing that there is another option and that is to
5 look at the land uses and reduce the density such that
6 we're able to keep that intersection under those
7 short-term improvements. So, we're trying to build in
8 different options in case the town decided to not
9 address the land use or development.

10 MR. O'ROURKE: That doesn't take into effect
11 Wal-Mart.

12 MR. GRASSO: It does. It fully takes that into
13 account. Wal-Mart is one of the short-term projects.

14 MR. O'ROURKE: The starlight?

15 MR. GRASSO: The Starlite is under the long-term
16 projects. It would be one of those projects that would
17 come between 2010 and 2020 and it includes a very large
18 amount of development there on that parcel. That's
19 900,000 square feet. We feel that is an upper
20 threshold. The site is heavily constrained. We didn't
21 want to drill that onto that property too much, not
22 knowing exactly the amount of development it could
23 take.

24 The way that we could go about it if we could
25 plan for the worst case is looking at land use. You can

1 actually say, okay, we know that the short-term
2 improvement is going to keep it at a level of service C
3 for quite a few years. How much development could that
4 parcel accommodate and still keep it at a C or a D or a
5 marginal E before we get into a real critical failure
6 F? That's something that we would probably need to look
7 at when that project came in for development. That
8 would be the responsibility of the applicant to go
9 through and say, based on this site's project, these
10 are the impacts that we think are going to have on this
11 intersection. At least we know that we're planning for
12 that worse case scenario.

13 CHAIRPERSON DONOVAN: Joe, is that NCOR? Do you
14 know? Or is it COR?

15 MR. O'ROURKE: It's COR. It's the same as across
16 the street. That's the only property on there. Is that
17 correct, Kevin?

18 MR. DELAUGHTER: The only property zoned COR in
19 that vicinity -

20 MR. O'ROURKE: On that run right there
21 (Indicating).

22 MR. LACIVITA: You're saying that it's not
23 build-out, C.J., right?

24 MR. O'ROURKE: Right.

25 MR. GRASSO: Definitely the most significant

1 parcel that's going to effect this intersection.

2 MR. O'ROURKE: Isn't that correct?

3 MR. DELAUGHTER: Certainly the largest area, but
4 there may be some other smaller parcels.

5 MR. O'ROURKE: East of there?

6 MR. DELAUGHTER: Possibly to the north.

7 CHAIRPERSON DONOVAN: Tom?

8 MR. NARDACCI: Just wanted to make a brief
9 comment. At pretty much all the hearings that we've had
10 and some of the meetings and some calls, I didn't feel
11 like the initial report update gave it any
12 consideration. So, I'm pleased that you took the time
13 to go back because a lot of the things that we do on
14 this board - - it's particularly touchy when we start
15 talking about commercial development impact in
16 residential neighborhoods, as you know. This is
17 residential traffic that we're talking about.

18 I think that it's important that we look at
19 projects like this and do updates and that we pay
20 particular attention to those intersections that will
21 have a direct impact on the residents. That's why I've
22 consistently said from the get-go that we have to look
23 at this intersection. What you're coming back with
24 tonight - it's not a big improvement that we have to do
25 here in order to make it work. So, I think that we need

1 to keep that in mind as we're looking at the big
2 picture of 30,000 feet and this major intersection of
3 Route 9 and old Loudon. I think that we should keep in
4 mind what's happening downstream a little bit because
5 that's what's going to impact the residences and that's
6 what we need to keep in mind.

7 So, I'm pleased that you took the time and that
8 you showed that graph. It seems like a pretty easy fix,
9 right?

10 MR. SARGENT: I think so.

11 MR. NARDACCI: I just wanted to say that I
12 appreciate it.

13 Joe, I asked you to dig out some old documents
14 for me to take a look at and I appreciate you doing
15 that. I think that it shows the benefit of us having
16 town designated engineers where we can go to you and
17 rely on you to get us that information.

