

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 COUNTY OF ALBANY  
TOWN OF COLONIE

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

THE TAPED AND TRANSCRIBED MINUTES of the above  
entitled proceeding BY NANCY STRANG-VANDEBOGART  
commencing on March 23, 2010 at 6:02 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  
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  
Mark Nadolny, Creighton Manning Engineering

1                   CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: Tonight to start  
2                   early, we came in to get an update on the  
3                   Boght GEIS - the traffic update.

4                   Joe?

5                   MR. GRASSO: I just want to go through  
6                   what we hope to accomplish over the next hour  
7                   or so.

8                   At the last Planning Board meeting about  
9                   a month ago we presented an update for the  
10                  GEIS. There were a number of specific  
11                  questions asked of us by the Planning Board  
12                  that we needed to fix and go through and do  
13                  some additional analysis and pull the  
14                  responses together. We had also talked about  
15                  wanting to run a traffic simulation model  
16                  because it rapidly shows how we expect that  
17                  the corridor is going to operate.

18                  Myself and Mark Sargent of Creighton  
19                  Manning put an item by item response together  
20                  which all of you should have in front of you.  
21                  I'll also provide a copy to the Planning  
22                  Department for the town's file.

23                  What we'd like to do, if the board  
24                  doesn't mind, is rather than go through these  
25                  in numerical order, I would like to jump

1           around a little bit. I'd like to start it off  
2           by the level of service summary which is  
3           comment number four. We'll go through that in  
4           detail. Then I would like to go through the  
5           traffic simulation model because I think  
6           that's going to take some time. Then we'd like  
7           to entertain any questions that the board has  
8           on that.

9                     If there is time left over, we can go  
10           through the other responses which are more  
11           self explanatory, so to speak, to make sure  
12           that we can get through this model within the  
13           next hour because it's really important that  
14           we allow the time to go through it and digest  
15           what the model is showing. If that's good with  
16           the board, I'm going to have Mark Sargent come  
17           up and I'm going to ask everybody to go to  
18           table three which is an attachment in the back  
19           of everybody's packet. I just want to take you  
20           through the intersections and go through the  
21           levels of service.

22                     We had touched on this at the last  
23           meeting in a more generic fashion, but I think  
24           that the board is comfortable looking at these  
25           levels of service summary tables and

1 interpreting the results. I'd like to go  
2 through intersection by intersection.

3 Mark, can you go up and go through table  
4 three, starting out with the Route 9/9R and  
5 I87 access?

6 We don't have any copies for the public  
7 tonight. We have provided a copy for the town  
8 and we can provide comments to anybody who  
9 would like to have them, but we don't have  
10 extra copies tonight.

11 MR. SARGENT: I'm just going to back up  
12 one step. If you recall when we presented  
13 levels of service at the last meeting, we had  
14 a graphic that showed overall intersection  
15 levels of service at each of the five or six  
16 study area intersections. That's the way to  
17 reflect the overall operating conditions at  
18 the intersections. Levels of service can also  
19 be reported on each of the individual  
20 approaches and each of the individual lane  
21 groups of the intersection. So, that's the  
22 table that you're looking at and some of the  
23 detail behind those levels of service  
24 summaries.

25 One thing that I also want to point out

1 is that the conclusion of what we have  
2 presented last month is that levels of service  
3 in the area are generally adequate with the  
4 exception of the 9/9R intersection. That's  
5 played out here as we present this.

6 When you look at the first column it  
7 shows the levels of service under existing  
8 conditions. That first intersection in the  
9 first column shows that the intersection  
10 overall operates at a level of service D which  
11 is borderline satisfactory with 51 seconds of  
12 delay, overall. Individually you can see some  
13 of the lane groups within that intersection  
14 are operating at level of service E or F. So  
15 that tells us that it's basically operating at  
16 or near capacity. That's no surprise to  
17 anybody that the 9/9R intersection is  
18 operating at or near capacity.

