

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

\*\*\*\*\*  
AN UPDATE TO THE BOGHT GEIS TRAFFIC STUDY  
\*\*\*\*\*

THE TAPED AND TRANSCRIBED MINUTES of the above  
entitled proceeding BY NANCY STRANG-VANDEBOGART  
commencing on February 23, 2010 at 8:36 p.m. at  
the Public Operations Center  
347 Old Niskayuna Road, Latham, New York 12110

BOARD MEMBERS:

CHARLES J. O'ROURKE, CHAIRPERSON  
ELENA VAIDA  
MICHAEL SULLIVAN  
THOMAS NARDACCI  
PAUL ROSANO  
PETER GANNON  
TIMOTHY LANE  
PETER STUTO, Jr. Esq., Attorney for the Planning  
Board

Also present:

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

1 MR. GRASSO: Okay, C.J., I'm going to  
2 start. I'm actually going to go back a little  
3 about 20 years just to bring the board up to  
4 speed again on this Boght Road traffic update.

5 Back in the late 1980's the town  
6 initiated a generic environmental impact  
7 statement in what was known as the Boght  
8 Road/Columbia Street area which looked at  
9 build out in the northeast section of town.

10 The study included about 4,100 acres.  
11 Just by reference when we talk about the study  
12 area - the north side of the study area is the  
13 town's bike path, the west side of the study  
14 is the Adirondack Northway, the east side of  
15 the study area is the City of Cohoes boundary  
16 and then the south side of the study area is a  
17 portion of Route 2 and I think that this is  
18 Swatling (Indicating) and a portion of  
19 Route 7.

20 The study done in the late '80s looked at  
21 development of the study area over a 20 year  
22 planning period which would take us to 2009.  
23 The result of that study was what we refer to  
24 as a statement of findings. That is a set of  
25 conditions that development projects could get

1 reviewed and approved under if a project fell  
2 within the context of that statement of  
3 findings. Part of that statement of findings  
4 included capital improvements that would  
5 address the impacts of growth within the study  
6 area.

7 The one issue that we're going to talk  
8 about tonight is addressing the traffic  
9 impacts of development. Back in the late '80s  
10 when the study was completed, there was a set  
11 of traffic improvements anticipated to be  
12 required to address the impacts of development  
13 throughout the planning area.

14 Back in 2005 the town initiated an update  
15 to the study to look at the amount of  
16 development that had occurred and the scope of  
17 traffic improvements.

18 The technical analysis was done but the  
19 study was never completed because the update  
20 showed that there hadn't been a lot of  
21 development that had occurred within the past  
22 15 years. The town did not complete the study  
23 and revise the statement of findings at that  
24 time.

25 From 2005 to 2009 there have been a

1 number of site plan applications that had been  
2 brought before the Planning Board and are  
3 currently under consideration.

4 Back in early 2009 the town initiated  
5 another update to the traffic portion based on  
6 the new applications that had been received as  
7 well as the new zoning that had been enacted  
8 in 2007 with the intent to evaluate the scope  
9 of improvements.

10 That brings us to the current study that  
11 we are currently working on along with  
12 Creighton Manning Engineers, the traffic  
13 consultants, for the update.

14 Back in 2009 the last time that we were  
15 in front of the Planning Board, there was a  
16 certain set of improvements that we had  
17 recommended to address the traffic impacts  
18 associated with the currently pending  
19 applications, as well as the amount of  
20 development that we expected to occur looking  
21 out until 2020. That was up the updated  
22 planning period.

23 One of the recommendations that we  
24 supported from a traffic mitigation standpoint  
25 was the conversion of Old Loudon Road to a two

1 way traffic flow. Right now there is a portion  
2 of Old Loudon Road between Route 9R and  
3 Route 9 that operates as one way. One of our  
4 recommendations was to install a traffic  
5 signal at that intersection of Old Loudon Road  
6 and across from Autopark Drive and convert  
7 Old Loudon Road to two way.

8 That recommendation was not supported by  
9 the town, specifically the Planning Board  
10 because of the traffic diversion that would  
11 occur south on Old Loudon Road south of  
12 Route 9R and the additional traffic that was  
13 going to be directed through a pretty  
14 residential area.

15 Over the past few months we have been  
16 working with Creighton Manning on a new set of  
17 traffic improvements that would not include  
18 the conversion of Old Loudon Road to two way.

19 I'm going to turn it over to Mark Sargent  
20 of Creighton Manning. We want to go through  
21 this latest round of analysis that we've done,  
22 as well as the scope of improvements with the  
23 types of mitigation that we think these  
24 improvements would involve. Assuming that the  
25 scope of improvements get supported by the

1 Planning Board, over the next month we will  
2 try to finalize this study and create an  
3 amended statement of findings. The Planning  
4 Board was the original lead agent for the  
5 Boght Road GEIS and the Planning Board would  
6 need to be the first agency to approve any  
7 amendment to the statement of findings.

8 Assuming that the Planning Board did approve  
9 that, we would need to have a public hearing  
10 at the same time. Then the amended statement  
11 of findings would go to the other involved  
12 agencies that are involved in this process  
13 which includes the Colonie Town Board, New  
14 York State Department of Transportation, CDTC  
15 and CDTA. They could either adopt the same  
16 amended statement of findings as is or adopt  
17 their own amended statement of findings.

18 Assuming that all goes forward, then the  
19 Planning Board would have the ability to  
20 approve current site plan applications that  
21 are currently before the town as well as  
22 future site plan applications that were deemed  
23 consistent with the statement of findings,  
24 agreeing that these projects would take part  
25 in compliance with this statement of findings

1 and paying mitigation fees to go towards this  
2 plan of traffic improvements.

3 With that, I'm going to turn this over to  
4 Mark and he's going to go through the latest  
5 round of evaluations that we completed.

6 MR. NARDACCI: Joe, excuse me for one  
7 second. Who defined the original Boght study  
8 area?

9 MR. GRASSO: It was defined by the Town  
10 Board and the Planning Board. It took as far  
11 east of the City of Cohoes boundary. On the  
12 west it's bounded by the Adirondack Northway.  
13 The western boundary also abuts the airport  
14 area GEIS, which also had been done and that  
15 covered another four or five thousand acres of  
16 the town. Like I said, it extended as far to  
17 the north as the bike path. That was not  
18 simply because there were current development  
19 applications that were being considered within  
20 this area. Basically to the south it takes you  
21 down to a pretty densely developed portion of  
22 the town.

23 So, I think that this was an area where  
24 there were relatively undeveloped properties  
25 that were zoned to accommodate a significant

1 amount of additional development and the town  
2 was starting to see development activity  
3 within the study area. It hadn't received any  
4 kind of overall study to look at the impacts  
5 of development.

6 Any other questions before we go into the  
7 technical part?

8 ***(There was no response.)***

9 MR. GRASSO: Okay, Mark?

10 MR. SARGENT: Thanks, Joe. That was a  
11 nice comprehensive overview. I just have a  
12 little bit of overlapping information that  
13 might sound a little bit redundant. Joe  
14 outlined the whole Boght Road study area.

15 The focus of our work most recently has  
16 been in this area (Indicating), around 9 and  
17 9R where most of the development has been  
18 concentrated. We have not been looking at  
19 transportation improvements throughout the  
20 entire Boght Road area. We have been focusing  
21 in on this area right here (Indicating).

22 Again, as Joe had said, we have worked to  
23 a point of identifying a number of different  
24 traffic mitigation measures. Those are shown  
25 here (Indicating). In general, we had reached

1 agreement on the vast majority of these with  
2 the exception of this one of converting  
3 Old Loudon Road to a two way.

4 There is a fair amount of animation that  
5 is shown on this site. You can see 87 across  
6 the north area. Route 9 to the middle of the  
7 screen and 9R and Johnson Road to the west.  
8 Old Loudon Road, Autopark and Century Drive  
9 and Dunsbach Ferry Road are here. That's just  
10 so that you're oriented. You can see the study  
11 area. This is where we've been focusing our  
12 efforts.

13 We weren't able to reach agreement on the  
14 idea of converting Old Loudon Road to two way  
15 and the amount of development proposed in this  
16 area had seemed like it had been planned in  
17 the GEIS. With the combination of the Wal-Mart  
18 project and the build out of the Century Hill  
19 office project, they were larger in scale. So,  
20 that's what necessitated the project and that  
21 brings us to this idea that we were asked to  
22 look at most recently, which is the idea of a  
23 two way connector road between Latham Autopark  
24 Drive and the intersecting Johnson Road here  
25 (Indicating).