18 CHAIRPERSON DONOVAN: Does anybody else want to
19 interject or do we let Mark finish?

20 MR. SARGENT: I really don't have much else. I
21 don't have any information on the third intersection.

22 The north intersection of Boght and 9 was not in
23 the study area for this update. It wasn't something
24 that we had been looking at over the last nine months
25 or a year. It didn't come to light until just recently

1 when we started looking at the cost estimates and that
2 intersection of Boght and 9. The previous
3 recommendation was for six or seven lanes on Route 9.
4 That's what started this whole process is that the
5 agency agreed that we can't build six or seven lanes on
6 Route 9. We have to live with a five lane section.

7 At that intersection, we took another look at it
8 in detail with the right-hand turn lane in addition to
9 some left-turn lanes on the side streets. That's Boght
10 and 9.

11 MR. GRASSO: So that's what we're building into
12 the capital improvement plan. It will be collecting
13 mitigation fees for that improvement as well. That will
14 be added to the list as a new item.

15 I'd just like to take a minute to talk about the
16 levels of service F as we go out 20 years and why
17 sometimes we don't show the same levels of concern as
18 the board members or the public do. It's not that we
19 don't care because we're here to fix problems. That's
20 our job.

21 But one thing that we do know is that when you
22 try to project out a number of years down the road and
23 you're projecting levels of service F, we can't know
24 exactly what's going to get built through that time
25 period and what other improvements are going to be

1 implemented. What we find is that as traffic levels
2 increase and you start to approach those poor levels of
3 service, driving habits change. Things change that we
4 always refer to as self-mitigating where people will do
5 what they need to do to avoid those problem spots.

6 That's why very often even though on our original
7 projection we'll say that at 2020 we're going to be at
8 levels of service F. We never seem to get there and the
9 reasons why is that these other things that are very
10 dynamic that we can't qualify today start to occur over
11 time. It's why we always say, sometimes we have to wait
12 for it to get worse and figure out exactly what's bad
13 about it. As Tom mentioned, what certain hours of the
14 day is it bad, or are we talking about a long period of
15 time? Do we have safety concerns starting to pop up
16 that we need to address? There are other factors that
17 we need to look at before we just jump to committing to
18 building this improvement.

19 Basically what we're trying to do is take the
20 conservative approach. We've got a mechanism in place
21 to make sure that we collect the fees for these
22 improvements so that we're actually planning for it. We
23 can actually put these improvements in the ground when
24 we need to, or put the funds towards the improvements
25 that may show up over time as needing to be done as

1 well.

2 I think that we've talked about a lot of the
3 improvements and we haven't been able to provide any
4 definitive numbers to the board. Although based on what
5 we've seen tonight, we'll be able to do that in short
6 order. I think the order of magnitude in the cost of
7 all the improvements before it got evaluated back in
8 1989 for short term and long term improvements was
9 about 19 or 20 million dollars worth in today's
10 dollars. Our estimates right now are looking to be in
11 like the 13 to 15 million dollar range for all the
12 improvements.

13 MR. O'ROURKE: In today's dollars?

14 MR. GRASSO: In today's dollars, yes. The primary
15 reason for that, C.J., is because we don't have the
16 third lanes being added on Route 9, which we've said is
17 an extremely costly improvement.

18 CHAIRPERSON DONOVAN: It would have to be borne
19 by the state, is that correct?

20 MR. GRASSO: Back in 1989, we thought that there
21 was going to be a private share and that's what we've
22 been working towards. There isn't the support amongst
23 us to collect for that implement any longer and that's
24 one of the reasons why the overall cost of the
25 improvements has come down. There has been a big shift

1 in terms of where the costs are being apportioned but
2 it is less than what we originally anticipated.

3 So, hopefully when we come back before the board
4 again, we will have that detailed cost estimate and we
5 will have a cost associated with each improvement so
6 that the board can say, yes, this is an improvement
7 that I feel comfortable and I can see that this is the
8 cost that we're going to be collecting for. So, when we
9 decide that it's time for us to put this improvement
10 in, this is the fees that will have been collected over
11 time for that.