19 MR. GRASSO: On the screen we have the  
20 map that shows the street network and the  
21 corridor. I'm just going to highlight the  
22 boundaries of the GEIS study area which is the  
23 black outer boundary here (Indicating). It  
24 extends down towards Watervliet and Cohoes.  
25 The first intersection that Mark talked about

1 is the 9/9R intersection.

2 MR. SARGENT: Under the scenario in  
3 column two here (Indicating) this is where the  
4 additional land development is in the area. It  
5 shows that the delays at that intersection  
6 will eventually double. You look at again at  
7 the overall level of service; it's F. The  
8 average motorist will wait for two minutes  
9 longer at that intersection whereas today they  
10 wait for about 50 seconds.

11 In the third column, you see the overall  
12 operation with all the additional land use at  
13 the end of the connector road and it shows  
14 level of service improving back to level of  
15 service D with 41 seconds of delay. So, it's  
16 actually nominally better than the existing  
17 conditions. Some of the lane groups continue  
18 to operate at level of service E, meaning they  
19 borderline at capacity.

20 That's really the focus of this table. It  
21 should be the focus that the connector road  
22 provides a significant quantifiable benefit in  
23 the operations at that intersection.

24 If you look at the table in a little more  
25 detail and you look under where it says

1           Route 9 northbound, you're still at the first  
2           intersection. We're still in the top row of  
3           the intersection. But within that there are  
4           individual lane groups recorded. If you find  
5           the one for Route 9 northbound, which is  
6           really the eighth letter down, it shows that  
7           the delays will increase from 53 seconds to  
8           150 seconds. It will triple northbound without  
9           an improvement. With an improvement, it will  
10          go back to about 60 seconds.

11                        That's what we're talking about. That's a  
12          fundamental conclusion here. Without  
13          improvements for northbound through traffic,  
14          Route 9 will experience significant  
15          degradation from operation; a triple in delay.  
16          With the bypass the delays will be mitigated  
17          largely and keep it at a minute rather than  
18          two and a half minutes.

19                        Moving on to the next intersection, it is  
20          currently unsignalized. That's what the U  
21          stands for.

22                        MR. GRASSO: Mark, can you just clarify  
23          what intersection we're talking about now?

24                        MR. SARGENT: We're now talking about the  
25          Latham Autopark Drive intersection.

1           MR. GRASSO: The new road that is  
2 proposed and then from Route 9 over to  
3 9R -- this total intersection.

4           MR. SARGENT: People will typically get  
5 out of that intersection and make a left or a  
6 right at the stop sign and will wait longer  
7 than 50 seconds.

8           CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: Mark, how did you get  
9 that?

10          MR. SARGENT: There is a highway capacity  
11 manual. It's a document about this big  
12 (Indicating) and it has all the different  
13 formulas. The chapter on unsignalized delays  
14 is about 100 pages long. There are proven  
15 formulas on gap acceptance and how motorists  
16 behave under different prevailing traffic  
17 scenarios.

18          CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: These numbers are  
19 existing without any developments.

20          MR. SARGENT: That's right.

21          MR. GRASSO: But you have to understand  
22 that it's just during the p.m. peak hour. You  
23 have heard others say that during the other  
24 23 hours of the day things are fine, but our  
25 analysis is always focused on the p.m. peak

1 hour.

2 MS. VAIDA: What do you use for a time  
3 period?

4 MR. SARGENT: It's 4:30 to 5:30; a one  
5 hour time period.

6 MR. GRASSO: So during other hours of the  
7 day, it's possible that could operate at a  
8 level of service A.

9 MR. SARGENT: Under the next column,  
10 we've assumed that a signal would be installed  
11 there that shows that it would operate at  
12 level of service D, overall, without any other  
13 improvements in the area and without  
14 additional geometry as well as without the  
15 connector road.

16 In the final column, you see with the  
17 connector road, the intersection operates at  
18 level of service C. The bottom line is when  
19 you scan up you can see that all of the  
20 approaches operate at D or better.