1           We have taken a closer look at how a road  
2 through there might look. We have laid this  
3 out according to standard highway design  
4 criteria. You can see here (Indicating) that  
5 it would have to pass through a wetland and  
6 that would need to be mitigated. Functionally,  
7 you couldn't design a road through here. There  
8 would be impacts that would be associated with  
9 it. It would impact this property here  
10 (Indicating) There is no public right of way  
11 between these parcels. So, there would need to  
12 be a taking or an agreement here to establish  
13 a public road through here. The rest of the  
14 alignment is really all within a single  
15 parcel.

16           This is essentially a picture of what the  
17 new road would look like.

18           The concept here shows that Old Loudon  
19 Road would continue to intersect one way. So,  
20 the tail end here would be removed and grassed  
21 and it would be brought in at a T intersection  
22 here.

23           MR. NARDACCI: Mark, whose idea was this?

24           MR. SARGENT: Where did this idea come  
25 from?

1 MR. NARDACCI: Yeah.

2 MR. SARGENT: It emerged at the town  
3 level. Someone at the town suggested this.

4 MR. NARDACCI: I just want to tell you  
5 what my immediate concern is. You're pulling  
6 traffic from Autopark and sending it down into  
7 the Boght neighborhood.

8 MR. SARGENT: I'm just going to back up a  
9 little.

10 The development that's here, the Wal-Mart  
11 and the build out of Century Hill Park - it's  
12 been proposed that the traffic signal be  
13 installed here (Indicating) to provide access  
14 to that. DOT, others and engineers have agreed  
15 that a signal by itself is not sufficient  
16 mitigation for the build out for that. There  
17 needs to be some additional traffic  
18 mitigation.

19 Operations at 9 and 9R and at this signal  
20 and along Route 9 in general would deteriorate  
21 measurably if that area is built out and a  
22 signal is installed here. So the idea is that  
23 New York State DOT and others are looking for  
24 some conditional improvement above and beyond  
25 simply installing a signal.

1           MR. NARDACCI: I look at this the other  
2 way. I'm going to be a little cynical here. I  
3 look at this as this gives us a reason to have  
4 a light. If DOT has an intent to improve with  
5 a light, this connector road provides the  
6 action that is necessary in order to now say,  
7 okay, now we can have the light.

8           My concern is this: At least since I've  
9 been here - which is just a few years  
10 now - everything that I have said in other  
11 meetings with other town officials has been  
12 that we don't want to have traffic go into the  
13 neighborhoods. I know that there was a lot of  
14 money spent on this and I'm not an engineer. I  
15 was a history major in college but I just try  
16 to look at things. I'm a little cynical.

17           MR. GRASSO: We understand that a  
18 significant concern of the town and both the  
19 Planning Board and the Town Board and the  
20 residents is going to be that if we develop a  
21 new traffic plan for this area that we don't  
22 want to send additional trips through the  
23 residential neighborhoods. We've got a plan  
24 that we think does that.

25           In terms of the connector road, that was

1           our idea and I'll take responsibility for it.  
2           The connector road concept only works if there  
3           is a signal on both ends, obviously, in order  
4           to get on and off Route 9 and Route 9R. It's  
5           tied to a signal there across from  
6           Autopark Drive.

7                     When we talk about this connector, we're  
8           talking about what we commonly refer to as  
9           Parcel 28. It was a large parcel that was  
10          previously looked at for a large amount of  
11          speculated development. The town hadn't  
12          received any development applications. This  
13          whole connector road is within the confines of  
14          Parcel 28 and we tried to respect the  
15          constrained lands of that parcel.

16                    The intent of the traffic improvement  
17          plan is to try to divert trips away from the  
18          Route 9/9R intersection. This is a failing  
19          intersection and will continue to degrade with  
20          just the little background growth that's going  
21          to occur. As development occurs throughout the  
22          study area, small little projects and projects  
23          that get approved one at a time, traffic  
24          conditions will continue to degrade worse than  
25          they are. They fail now and they're going to

1 continue to get worse without a significant  
2 improvement to the area.

3 We thought that Old Loudon Road going to  
4 two way was a significant improvement. It  
5 wasn't supported by the town because of what  
6 we considered a negligible amount of  
7 additional trips on Old Loudon Road. This  
8 board, however, felt like it was significant.  
9 This improvement, we think, has a far less  
10 impact on the residential neighborhoods but  
11 still provides a diversion of traffic away  
12 from the 9/9R intersection and gets southbound  
13 traffic headed east towards Cohoes.

14 MR. NARDACCI: I know that you have a  
15 presentation to make, but I want to just  
16 address some concerns.

17 What are we looking at as far as trips?

18 MR. GRASSO: Mark will go through that.  
19 He'll go through the detailed results.

20 MR. SARGENT: So, we were asked to look  
21 at this road and the light. Will it solve any  
22 problems? The first thing we did was get  
23 together with town officials. We were asked to  
24 look at and review all of the land development  
25 that then was believed to be developed in the

1 Boght Road area. We had developed an area  
2 traffic forecast that was based on information  
3 that we get from the town about what's  
4 happening with land development. We sat down  
5 again and went over the latest status of all  
6 these developments and we identified a number  
7 of short-term projects that are active and are  
8 being constructed and should be included in  
9 the short-term forecast.

10 Notable projects included the one shown  
11 here (Indicated), Canterbury Crossings. We're  
12 not saying that's going to be entirely built  
13 out in five years, but the forecast did  
14 include 50% of Canterbury Crossings. They  
15 include Stage I and Stage II of Century Hill  
16 but not the complete build out - at least in  
17 the short-term forecast. It also included  
18 Shelter Cove, Wal-Mart and the Mohawk  
19 Riverfront project. These are some of the land  
20 development projects that we had included in  
21 the short-term forecast.

22 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: Only half of  
23 Shelter Cove, right?

24 MR. SARGENT: Correct.

25 What you also see on this slide is that

1           there are a number of other parcels shown in  
2           blue. These are active residential projects  
3           that have been approved and the vast majority  
4           of them are under construction. These are all  
5           included also in the short-term development.

6                         We were concerned about potential  
7           additional traffic on Johnson Road. This  
8           development in this southern part of the  
9           Boght Road area will be increasing some of the  
10          traffic volume on Johnson Road as a result of  
11          land development here.

12                        MR. GRASSO: Mark, it's important for the  
13          board to know that there are a couple of  
14          projects that are actually outside the GEIS  
15          study area. That includes the Shelter Cove  
16          project and the Mohawk Riverfront Estates  
17          project. So, we took a certain amount of the  
18          traffic from those projects and included it in  
19          new trip generation; even though they are  
20          outside the study area and would normally not  
21          be included. They would normally fall into  
22          just what we consider background growth. They  
23          are real projects and they are on the boards.  
24          We felt reasonable that we could establish a  
25          certain development horizon for those

1 projects, so we included those in the trip  
2 generation. As those projects are brought  
3 before the Planning Board, I want the Planning  
4 Board to know that they are not officially  
5 within the GEIS study area.

6 MR. SARGENT: One of the concerns also is  
7 that as part of the previous work, we always  
8 look at the build out of the area. We looked  
9 at all of the land and what was potentially  
10 going to be built and assumed that it would  
11 all be built within our planning process. We  
12 have learned over time that is not reasonable.  
13 This area is not building out. At this time we  
14 were asked for a moderate forecast and to come  
15 up with a development forecast that had a more  
16 reasonable estimate of what will occur and not  
17 what could occur.

18 That's shown here and I'd like to draw  
19 your attention to the bottom line here  
20 (Indicating). It puts the forecast in the  
21 context with some of the previous estimates  
22 and I'll talk through this slide for a moment.

23 You can see that the result of those  
24 developments that I just highlighted, it shows  
25 that we're looking at approximately 1,800

1 additional p.m. peak hour trips on the network  
2 in the next five years. Our new short-term  
3 planning horizon is the year 2015. So we're  
4 looking at 1,800 trips. We've maintained a  
5 long-term planning horizon of 2020. There will  
6 be an additional 1,700 trips and that's  
7 associated with some of the other developments  
8 on the chart.

9 All together we're saying that within the  
10 next 10 years, you can see about 3,500  
11 additional p.m. peak hour trips. When you  
12 compare those assumptions to what we have been  
13 doing recently, you can see that it's  
14 significantly less than the forecasts that  
15 were in the earlier version where we had 6,300  
16 trips. This gets to the issue of build out.  
17 This is the maximum build out of land in the  
18 area. This is what we reasonably expect to  
19 happen.