12 MR. LACIVITA: I think to even further your
13 point, Joe, on the 2020 build-out, the study that
14 Creighton Manning did prior to this, we're not even
15 experiencing the level of build-out that they
16 anticipated back in '98 or 2005. So, we're not even
17 there yet.

18 MR. O'ROURKE: Right. It was off almost 60%.

19 CHAIRPERSON DONOVAN: I know that, Mike, you had
20 concerns about the Johnson Road intersection.

21 MR. SULLIVAN: My concern is that this particular
22 intersection goes to a level of service F and it can
23 back up into Route 9 and the Johnson Road. So, if we
24 have a means of keeping it at a level of service D,
25 which I would say that it is the limit of desirable

1 level of service, that is okay.

2 My other concern was that the PDDs north of the
3 Boght GEIS proposing more dense development. For
4 example, the Mohawk Estates project currently has about
5 20 a.m. and p.m. trips generated. It would then go to
6 200 p.m. trips; 90% going to or from the south. I was
7 wondering if that was accounted for in the traffic
8 studies.

9 My concern is that we are underestimating the
10 volumes and the more PDDs that we approve - if they're
11 not in the GEIS, they're not accounted for in the
12 traffic study. So, what is appearing to be a level of
13 service D, maybe should be a level of service E. That's
14 my concern with that.

15 MR. GRASSO: My response to that is that they are
16 accounted for in background growth. That's how they are
17 accounted for - understanding that you can get specific
18 projects that come in that change the background growth
19 volumes. But then I'm sure that there are other things
20 that are going to occur that we've looked at that will
21 not be built-out in accordance with the horizons that
22 we're projecting. That may decrease traffic. That's why
23 we're confident that the background growth increases
24 that we've built into the model are appropriate for the
25 corridor.

1 MR. SULLIVAN: Is that about 3% per year?

2 MR. GRASSO: Yes.

3 MR. SULLIVAN: But if we were to take the growth
4 compared to the Mohawk River Estates, for example,
5 that's currently 20 trips. If it goes to 200 trips,
6 that's much more than 3%, if you string it out over the
7 next 10 years to 2020. It's highly likely that the
8 adjacent properties will also be developed because
9 there is going to be a waterline put in to the northern
10 limits of town. It's actually been sized to accommodate
11 additional development.

12 There is also Shelter Cove and Canterbury
13 Estates. My concern is that we get 10 or 20 projects
14 over the next ten years -

15 MR. O'ROURKE: It doesn't take that into account.
16 It was a higher density in '89.

17 MR. SULLIVAN: No, this is like a 20% increase,
18 if you were to project it out over 10 years.

19 MR. O'ROURKE: Oh, only Mohawk River, not Shelter
20 Cove.

21 MR. SULLIVAN: But if you have another 10 Mohawk
22 Rivers in the next 10 years, you're adding 1,000 cars
23 that might not be accounted for.

24 MR. O'ROURKE: That's a legitimate point.

25 MR. GRASSO: Some of those are accounted for as

1 is and as proposed. Others aren't and I'm sure that
2 there are going to be others proposed -

3 MR. O'ROURKE: Understand that it's a model and
4 I'm not the smartest guy in the world as I sit here,
5 but I know that if I'm at Mohawk River Estates on
6 Route 9 at the far north end of this community and I
7 want to get south, I'm going to get on the Northway.
8 That means that I'm going north and getting on Exit 8
9 over the river. So, it also doesn't take into account
10 common sense. These are models based on traffic flow;
11 correct, Joe?

12 MR. GRASSO: That's correct.

13 MR. O'ROURKE: It doesn't take into account
14 common sense.

15 MR. SULLIVAN: But for years we've heard from the
16 developers that people are coming down from Saratoga
17 County. We're losing all of our capacity to commuters.
18 Why is that? As Joe mentioned, it's mitigation. The
19 Northway is backed up so take Route 9. My concern is
20 that the Northway is backed up and Route 9 is failing
21 and people are now going to go Old Loudon Road.

22 MR. O'ROURKE: It's legitimate for four hours a
23 day; 10 in the morning to 2 in the afternoon.

24 CHAIRPERSON DONOVAN: Mike, I think that the
25 improvements that they've made on the Northway makes a

1 big difference through the traffic going south.

2 MR. O'ROURKE: People laughed at me when I said
3 you add another lane on Route 9. You know Joe. You've
4 been here the whole time and they said, oh, no, that
5 won't improve anything. The problem on Route 9 is
6 because people are making a right into Rite Aid.
7 They're making a right into Kirkers. They're making a
8 right at the Hess, which stops that right hand traffic.
9 There is only one lane of traffic for all intents and
10 purposes heading north at those times. The same thing
11 south. If you were to add one lane of traffic north and
12 south, that solves it.

13 MR. GRASSO: The other thing that I'd like to say
14 is that if there is a lot of development that we didn't
15 anticipate outside that corridor - even within the
16 corridor, we're projecting out to 2020 so we're still
17 looking over a decade away. What we'll generally see is
18 that the improvements that we identified have to be in
19 2020. We might have to implement in 2017, 2018 or 2019
20 so we may have to accelerate those a little bit. But at
21 least we're collecting the fees for that.

22 The other thing that we'll see is that you may
23 not see the level of development within the corridor
24 that we're projecting. We're still projecting a lot of
25 development within this corridor from now until 2020

1 that we're building improvements for.

2 MR. SULLIVAN: But are we also accounting for
3 development upstream, coming down from Saratoga?
4 Clifton Park will be developing as well. My point is
5 that we can't just look at that corridor. The twin
6 bridges will likely remain twin bridges for the
7 foreseeable future. In this case, Route 9 is the only
8 viable option. That's my point.

9 MR. O'ROURKE: Mike, those are all valid. I just
10 say to somebody that owns property on there and has
11 paid taxes: Do we hold them hostage because somebody
12 might develop something in Halfmoon?

13 MR. SULLIVAN: I'm not saying that you can't
14 develop it, but you have to look at what the
15 development has.

16 MR. O'ROURKE: Right, but then in terms of the
17 overall picture, who is responsible for the cost of
18 that? Is it the taxpayers for the Town of Colonie?

19 MR. GRASSO: Responsible for Clifton Park?

20 MR. O'ROURKE: The improvements necessary to
21 handle the Saratoga County traffic that's going to
22 grown.

23 MR. GRASSO: No. If the town looks at land use, I
24 think that you want to do a check and see what we
25 expect the Route 9 corridor to be. Are we trying to

1 build it to be a relief valve for the Northway?

2 MR. O'ROURKE: It has to be because the federal
3 government has told us that it has to be.

4 MR. SULLIVAN: Or, because they have a place at
5 the table now and they've helped us develop this plan,
6 which is really tailored towards the needs of the Town
7 of Colonie and the properties in the town. That's been
8 our focus and they understand that. So I think that
9 when we look at land use, we can look at how do we make
10 this corridor so that it can to be developed, allow
11 this section of town to be developed in accordance with
12 a good land use plan and decide how much capacity we
13 want to build for other communities outside the Town of
14 Colonie? How much do we want it to be a relief for the
15 Northway?

16 MR. O'ROURKE: So, in your estimation as a
17 professional advising this board: Is land use the
18 solution to what we're talking about?

19 MR. GRASSO: We think that the current plan that
20 we have is the solution. We think that relooking at
21 land use is another option that you can choose to take.
22 We're not forcing the town to look at land use. It's
23 just another option. We basically have built our way
24 out of it with these improvements. We've got a plan in
25 place to put these improvements in the ground. We're

1 just trying to provide options for the town.