20 MR. NARDACCI: So it's 3,493 and not  
21 3,493 on top of 8,000?

22 MR. SARGENT: Correct.

23 MR. NARDACCI: I would like to have an  
24 understanding from 2009 to 2010; I really want  
25 to know exactly how we're 2,900 trips less.

1 MR. SARGENT: I've got another chart for  
2 that.

3 MR. NARDACCI: These are forecasts right?

4 MR. GRASSO: Right.

5 MR. NARDACCI: So in 2009, the forecast  
6 is 6,318 and now we're saying there is not as  
7 much development as we thought. So, it's  
8 3,493.

9 MR. SARGENT: Right, and I can try to  
10 clarify that for you.

11 One of the assumptions that we took with  
12 this forecast is that all the land developable  
13 the area would be built out. All developable  
14 main parcels would be built.

15 How much traffic would be potentially  
16 generated in the Boght Road area? We estimated  
17 that there would be 6,300 trips total.

18 We assigned an arbitrary planning horizon  
19 to the year 2020. The reality is that the area  
20 isn't going to be built out. Not all of those  
21 trips are going to occur. This is a different  
22 assumption. Now we're saying that if you built  
23 the area, this is what is likely to occur  
24 within the next year and not within the next  
25 10 years. It's not the potential build out in

1 the area. It's a different scenario.

2 MR. NARDACCI: Is this consistent or  
3 inconsistent with our other GEIS areas?

4 MR. SARGENT: It consistent with the  
5 airport map. The airport went through the  
6 exact same scenario. We've got a maximum build  
7 out and then it backed off.

8 The other thing here is that there was  
9 one significant development that contributed  
10 to this high number and that was the one that  
11 they called Parcel 28.

12 It's a big parcel and it's one that  
13 involves that connector road and has a lot of  
14 wetlands in it. On paper based on zoning it  
15 has the potential to be built out to about one  
16 million square feet of development. The  
17 earlier study assumed that it would be built  
18 out to about a million square feet of  
19 development.

20 MR. NARDACCI: And what do you have it at  
21 now?

22 MR. SARGENT: We have it at 100,000.

23 MR. NARDACCI: So you're going to put a  
24 connector road through the middle of Parcel 28  
25 and you're going to have frontage on both

1 sides of that parcel and you're only going to  
2 develop 100,000 square feet?

3 MR. GRASSO: Just so you understand,  
4 these are projections that support this study.  
5 It's not to say that the maximum development  
6 potential of that property is capped at  
7 100,000 square feet. Based on our drilling  
8 into this parcel and looking at the extent of  
9 wetlands and looking at how access could be  
10 accommodated, we feel like 100,000 square feet  
11 is a reasonable amount of development that we  
12 could expect to see proposed there.

13 MR. NARDACCI: Okay, you're talking about  
14 putting in a connector road. What's the  
15 traffic that we're looking at with that  
16 connector road? Can you give me just a  
17 ballpark number?

18 MR. SARGENT: If we built it today, and  
19 Wal-Mart goes in and with the other  
20 development in the area, 400 to 500.

21 If you constructed that road today, as I  
22 said, it would only attract a few diversions  
23 from the 9/9R intersection.

24 MR. NARDACCI: I'm not a developer. With  
25 a road going through the middle of the parcel,

1           that other parcel seems like it becomes more  
2           viable than it was as its own.

3           MR. GRASSO: It's more viable from an  
4           access standpoint. What we're trying to do is  
5           we're trying to describe what it was  
6           previously evaluated at.

7           I don't know where the 985,000 square  
8           feet of development came from. It might have  
9           been something like the planning staff back in  
10          1989 called the owner and said, have you ever  
11          done a study to evaluate what the maximum  
12          development potential of your property is?  
13          We're going to do a study. He might have said,  
14          985,000 square feet. A realtor told me that I  
15          could get that. So, that's what was studied in  
16          1989. What we're trying to do is improve the  
17          accuracy of the study.

18          MR. NARDACCI: Here's the thing. You guys  
19          are engineers and you understand math better  
20          than I do. What I understand is we're talking  
21          about reasonable forecasting. If you put a  
22          connector road through the middle of  
23          Parcel 28, I would suspect that you're going  
24          to have more than 100,000 square feet with the  
25          development.

1           MR. GRASSO: And if the Planning Board  
2           says, you know what? We don't feel comfortable  
3           going from 985,000 to 100,000 square feet -  
4           the Planning Board might say, we'd rather see  
5           the numbers run at 300,000 square feet or  
6           500,000 square feet. Well, we've got a model  
7           now set up so that it's very easy to do  
8           another scenario. If there is a certain  
9           project that you say, I think that Shelter  
10          Cove is going to be built out over the next  
11          two years, put all the development out and  
12          don't go out five years.

13           CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: Let's explain what he  
14          has up. Explain the 1989 - but 2005 and 2009  
15          are under the same premise, correct?

16           MR. SARGENT: No. That's why it's  
17          different and that's why we want to point this  
18          out. They are similar to the scenario that  
19          you're talking about potentially playing out  
20          here with Parcel 28.

21           What happened here is the GEIS update was  
22          undertaken in 2005. The build out of the area  
23          was predicted to generate 5,700 trips.

24           Then along came Wal-Mart and the build  
25          out of Century Hill Office Park which was

1 greater than predicted. So, here we're  
2 predicting 5,700 and you put the brakes on  
3 that. That was something that we took a little  
4 heat for because it was planned to be 100,000  
5 square feet of office and it was also planned  
6 to be an Autopark down in that area, based on  
7 current thinking of the town at that time. So  
8 that's why traffic forecasts increase from '05  
9 to '09 because this is when Wal-Mart and the  
10 build out of Century Hill Office Park came to  
11 light.

12 MR. NARDACCI: Mark, Autopark was  
13 approved when? When was it first reviewed?

14 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: 2004.

15 MR. GRASSO: No, 1999.

16 MR. SARGENT: The build out projections  
17 changed.

18 We sat down with the town and the staff  
19 and we thought that it made sense that another  
20 shopping center was going to sit there. As Joe  
21 said, if it turns out that you want to assume  
22 something more dense, there is reserve  
23 capacity in this network.

24 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: My whole point in  
25 just bringing that up is just to point out

1 that these are estimates to the board.

2 MR. GRASSO: You're right. One thing that  
3 we always recommend to towns when they decide  
4 to embark on a GEIS is that you need to do  
5 updates to the study and that's exactly what  
6 the town has been trying to do starting in  
7 2005.

8 MR. NARDACCI: I don't understand it and  
9 I really need to understand how the  
10 projections have increased so dramatically,  
11 considering all of the developments that we  
12 have seen in this area and what was going to  
13 happen then versus what the reality is. I can  
14 see 985,000 square feet versus never been  
15 developed in 1989 to today and nothing has  
16 been proposed. I can understand that.

17 MR. SARGENT: I don't know that they have  
18 actually decreased that significantly. What we  
19 have done is we have put a different number in  
20 the current planning. The potential of the  
21 build out in the area is the same. It's still  
22 roughly 6,000 trips. The potential is still  
23 about the same. We are now planning for a  
24 smaller number within a time frame. In  
25 10 years from now if it turns out that the

1 area is developing much more intensely - we  
2 haven't seen that. This was an  
3 over-prediction and this was an  
4 over-prediction (Indicating). In this, we have  
5 moderated it.

6 MR. NARDACCI: Just to be clear, I feel  
7 better in over-predicting because we have seen  
8 this. What we're going to do is in addition to  
9 laying out the GEIS, we're going to layout the  
10 improvements. What are the improvements?

11 MR. GRASSO: What we can do is we can  
12 provide a sensitivity analysis where we can  
13 say okay, instead of the 3,500 trips, what if  
14 it turns out to be 5,000 trips? What would  
15 happen to the levels of service that we would  
16 expect to see in 2020? We can easily do that  
17 now that the model is set up. We just need to  
18 know what those types of questions are from  
19 the Planning Board.

20 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: I'd like to see it  
21 incrementally and 10% off, 20% off, 30% off  
22 and what those numbers are on a separate  
23 chart.

24 MR. SARGENT: We can do that but in the  
25 end, the trends will be the same. You'll see a

1 benefit from the connector road and the amount  
2 of benefit that will come from that. You might  
3 need an additional turn lane or auxiliary lane  
4 at an intersection but in general, the trends  
5 and the types of inclusion won't provide a  
6 benefit or not. Those conclusions, I think,  
7 will stay valid.

8 MR. NARDACCI: Here is my top concern. I  
9 don't want to wiggle the numbers to make them  
10 work. I'm not saying that anyone is trying to  
11 do that. I just want that out in the open. We  
12 know what all of the intersections are. There  
13 are 12 that are going to be level of service  
14 F. I don't want to reduce the numbers because  
15 then we could figure out these intersections  
16 work and now we only need a turning lane  
17 instead of making the hard choices.

18 Our responsibility here is really to  
19 steward this area. There are so many changes  
20 happening here that have never changed and  
21 have never happened. There is so much concern  
22 from the residents that live in this area of  
23 town.

24 MR. SARGENT: You like the idea of  
25 keeping a built out scenario in there.

1           MR. NARDACCI: I mean, that's my opinion.  
2           Other people may have different scenarios and  
3           you guys are professionals. You see it and  
4           deal with it all the time. That's why I asked  
5           what does the airport do? I think that's  
6           important. What's the other GEIS areas?

7           MR. GRASSO: Lishakill and Kings Road.

8           MR. NARDACCI: I think that we need to  
9           openly discuss the numbers so that down the  
10          road when the public starts taking a harder  
11          look at it and saying well, 8,000 to  
12          3,000 -- I'm going to say that it just seems  
13          like you're trying to make the numbers work.  
14          Do you know what I'm saying?

15          MR. SARGENT: The next slide will inform  
16          us a little bit. I do want to point out one  
17          other fact.

18          In 1989 the build out of the area was  
19          going to generate an additional 9,000 peak  
20          hour trips. We were not able to quantify  
21          exactly how many trips were generated but we  
22          did look at the amount of land and acreage  
23          that was associated with some of that  
24          development. Approximately 30% to 40% of the  
25          land in the area speculated to be developed in

1 this time frame was actually developed. It was  
2 approximately one-third. So you could  
3 reasonably say that of that prediction of  
4 9,000 that only 3,000 actually happened.

5 MR. GRASSO: So some of that development  
6 did occur from 1989 to 2009.

7 MR. SARGENT: What was left over from the  
8 9,000 is the 6,000. Three thousand was built  
9 and we're saying that there is still room for  
10 6,000. That build out number - we haven't  
11 reduced it, it's just that part of this has  
12 been built. There is still capacity for about  
13 6,000 trips of build out. There is potential  
14 for about 6,000 trips. We're saying that it's  
15 not all going to happen in the next ten years.  
16 This is still pretty high when you look at the  
17 next slide.

18 This slide shows the different traffic  
19 forecasts (Indicating). It is one segment of  
20 traffic volume in the area of all of the  
21 segments. This is one representative segment  
22 of some of the trends that we're seeing. So,  
23 this is starting to show the volume on Route 9  
24 right now. Dunsbach Ferry Road back in 1989  
25 had a volume that was about 18,000 vehicles

1 per day. In 1989, it was predicted that the  
2 build out in this area - that volume would go  
3 up to about 36,000 or 37,000 per day.

4 Now in 2005 when we undertook the current  
5 update, you can see here that the existing  
6 volume was closer to 23,000 or 24,000 per day  
7 (Indicating). So, we were not on track. We  
8 weren't seeing that level of traffic. It was  
9 probably 5,000 less, but we still saw the  
10 potential build out for those additional 6,000  
11 trips. This is what those trips looked like  
12 along with other regional background growth in  
13 the area. You can see that line (Indicating).  
14 We didn't put our horizon year out beyond  
15 2020.

16 This bump here is what we were asked to  
17 look at in the '07 and '08 timeline with  
18 Wal-Mart and Century Hill coming along. We're  
19 very concerned about short-term development.  
20 Give us an analysis of the build out of  
21 Century Hill, Wal-Mart, Canterbury Crossing  
22 and Shelter Cove all within a couple of years.  
23 What happens when these things hit? We don't  
24 care about anything else. We want to know what  
25 happens when you see all this traffic. What

1 are the improvements that we need?

2 That's why a short-term forecast was  
3 predicted to be so high.

4 This is what we're looking at now. This  
5 yellow goldish line is the current forecast  
6 (Indicating). So even though we're saying  
7 3,500 peak hour trips within the study area,  
8 you can still see that it's a fairly healthy  
9 growth rate on Route 9 in the area especially  
10 when you compare it to how traffic on Route 9  
11 has actually grown.

12 Over the last five years, the traffic  
13 volume on Route 9 has really been stable  
14 because of the economy and other factors. So,  
15 we have gone from 18,000 to closer to 25,000  
16 cars per day. We're still predicting a  
17 significant amount of additional traffic on  
18 Route 9.

19 Beyond 2020, there is potential for more  
20 growth.

21 This is the diversion issue. Does this  
22 connector road provide any benefit? Why are we  
23 looking at it? Why are we considering it? How  
24 much traffic would it accommodate?

25 We worked with CDTC and we modeled it and

1 looked at existing traffic patterns in the  
2 area. If we built that route today, it would  
3 not attract any through traffic. It would not  
4 generate a single new trip in the  
5 neighborhood. There isn't that diversion for  
6 any regional route. It is simply a local  
7 connection that would divert traffic from the  
8 9/9R intersection.

9 So if you live in the Johnson Road area  
10 and you want to go north on Route 9, you would  
11 use this connector road. Coming south on  
12 Route 9 and going back to the neighborhood,  
13 you would use it to get back there. This would  
14 move some of the existing traffic onto this  
15 road.

16 MR. GRASSO: If you remember when we  
17 talked last time, we know that Route 9 serves  
18 as a relief valve to the Northway and when  
19 there are incidents on the Northway. There was  
20 a concern that if we changed Old Loudon Road  
21 to two way that would become a relief valve to  
22 Route 9 when Route 9 clogs up. This new  
23 connector road serves no benefit as a relief  
24 valve to the Northway, Route 9 or Old Loudon  
25 Road. So, it's distinctly different than what

1 was previously considered.

2 MR. SARGENT: These trips here under the  
3 existing conditions and forecast year showed  
4 the diverted traffic total of about 440. That  
5 does not include trips associated with that  
6 100,000 square feet. It's just additional thru  
7 traffic. That is 440 fewer trips that are  
8 going to show up to the 9 and 9R intersection.

9 That is an intersection that DOT is  
10 concerned about.

11 If we could move some existing and future  
12 trips away from that intersection, that's  
13 where the benefit comes in.

14 We looked at the different levels of  
15 service. I'm sure that you're familiar with  
16 that term to measure the quality of traffic  
17 flow. It has a long delay and we evaluated the  
18 levels of service at all five of these  
19 intersections.

20 This chart of figures (Indicating) shows  
21 that the level of service without the bypass  
22 and the level of service with the bypass. You  
23 see no real significant difference at any of  
24 these intersections. There are moderate  
25 changes in levels of service. It's really

1 comfortable. What you do see here is the  
2 benefit at 9 and 9R where if you build the  
3 bypass rather than level of service D with 51  
4 seconds of delay, you wind up with a level of  
5 service C at 33 seconds of delay.

6 I want to point out something here. This  
7 level of service D is not a no build  
8 condition. This level of service D already  
9 assumes that there would be some improvements  
10 here. If you recall, the previous work had  
11 recommended an additional thru lane on 9R at  
12 Route 9 as a way to improve operations. If  
13 there were no improvements here and we didn't  
14 build this bypass, this would clearly be a  
15 level of service F with a minute or two of  
16 delay. There is no doubt about that. This  
17 intersection will fail miserably without  
18 improvements.

19 So, this level of service that we're  
20 reporting here has two improvements in it. It  
21 has an additional thru lane westbound on 9R  
22 and 9. That's what shown here as a level of  
23 service B. That's not bad. In addition to  
24 building the connector road, it improves this  
25 to a level of service C in the short-term.

1                   This gets to the DOT's issue about  
2                   traffic operations and why they're concerned  
3                   about simply plopping down a traffic signal at  
4                   Latham Autopark Drive and total vehicle hours  
5                   of delay on Route 9 traveling northbound. It's  
6                   an important corridor. There are 40 vehicle  
7                   hours of delay. If we build out those 3,500  
8                   trips that we had by 2020, delays to Route 9  
9                   will triple. They'll go from 40 to 116 vehicle  
10                  hours of delay. You will see additional  
11                  traffic congestion.