2 CHAIRPERSON DONOVAN: We're not even taking into
3 account Sparrowbush Road, the HCOR zone, which allows
4 box stores.

5 MR. GRASSO: What we want to do is make the town
6 feel comfortable making decisions on applications that
7 come before you in this corridor, knowing that we can
8 adjust the traffic patterns.

9 MR. O'ROURKE: I only have two things.
10 Dunsbach Ferry: Did anybody look at that tying in
11 behind into Century Hill?

12 MR. GRASSO: We looked at it and we dismissed it.
13 We didn't think that it was going to provide a
14 significant benefit so we didn't feel like it was
15 warranted or desirable regarding possible change in the
16 character of traffic on Dunsbach Ferry.

17 MR. O'ROURKE: Really why? Can you explain that?

18 MR. GRASSO: Just in terms of the residential
19 nature of Dunsbach Ferry and you're basically inviting
20 trips to go down there from commercial areas. We really
21 didn't feel like we needed it to keep traffic going
22 along the Route 9 corridor.

23 MR. O'ROURKE: My concern is, as Tom says, it's
24 more about busses. Just so you know, all the busses
25 take short cuts. They all go the opposite way. They

1 don't come out to Route 9 unless they have to.

2 CHAIRPERSON DONOVAN: You're talking about school
3 busses?

4 MR. O'ROURKE: Yes. So, we're just taking school
5 busses and we're rerouting them through. I'm not sure
6 that there is validity to saying that we're taking
7 commercial traffic, which is off-spilling traffic.
8 Let's distinguish between the two. People, for the most
9 part, come to work in the morning and leave in the
10 afternoon. Again, everybody here probably does the same
11 thing. So, let's distinguish between that. Nobody is
12 going into Century Hill to have a good time and then
13 going through the neighborhoods unless you're going to
14 miss traffic and go out and head up near Cumberland
15 Farms, or out the back way across Mill Road, or however
16 you go across the town. My main concern, like Tom
17 mentioned eight months ago at these meetings, is the
18 bus route.

19 So, if there was the ability to tie in to Century
20 Hill and have a traffic signal and have it signalized
21 to take care of some of that traffic, I think that we,
22 as citizens, would benefit. That's my opinion. I just
23 don't know if it was looked at.

24 MR. GRASSO: It was considered. It's not part of
25 the final plan only because we don't feel like it's

1 warranted.

2 CHAIRPERSON DONOVAN: Did we have discussions
3 with the North Colonie School District at all?

4 MR. GRASSO: Yes and obviously they have concern
5 about the change in the character of traffic along the
6 front. That's where we left it. If we were going to
7 look at other options, we would really need to drill
8 down into it.

9 MR. O'ROURKE: The second point that I'd like to
10 make is that this intersection on Route 9R/Old Loudon
11 and again, I'm 100% against T-ing that with the
12 proposed Wal-Mart. I'm a million percent against that.

13 But in the meantime, if you just look at the
14 aerial here, it just says to put a roundabout here
15 (Indicating). I just wondered if anybody did look at,
16 in terms of traffic flow, putting a roundabout in. We
17 do have sufficient amount of space there to be able to
18 put a roundabout in. The problem at that intersection
19 is that if you miss the light and you miss the
20 Northway, people go 60 miles an hour trying to catch
21 those lights and that's the problem.

22 MR. GRASSO: Regarding the roundabout, they were
23 looked at in the study. Their latest analysis has a
24 roundabout analysis to see if - you have to go back and
25 revalidate some of the things that we had already

1 looked at. It doesn't work. My perspective on the
2 roundabout is that if you do one, you're committed to
3 doing multiple at intersections and there are certain
4 intersections where you just can't address the traffic
5 volumes. What makes this work is that when we change
6 the signals, we're interconnecting the signals so it
7 works as a whole system. It models the traffic going
8 through the whole corridor, not just trying to maximize
9 the timing at that one signal. That's where you can't
10 just address a roundabout with one area.