12                 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: I disagree with that.  
13                 That's math telling you that. I'm telling you  
14                 that people on the Northway aren't going to  
15                 get off and put up with that on Route 9.

16                 MR. GRASSO: I think that what he's  
17                 saying is that things self mitigate. We have  
18                 used that word and we are assuming that there  
19                 are other options for traffic to use.

20                 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: Again, when the  
21                 Northway builds up and backs up is what  
22                 creates some of the peak issues in this  
23                 corridor. So people are looking for the  
24                 shortest way home. You guys are the engineers  
25                 and you guys are the smart guys. I'm just

1 saying that I don't agree that it goes up with  
2 no build four times; 400% in 10 years.

3 MR. GRASSO: You have to understand that  
4 it's additional traffic. This is total delay  
5 of all of the cars.

6 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: I agree with you but  
7 somebody has to still explain to me - it's a  
8 north/south issue. There is no west. West is  
9 the Northway. So, to have a solution to a  
10 north/south problem - east/west -- you guys  
11 are way smarter than me. I just can't figure  
12 that out.

13 MR. SARGENT: There is a fundamental  
14 curve in traffic engineering. One capacity  
15 delay curve is essentially flat. You have low  
16 volume and you have low delay. When you have  
17 high volume, you still have low delay up to  
18 about 90 or 95% of the capacity of the road.  
19 Once you reach capacity of a roadway, that  
20 curve steepens up like this (Indicating) and  
21 delays increase dramatically. So, what we're  
22 talking about is that we're at the scenario  
23 where we're basically at capacity. If we add  
24 3,500 initial trips, the delay curve steepens  
25 so greatly that you will see dramatic

1 increases in delay and it's a fundamental  
2 traffic engineering equation that is  
3 essentially understood.

4 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: I don't dispute that.  
5 My contention is that what we're talking about  
6 is a north/south issue. Would you agree or  
7 disagree?

8 MR. SARGENT: Yes.

9 MR. GRASSO: It is.

10 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: But now we're  
11 proposing that 400 trips are going to go  
12 east/west.

13 MR. SARGENT: It's a conflicting movement  
14 issue that any intersection has a number of  
15 conflicting movements that can happen at  
16 different times; northbound through as opposed  
17 to southbound lefts.

18 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: Honestly, I'm just  
19 talking about logic. I know that there is  
20 going to be a problem in this kind of backup.  
21 I'm going down Boght all the way down and  
22 going into Johnson the back way. So, that just  
23 tells you that this is a commuter issue. It's  
24 a north/south commuter issue.

25 MR. SARGENT: No doubt about it. There is

1 a fundamental issue here and that is if we  
2 build out some or all of these 35 potential  
3 developments in the area and we don't build  
4 any improvements, there is going to be an  
5 increased delay. People are going to find  
6 other ways to go. People will seek other  
7 routes until they find the one that works for  
8 them with the least amount of delay. There is  
9 clearly going to be increased delay. It could  
10 be two times as much delay. It's going to  
11 increase. No doubt about it.

12 With building a road connection, it will  
13 distribute some of that delay. You'll have  
14 additional choices. They'll avoid the  
15 congested intersection. We've got some data  
16 here that shows delays going down. Whether it  
17 goes down precisely by this much, who knows?  
18 The trends are definitely there. There is  
19 clearly a traffic benefit to building this  
20 connector.

21 MR. GRASSO: What we're trying to do is  
22 to stop the additional traffic that is going  
23 to be generated whether it comes from  
24 background growth or an incident on the  
25 Northway or new development traffic. We're

1           trying to stop that from just utilizing the  
2           existing roadway network that has the  
3           capacity. Where is that capacity? It's in the  
4           residential neighborhoods.

5                   CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: Let's talk about  
6           something different then for one second. Throw  
7           out peak. What happens?

8                   MR. SARGENT: During off peak conditions,  
9           you get where you need to go.

10                   MR. SULLIVAN: But when is everyone  
11           trying to use the road? That's the problem.  
12           When you're trying to get home or go to work,  
13           it's the peak. You can go to a restaurant at  
14           3:00 in the afternoon and get any table that  
15           you want. At dinnertime, it's packed. That's  
16           the problem.

17                   MR. NARDACCI: I'm having a hard time  
18           understanding building a connector road to  
19           have positive impacts. You're talking about by  
20           2020 people are going to mitigate themselves  
21           down. Yet with the slide before we're  
22           basically saying that the only people that are  
23           going to use the connector road are people  
24           that are going to that neighborhood anyway.  
25           I'm having a hard time grasping that.

1           MR. LACIVITA: I think that people that  
2           are going to use that bypass road are still  
3           going to come down to 9 and 9R and come up and  
4           find their way to Old Loudon Road. This just  
5           gives them a relief valve to go a little  
6           further.

7           MR. NARDACCI: It's going to have to  
8           improve that intersection but they're going to  
9           avoid it.

10          MR. GRASSO: There are expected  
11          diversions. There are not expected diversions  
12          along Johnson Road, but there are expected  
13          diversions on the new connector road. that  
14          will be 150 cars during the peak hour.

15          MR. NARDACCI: What's an expected  
16          diversion?

17          MR. GRASSO: It's a car that's currently  
18          going down through the 9/9R intersection that  
19          we now think is going to take the connector  
20          road to free up capacity in that intersection.

21          MR. SULLIVAN: You get to take all the  
22          left turns that would normally go down 9  
23          south.

24          MR. GRASSO: Exactly. Which I understand  
25          that for somebody that wants to go east where

1 the heavy volume is north/south, we're just  
2 peeling off the cars that want to go east.

3 MR. NARDACCI: From the first meeting  
4 that I attended, I expressed a concern that I  
5 felt that we were trying to build a reason to  
6 build a red light. I don't see how this  
7 changes that concern that I have. We're saying  
8 that maybe there are other things. That's a  
9 major change that we're talking about, yet  
10 we're saying that it's not -- is the expense  
11 worth the potential benefits?

12 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: Take Wal-Mart out.  
13 What's that? Half the trips?

14 MR. SARGENT: Probably.

15 MR. NARDACCI: This is the main thing  
16 that we're talking about. This is the thing  
17 that we've spent a lot of time on and a lot of  
18 hours engineering and figuring out what we can  
19 do. Yet, we're talking about 140 diversions.

20 What would a connector road like this  
21 cost?

22 MR. GRASSO: I'll say two to three  
23 million dollars.

24 MR. NARDACCI: And it would be the length  
25 of Maxwell Road or longer.

1           MR. GRASSO: It's 2,000 feet. This isn't  
2 about trying to build a traffic improvement  
3 that accommodates Wal-Mart.

4           One of the other things that we did  
5 awhile back was we looked at the density of  
6 development where it wouldn't be retail. It's  
7 all commercial office buildings. Based on the  
8 existing zoning and at the density that we're  
9 already seeing occur in commercial office  
10 space, you're going to get just as much  
11 traffic during the p.m. peak hour as you do  
12 out of the Wal-Mart from those same two  
13 parcels that are proposed for the Wal-Mart.

14           MR. NARDACCI: If there is no four-way  
15 intersection, would DOT ever approve a red  
16 light?

17           MR. GRASSO: If there is no connector  
18 road?

19           MR. NARDACCI: No.

20           MR. GRASSO: And if there is no  
21 conversion of Old Loudon Road to two way, DOT  
22 will not approve a red light there.

23           MR. NARDACCI: Right.

24           MR. GRASSO: Then what the board needs to  
25 do is they either need to accept the

1 degradation of traffic or they have to stop  
2 approving projects. Those are the options.  
3 Traffic will continue to deteriorate. We're  
4 just proposing an improvement to try to  
5 maintain acceptable levels of service. The  
6 Planning Board doesn't have to support the  
7 improvements and move forward with a plan.

8 MR. NARDACCI: What we're looking at here  
9 is based on 3,500 and not the 6,000, right?

10 MR. GRASSO: Like Mark said, there has  
11 already been some amount of traffic that has  
12 occurred.

13 MR. NARDACCI: For example, for the last  
14 however many meetings that we've had, we've  
15 talked about 12 or so intersections being at  
16 risk of going to level of service F. Now today  
17 because we have changed the model - changed  
18 the numbers to 3,500 all the sudden everything  
19 is a C.

20 MR. GRASSO: Well, it's a different scope  
21 of improvements though, too.

22 MR. SARGENT: I don't know if there is  
23 really 12. I don't know where you're getting  
24 12 from.

25 MR. NARDACCI: Maybe I have it wrong.

1 MR. SARGENT: The study and size has been  
2 the same.

3 MR. NARDACCI: The last time that we met,  
4 how many intersections -

5 MR. GRASSO: If you look at all of the  
6 intersections that were analyzed in the study  
7 area -

8 MR. NARDACCI: Right, how many were we  
9 projecting at level of service F?

10 MR. SARGENT: I would say potentially  
11 zero. The last time that we met when we had  
12 this area here (Indicating), we had a plan to  
13 accommodate this with acceptable levels of  
14 service.

15 MR. NARDACCI: So before any proposed  
16 improvements, how many intersections were  
17 going to be at a level of service F?

18 MR. SARGENT: Probably two or three.

19 MR. GRASSO: Dunsbach Ferry was one.  
20 Century Hill might have been and 9/9R.

21 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: I don't think Century  
22 Hill was.

23 Old Loudon, 9R, Dunsbach -

24 MR. NARDACCI: I misspoke. How many of  
25 those were level of service D?

1           MR. SARGENT: Probably none. I think that  
2 the other two were C. Clearly there were three  
3 that were going to fail.

4           MR. NARDACCI: This is the first time  
5 that I'm seeing this and we're looking at a  
6 completely different model from what we have  
7 been talking about. I'm trying to understand  
8 how this connector road - what intersections  
9 does it improve? And how much does it improve  
10 those intersections? You're going to the  
11 expense of several million dollars.

12           MR. GRASSO: Mark, I think that we can  
13 issue the level of service table that looks at  
14 all of the intersections and shows the  
15 improvement.

16           MR. SARGENT: That's essentially this  
17 table right here (Indicating). It will reduce  
18 delays at the 9 and 9R intersection. I've  
19 taken out those 440 trips from that  
20 intersection and that's enough to cut delays  
21 in half and accommodate the build out of the  
22 development in this area along with reasonable  
23 forecasts for the remainder.

24           MR. SULLIVAN: Mark, could you show that  
25 graphically with a queuing diagram to show how

1 much they would back up? Currently there is  
2 only one left turn lane if you're heading  
3 south on Route 9 trying to go onto 9R. There  
4 is only one lane to store those cars. Given  
5 the cycle, you can't move as many cars as you  
6 can when you're heading northbound because  
7 there is two left turn lanes heading  
8 northbound. So, we're taking them out of this  
9 equation, basically. We're handling them at a  
10 previous intersection. So, now you have more  
11 time in the cycle to devote to just straight  
12 north/south movements which improves your  
13 overall level of service for the predominant  
14 movement in that intersection. So, by taking  
15 them out of the previous intersection, you  
16 don't have to worry about them taking those  
17 left turns. It's just one left turn lane.

18 If we could show that graphically, I  
19 think that it would be helpful because you can  
20 see if you did nothing what the backup would  
21 be. We're expecting a huge number of left  
22 turns from Wal-Mart trying to take 9R into  
23 Cohoes. Now, they'd be going straight onto the  
24 connector road and then getting on 9R farther  
25 downstream and avoiding that problem

1 intersection at 9 and 9R.

2 MR. SARGENT: We could bring the  
3 simulation model in and show it side by side  
4 and see the queuing and congestion and  
5 breakdown of operations here without the  
6 improvement.

7 MR. SULLIVAN: That would show how this  
8 east to west movement would improve the  
9 north/south flow for the main traffic on  
10 Route 9.

11 MR. NARDACCI: I think that's important  
12 for us to understand. It's just hard to look  
13 at this in a new model. Just give us the exact  
14 info. This is what it would look like without  
15 the connector. This is what it saves.

16 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: These are the same  
17 numbers that Barton and Loguidice has?

18 MR. SARGENT: They're pretty darned  
19 close.

20 MR. GRASSO: The trip generation from the  
21 proposed development is consistent.

22 We can come back to the Planning Board  
23 with additional information.

24 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: Joe, can you get us a  
25 cost on the road? I don't think that you can

1 build that road for two million dollars.

2 MR. GRASSO: Sure. I haven't put any  
3 costs to it; just so you know.

4 MR. NARDACCI: We spent a lot of time  
5 talking about this road but I really would  
6 like to have an understanding of all the  
7 improvements that we're talking about.

8 I've expressed a few times a major  
9 concern with Dunsbach Ferry and at one point  
10 it was said, well, maybe down the road there  
11 would be no left turns. I don't think that we  
12 should leave it up to maybe down the road. I  
13 think that we should talk about that. What are  
14 the improvements? On a subsequent meeting it  
15 would be some potential improvements there.

16 MR. GRASSO: Right, we talked about that.

17 MR. NARDACCI: So, I would like to  
18 incorporate that into this open discussion.  
19 What does it mean?

20 MR. GRASSO: The next time we come before  
21 the board it will include a simulation which  
22 takes some time to set up. We may want to try  
23 to start the meeting at 6:30 and give  
24 ourselves half an hour before the regularly  
25 scheduled Planning Board meeting to go through

1 this stuff.

2 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: Absolutely. Is that  
3 half hour enough time?

4 MR. LACIVITA: Could we think of a  
5 designated meeting time?

6 MR. GRASSO: Maybe 6:00 would be better.  
7 We just don't want people waiting for the  
8 meeting to start.

9 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: I just want to  
10 provide the other board members with enough  
11 time. How soon are we looking at doing it?

12 MR. GRASSO: Not the next meeting but the  
13 second meeting in March.

14 MR. NARDACCI: And I'd like to see some  
15 of the CDTC work that they have incorporated  
16 into this. Especially with the fact that they  
17 said that there is zero effect on the  
18 neighborhoods. I can see that by looking at  
19 it, it's connecting to Johnson. I think that's  
20 important and I think that's important for the  
21 public to understand that.

22 MR. GRASSO: And there is a reason why we  
23 have CDTC to look at the diversions. They run  
24 these models all day long.

25 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: If Wal-Mart were to

1 go in, all of these improvements have to be in  
2 place before it opens.

3 MR. GRASSO: Not necessarily. That's up  
4 for - if the applicant wishes to propose a  
5 project and the improvements aren't in place,  
6 the Planning Board can say, we want to know  
7 the impacts of your project on the system  
8 without a certain amount of improvements being  
9 in place. That's whether it's the Wal-Mart or  
10 any other development that takes place.

11 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: That's over half the  
12 trips, right?

13 MR. SARGENT: Wal-Mart, by itself?

14 MR. GRASSO: Everybody has the right to  
15 propose a certain application -

16 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: It's got to be half  
17 the trips.

18 MR. SARGENT: On that side of the road? I  
19 don't think so. Well, that's about right  
20 actually.

21 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: Don't call me a liar  
22 for 40%.

23 MR. SULLIVAN: Joe, you had mentioned  
24 that after the road was to go through Parcel  
25 28, it will affect some wetlands. Can you

1           assume that there would be onsite mitigation?  
2           Would we have to provide three to one for a  
3           disturbed area?

4                     MR. GRASSO:   Yes.

5                     MR. SULLIVAN:  And if we did that, could  
6           we then see what would be the maximum build  
7           out available for the remaining land? I know  
8           that you had said that it might be like  
9           100,000 square feet and the board was  
10          concerned that was too low. If we were to  
11          assume the three to one mitigation for  
12          wetlands, could we determine what would be the  
13          maximum -

14                    MR. GRASSO:  Whether or not the  
15          mitigation is two to one -- which is probably  
16          what I think it would be or say five to one  
17          because the parcel is so large, we don't think  
18          that's going to have an appreciable impact on  
19          the amount of development potential. We feel  
20          very uncomfortable starting to actually look  
21          at development plans on properties that we're  
22          not trying to represent. We just look at the  
23          gross square footage of unconstrained lands.  
24          We can take a look at it and see in terms of  
25          the amount of wetlands that we think are out

1           there affected by a road crossing. Maybe we're  
2           going affect a few acres.

3           CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: You can do it just on  
4           density.

5           MR. GRASSO: Right, just on density.

6           MR. SULLIVAN: If we're thinking that  
7           100,000 is too low and a million may not be  
8           feasible -

9           MR. GRASSO: Right and like I say, one of  
10          the things that we would do is say if we  
11          picked the middle of the road and said 500,000  
12          square feet, what does that do to the numbers?