11 MR. O'ROURKE: There's not enough feet in the
12 morning and there's not enough feet in the afternoon.
13 It just doesn't ever catch up with the volume of
14 traffic.

15 MR. GRASSO: Basically what we do is we take
16 advantage of the cueing that's provided at multiple
17 intersections that you wouldn't otherwise get. As Mike
18 discussed, he's got a valid concern about creating cues
19 at one intersection that if you don't look at the whole
20 system, it will actually back up and cause additional
21 failures.

22 MR. O'ROURKE: So these official lanes that
23 you're talking about in this area, those are all part
24 of this plan right now?

25 MR. GRASSO: Absolutely.

1 MR. O'ROURKE: And those fees are within that 13
2 million dollar number in today's number.

3 MR. GRASSO: Yes, to 15. I've learned. That's why
4 I'm giving you a range.

5 CHAIRPERSON DONOVAN: George?

6 MR. HOLLAND: No.

7 CHAIRPERSON DONOVAN: Kevin?

8 MR. DELAUGHTER: Nothing.

9 CHAIRPERSON DONOVAN: Elena?

10 MS. VAIDA: Nothing.

11 CHAIRPERSON DONOVAN: Joe? Tim?

12 MR. LACIVITA: No.

13 MR. LANE: No.

14 CHAIRPERSON DOVOVAN: Tom?

15 MR. NARDACCI: No.

16 CHAIRPERSON DONOVAN: We had the public hearing
17 on this and then we closed the public hearing so this
18 is just part of the process. We have gotten many public
19 comments.

20 Joe, you think that you can give us some figures
21 in like four weeks?

22 MR. GRASSO: Yes.

23 CHAIRPERSON DONOVAN: Okay. I'm actually going to
24 take a vacation in August. Hopefully we could put this
25 up for a vote in July. Once you get those figures, if

1 you could let Joe know and he can call me and then we
2 can set up a meeting in July to deal with it.

3 The public hearing is closed, but if you have any
4 comments, if you could please do it - you can send me a
5 note in writing to the Planning Department.

6 Joe, if I could have those copies sent to me and
7 to the members of the board; thank you.

8 John, I'm sorry, I closed the hearing, but if you
9 want to send me questions, please feel free to do so
10 and I'll make sure that these gentlemen get an answer
11 for us.

12 MR. NARDACCI: Jean, just a question of timing.

13 Will we get the proposed mitigation and the cost
14 analysis so we'll have some time before the next
15 meeting?

16 MR. GRASSO: My expectation, Tom, is that after
17 we get agreement from the committee, CDTC and CDTA -
18 well, even if we don't get CDTA's consensus - only
19 because they're just an interested party - - we will
20 get it out to the board for consideration in advance.

21 CHAIRPERSON DONOVAN: Joe, I think that you're
22 hearing from C.J. and it's been my concern right along
23 that making that Old Loudon Road two way and dumping
24 traffic back into the southerly portion of Old Loudon
25 Road into the neighborhoods - I have a concern.

1 We'll do that and then once we get all the
2 information, we'll decide when we're going to meet in
3 July and we'll post a hearing on the calendar.

4 John, direct your questions in a letter to me and
5 I'll forward them onto these gentlemen for an answer.

6 Thank you'll who were here for this and everybody
7 else, I think we put to sleep.

8

9

(Whereas the proceeding concerning the above
10 *entitled matter was concluded at 7:44 p.m.)*

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATION

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I, NANCY STRANG-VANDEBOGART, Notary Public in
and for the State of New York, hereby CERTIFY that the
record taped and transcribed by me at the time and
place noted in the heading hereof is a true and
accurate transcript of same, to the best of my ability
and belief.

NANCY STRANG-VANDEBOGART

Dated May 21, 2009