13          MR. SULLIVAN: That would be fair.

14          MR. GRASSO: Just so that we could  
15          understand the sensitivity of Parcel 28.

16          CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: That makes sense.  
17          That's reasonable.

18          MR. NARDACCI: And 100,000 seems too low.

19          MR. GRASSO: Understood.

20          MR. NARDACCI: Joe LaCivita, has there  
21          ever been a development plan introduced  
22          regarding that parcel? Is that something in  
23          the records?

24          MR. LACIVITA: There is nothing that is  
25          currently out there, but we just had

1           conversations this past week - actually last  
2           week with the property owner. We talked about  
3           a potential road connection and so on and he  
4           has no plans. He wants to see what the town is  
5           interested in doing. He also wants to talk  
6           about the potential zoning and whether it  
7           changes that. He knows that there is a lot of  
8           constraints on the lands.

9           MR. NARDACCI: What's the current zoning  
10          there?

11          MR. LACIVITA: That's a COR. So, we have  
12          talked to the developer within the past week.

13          MR. GRASSO: And there is another office  
14          building. Caldwell Banker has an office  
15          building right across from Johnson Road. A  
16          connector road would occupy part of the  
17          greenspace on that property as well. We can  
18          provide a blow up of what that intersection of  
19          Johnson Road would look like.

20          CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: Has someone talked to  
21          Kenny Raymond?

22          MR. GRASSO: No, on our side at least we  
23          haven't talked to either of the property  
24          owners about the connector road.

25          CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: I thought that Joe

1 just said that you did.

2 MR. LACIVITA: That's Parcel 28 that Tom  
3 was asking about.

4 MR. GRASSO: We haven't approached the  
5 property owners. We wanted to first talk to  
6 the Planning Board about the concept and we  
7 can provide a detail of what that intersection  
8 would look like. Like I said, DOT had wanted  
9 us to look at a realignment of Johnson Road to  
10 9R.

11 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: In case Mr. Raymond  
12 isn't willing to let us go through Caldwell  
13 Banker's greenspace, do we have a different  
14 scenario for that proposed road?

15 MR. GRASSO: We'd have to look at it and  
16 see. There could be other touch down spots on  
17 9R, but right now that's the preferred  
18 alternative from a design standpoint.

19 MR. BETTE: Just to help you while I was  
20 listening to everything and trying to  
21 understand what's really going on - I have a  
22 traffic engineering background and you're  
23 talking generalities here. Traffic is much  
24 more complicated.

25 You talk about peak hours and daily

1 volumes. It really depends on what type of use  
2 it is. Our office use doesn't really impact as  
3 much as some other uses do. We heard that when  
4 we first built the first couple of buildings  
5 in Century Hill that intersection was going to  
6 fail.

7 We did a little survey not for the whole  
8 park but in our building. We couldn't find  
9 anyone in our building that makes a left onto  
10 9R heading towards Cohoes. Our traffic is  
11 pretty much on and off the Northway. So, I  
12 don't think that the impacts from different  
13 uses are being correctly anticipated here.

14 Also, the town hit it right on the head.  
15 If you plan on building a big piece of  
16 infrastructure and only planning 100,000 feet  
17 of building, you're going to open that up to  
18 much more development, which is going to  
19 compound the problems. Eventually that new  
20 road is going to reach capacity. Not a lot of  
21 that traffic is generated by our office park  
22 at all. Retail probably has a little bit more  
23 because it will be more evenly distributed.  
24 Our office buildings are not going to add to  
25 that left turn volume significantly. We don't

1 need the connector for what we need to do. For  
2 the current zoning there, it's not needed.

3 If we made Old Loudon two way, it would  
4 help the left turn on Route 9 heading south.  
5 You can't put a dual left there because there  
6 is not enough room when you make the left  
7 before you get to Old Loudon Road. That's  
8 really the constraint. So, pulling the traffic  
9 intersection further down would be a smart  
10 thing to do, but it's smoke and mirrors.  
11 You're going to build this new road and you're  
12 saying they're only going to build 100,000  
13 square feet of development. If that road goes  
14 through, from my standpoint, that's the best  
15 piece of developable property in the Town of  
16 Colonie. I'm going to buy it and I'm going to  
17 build as much as I can. You hit the nail right  
18 on the head.

19 I'm looking at these generalities and  
20 saying that's not reality. The reality is:  
21 Take a look at the individual users and what  
22 their traffic patterns are and see how it  
23 meshes into the overall volumes. There is  
24 going to be self mitigation. You have to take  
25 a real hard look and instead of the annual

1           daily volumes of traffic, the problems out  
2           here are peak hour traffic problems caused by  
3           commuters. If you look at the volume on  
4           Route 9 being 25,000 vehicles, that's more  
5           than Central Avenue in Albany. It's mostly  
6           commuter traffic. If you go out there at 10:00  
7           in the morning to 3:00 in the afternoon, you  
8           can walk across Route 9 and not get hit by a  
9           car. There is no traffic out there because  
10          there is not a lot of development.

11                        So, the earlier maps that they show of  
12          the potential future development makes those  
13          numbers big if that all gets built out, but  
14          that needs to be controlled by zoning. So if  
15          you really need to do some new planning and  
16          say, okay, what needs to happen at this end of  
17          town? What kind of users do we want here and  
18          how does our existing infrastructure  
19          accommodate that given that we still have to  
20          let all of those commuters go through and go  
21          across the five lanes that go across the  
22          Mohawk River? That's the problem. You have  
23          huge waves that just spike the volume.

24                        When you look at the average daily  
25          volume, it's kind of straight lined. In this

1 case, it's a huge spike in the morning and a  
2 huge spike in the afternoon. It's a very  
3 different traffic pattern. It's hard to  
4 generalize. The problem here is letting  
5 commuters come through our neighborhood with  
6 appropriate growth in the neighborhood. That's  
7 really what the Planning Board has to decide.

8 I just wanted to point out that not all  
9 traffic is equal. Traffic complements what  
10 happens there very well. We don't impact it as  
11 much. Yes, we have traffic and we have over  
12 1,000 vehicles coming in and out every day.  
13 The level of service is still great. We don't  
14 miss any cycles going into our office in the  
15 morning. Our tenants haven't complained at all  
16 to us. So, our residents are pretty happy and  
17 the self mitigating part of that is if the  
18 traffic gets so bad, the tenants are going to  
19 move out and go someplace else. They're moving  
20 out of the someplace else to Century Hill  
21 because they don't want to deal with traffic  
22 on Washington Avenue Extension or in the City  
23 of Albany. Most of the office employees  
24 commute from the suburbs, Saratoga County,  
25 Niskayuna, some up the Northway and some from

1 Rensselaer County. The problem with the  
2 traffic in the overall scheme of things is  
3 that you have 787 volumes that necks up and  
4 comes through all of these roads to get across  
5 the river because we have a huge population in  
6 Saratoga County.

7 I'd like to see some work done on the  
8 distribution of traffic and what portion of it  
9 is commuters. That's what I said to the board  
10 last time is that when we move ahead with our  
11 project, I'll explain how our residents  
12 commute and what the movements are and we'll  
13 see if they match up to what the assumptions  
14 are. I know that originally in the '89 study,  
15 there was 950,000 square feet of office space  
16 that was included in the study and that's why  
17 the town asked me to look at that area for  
18 future office development because they had it  
19 all planned out.

20 With Anjio we have about 300,000 square  
21 feet of office space down there right now.  
22 That's what I'm saying is that if you build a  
23 road that's twice as big as the road that I  
24 have going from Autopark to Century Hill Drive  
25 and you're only saying 100,000 square feet of

1 development, you're fooling yourselves. You've  
2 got a lot more development than that. Given  
3 the current limitations on getting their  
4 traffic into the flow, if you don't build the  
5 connector road, you won't see all of that  
6 development. With all the wetlands that are up  
7 there, I don't think that you'll see a lot  
8 more development anyway. If you put the  
9 connector road through, you make a lot of big  
10 developable parcels.

11 I would take a look at the zoning of that  
12 because it attracts more retail and that's  
13 going to add to peak hour. If you put a lot of  
14 development in between those two nodes,  
15 eventually you're going to blow up both the  
16 nodes so why build the road? That's the way  
17 that I look at it.

18 MR. SARGENT: I will point out that under  
19 the last update that we were working on we did  
20 look at one million square feet in here  
21 (Indicating). We had identified some  
22 improvements by converting this to two way,  
23 adding turn lanes at this intersection and it  
24 was able to mitigate the impact of that  
25 project. Sure, there were some site access

1 issues that we hadn't worked out in detail and  
2 there was probably going to be some  
3 improvements along this section and  
4 improvements to Johnson Road, but in this area  
5 the impact of those additional trips  
6 associated with the build out, we had  
7 basically mitigated -

8 MR. BETTE: Right now that parcel doesn't  
9 have access to Route 9. You can get access to  
10 Route 9. We don't have a million square feet  
11 on the west side of Route 9 even if Wal-Mart  
12 was there. So why are you penciling that in  
13 for a million square feet when they can't even  
14 get to Route 9? If all that traffic had to get  
15 to 9R, they would never be able to develop  
16 that. so, by putting that new road through  
17 there, you're opening up that huge new  
18 potential development which is going to really  
19 impact the neighborhood. We don't need that  
20 road. It doesn't do anything.

21 If our Anjio guys come out of that  
22 intersection, I guarantee that not 10% of them  
23 are going straight if that road was there.  
24 They're all making a right onto the Northway.  
25 That's our traffic pattern for our office

1 users. If they were to make a left and head up  
2 Route 9 because they don't want to get on the  
3 Northway to fight traffic - I don't have many  
4 people in our park that are looking to make  
5 that cut through.

6 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: You mean then we  
7 could leave Autopark right turn in and right  
8 turn out the way that it was supposed to be  
9 and not spend money on infrastructure?

10 MR. BETTE: You have a huge median there  
11 and it's an easy place to get extra lefts  
12 rather than putting all the lefts on that side  
13 of Route 9.

14 MR. SULLIVAN: How is it that you can  
15 have an office park and that won't affect  
16 traffic on Route 9 yet if we develop the other  
17 side of Route 9 that's a problem?

18 MR. BETTE: That's not what I'm saying.

19 MR. SULLIVAN: No, you said that it's a  
20 problem if you put in a connector road and you  
21 develop that property, it's going to destroy  
22 traffic on Route 9.

23 MR. BETTE: I said you're going to  
24 encourage more traffic on Route 9. Right now,  
25 that parcel doesn't have access to Route 9.

1           MR. SULLIVAN: But you do and you're  
2           developing your property. How does that not  
3           affect traffic on Route 9?

4           MR. BETTE: Our traffic is pretty much  
5           opposite the peak hour.

6           MR. SULLIVAN: You have an office park.  
7           They work 8 to 5 peak hours. They're on the  
8           road at peak hours and they're going through  
9           those intersections.

10          MR. BETTE: With the peak hour traffic in  
11          the morning -

12          CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: Is north/south.

13          MR. BETTE: - we have a huge volume  
14          heading southbound. Most of our traffic is  
15          getting off the Northway and heading north and  
16          making a left in. That left movement isn't a  
17          problem for us. We don't have any capacity  
18          problems right here. If there is a signal here  
19          (Indicating) and they're coordinated and you  
20          have lefts at the same time, you're moving  
21          those left conflicting movements right out of  
22          the way. In the afternoon peak hour, you have  
23          all the commuters heading north. Our folks are  
24          pretty much making a right and getting onto  
25          the Northway.

1           That's why it's different because we're  
2           making a right out of here (Indicating) and  
3           we're headed opposite the peak hour traffic.  
4           So, when I leave my office, it's not a  
5           problem. There is a whole bunch of traffic  
6           here from all the commuters heading north and  
7           we're just making a right out of our road and  
8           hopping on the Northway. I don't have any  
9           delays getting home. That's what I'm trying to  
10          say. It depends on the use.

11           Now if there was retail there, that would  
12          be a different scenario there. At peak hour  
13          there is more of an even traffic flow back and  
14          forth. Office peak hour traffic flow is  
15          usually one direction. We do have some people  
16          that live in Saratoga County and rather than  
17          getting on the Northway will make a left and  
18          get in line with everybody else heading north  
19          on the way home, but they have a choice of  
20          which way to go.

21           What happens is when the Northway gets  
22          backed up, a lot more of those folks, instead  
23          of waiting in line, hop onto Route 9 and add  
24          to the peak hour problem. We're never going to  
25          solve that because it's a commuter route.

1           MR. SULLIVAN: I disagree with you as I  
2 did in the previous meeting. I think that you  
3 are adding traffic to intersections.

4           MR. BETTE: We are, but you can't just  
5 say that we have 1,000 vehicle trips. You have  
6 to take a look at what the peak hour flow is.  
7 Ours is the opposite of peak hour,  
8 predominately. It's not all. Yes, we're adding  
9 to the volume there, but a lot of our trips  
10 are opposite the peak hour. They're not making  
11 it spike higher.

12           MR. SULLIVAN: I don't know how you can  
13 predict the people that would be working in  
14 your proposed office space and where they will  
15 be living. I don't know how you can predict  
16 that they're all going right turn onto the  
17 Northway.

18           CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: Mike, even if to  
19 avoid the traffic, wouldn't you go the  
20 opposite way for a certain amount to find a  
21 different way?

22           MR. SULLIVAN: The problem is that you  
23 are stuck at the intersection. You have what  
24 time is allotted to you. So, if the rest of  
25 the intersection is used up for north/south

1 movements, you're still going to be sitting  
2 there. There is only so much time in the  
3 cycle.

4 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: What he's saying is  
5 true and makes some sense. A lot of places  
6 that you go, the traffic is both ways. You go  
7 out to California and it is both ways. Here,  
8 if you're trying to go north on Route 9, you  
9 watch the southbound traffic at night fly  
10 right down with no problem. It's just the  
11 opposite in the morning.

12 MR. BETTE: It's very skewed by the  
13 commuter traffic that goes through.

14 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: Do you see what I'm  
15 saying?

16 MR. SULLIVAN: I see what you're saying  
17 C.J., but I don't agree with stating that all  
18 the traffic generated by this development  
19 won't affect Route 9.

20 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: But it does matter  
21 which way in this area.

22 MR. BETTE: I'd like to show you a little  
23 survey of our existing employees and what  
24 their commute is so I can demonstrate that  
25 predominately it's opposite peak hours. That's

1 all I'm saying. You need to take a look at the  
2 users. It depends on what it is.

3 Some businesses generate peak hour  
4 traffic and some don't. There are peak hour  
5 generators either in the p.m. peak or the  
6 Saturday peak where morning peak doesn't add  
7 to it.

8 Here, the problem is that wave of people  
9 in that one direction. It's not a peak hour  
10 traffic problem like you find maybe on Wolf  
11 Road where it's in all directions. You just  
12 have peak traffic. Here you have a huge wave  
13 because of the commuter traffic and the need  
14 to get across the Mohawk River. That is the  
15 problem. It's not an average annual daily  
16 volume traffic problem like it would be at  
17 capacity.

18 The pipe is big enough. Do you want to  
19 encourage more outside water to go through  
20 your pipe or not? That's really what you're  
21 getting at. I don't think that by adding  
22 another piece of infrastructure, like you say,  
23 that goes east/west - yeah, it helps the left  
24 turn movements so it doesn't impact the flow  
25 of traffic through, but not a lot of that type

1 of traffic is a generator from our  
2 development. That's what I'm saying.

3 When I come out heading southbound, the  
4 left turn lane never backs up. The cycle is  
5 fine for the left turn lane. It's the  
6 projections of what's going to happen and the  
7 assumptions of where the traffic is going to  
8 go. I think that the traffic will find an  
9 alternative route. I mean, if that left turn  
10 signal becomes problematic, frankly some of  
11 the people living in East Hills or whatever  
12 will go straight down Route 9 and cut over 155  
13 rather than cutting over right there.

14 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: anyone else have  
15 anything?

16 ***(There was no response.)***

17 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: Joe, we'll look for  
18 you on the second meeting in March?

19 MR. GRASSO: Yes.

20 MR. LACIVITA: And that will be a 6:00  
21 start?

22 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: Right.

23 MR. LACIVITA: That's the 23<sup>rd</sup>.

24 MR. NARDACCI: I think that we should  
25 communicate through the neighborhood

1           associations in the neighborhood with  
2           discussing this.

3           CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: Well, it is on the  
4           agenda right?

5           MR. NARDACCI: I would definitely reach  
6           out to the neighborhood associations. I think  
7           that it's important and people are interested.

8           CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: Tom, it's 10 now. I  
9           don't think that we could open it to them.

10          MR. NARDACCI: I don't necessarily think  
11          that it should be open to them, but I think  
12          that they should at least know.

13

14

15                           *(Whereas the proceeding concerning the*  
16                           *above entitled matter was concluded at*  
17                           *9:59 p.m.)*

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

**CERTIFICATION**

*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 March 10, 2010***