21 MR. GRASSO: As Mark stated, with the  
22 existing geometry and known improvements,  
23 we're talking about a signal going in but no  
24 connector road. You say, well, why not just  
25 allow a signal because that intersection is

1 going to be D service and it's going to be  
2 acceptable. That was the concern raised by DOT  
3 that even though that intersection would be  
4 acceptable, the overall delays through the  
5 corridor are significantly impacted by that  
6 signal. DOT doesn't support the signal unless  
7 there is other improvements that would go  
8 along with it that address the overall  
9 corridor.

10 MR. SARGENT: The next group has no  
11 significant issues. It's a level of service B  
12 today. It's a level of service C under  
13 existing conditions.

14 MR. GRASSO: Just so everybody knows what  
15 intersection that we're talking about, it's  
16 the Century Hill Drive/Route 9 intersection.  
17 That's projected to go from a B to a C.

18 MR. SARGENT: Right. The next one has  
19 been a concern - an unsignalized intersection  
20 at Dunsbach Ferry Road. You can see today by  
21 looking at the level of service of Dunsbach  
22 Ferry Road, motorists that are stopped at  
23 Dunsbach Ferry and enter Route 9 only wait  
24 about 20 seconds to get out. That's the first  
25 problem. It's 19.6; level of service C.

1           The existing geometry without any  
2           improvements; no delay, will increase to  
3           77 seconds, a level of service F. That means  
4           you're going to wait over a minute to try to  
5           get out.

6           You also see with the bypass condition  
7           that the level of service is still F. There is  
8           a comfortable amount of delays. It's 70 plus  
9           seconds and that's the area where we don't  
10          have a definitive improvement. We have a  
11          number of ideas on the table.

12          The possibility of widening Dunsbach  
13          Ferry Road to provide two lanes; left and  
14          right so that right turners can get around the  
15          people that are waiting 70 seconds, or  
16          prohibiting left turns at the intersection.  
17          That's something that DOT had mentioned.

18          So the recommendation there is to  
19          monitor. It could be that doing nothing at  
20          that intersection is a satisfactory solution  
21          for the foreseeable future. That's what this  
22          table shows us. You can live with a level of  
23          service F, 70 seconds of delay indefinitely if  
24          no other signal problems develop.

25          MR. GRASSO: This is one of those

1 intersections that if it's a relatively low  
2 volume would be experiencing the F. We could  
3 see them self-mitigating that by going up to  
4 Boght Road and accessing the signal, if they  
5 went north. It's those left turns that are  
6 problematic to get out.

7 MS. VAIDA: If you do nothing there,  
8 you'd actually have a better result than if  
9 you do something.

10 MR. SARGENT: This is 77 versus the 73.

11 MS. VAIDA: No, I'm talking about the  
12 19.6 versus the level F.

13 MR. GRASSO: That's with no additional  
14 development over existing conditions. That's  
15 just the model and the way it operates today.  
16 With development it's going to degrade over  
17 time to a level of service F by 2029.

18 MS. VAIDA: I thought one was with the  
19 light and one wasn't.

20 MR. GRASSO: No.

21 MR. SARGENT: The final row shows 9R at  
22 Old Loudon Road. It's at a level of service C  
23 across the board. That intersection will  
24 operate okay under all scenarios.

25 MR. GRASSO: And that intersection is

1 this one down here (Indicating), the  
2 Route 9/Old Loudon Road intersection.

3 MR. SARGENT: And finally, 9R at  
4 Johnson Road will operate adequately again  
5 under all scenarios. The final geometry there  
6 in the right most column is dictated by that  
7 new alignment. The connector road would tie in  
8 opposite this intersection and it would create  
9 a four-way intersection which is currently a  
10 three-way intersection.

11 Again, what's most important is the top  
12 row; the 9/9R intersection. That's where the  
13 most dramatic differences are in the levels of  
14 service operation. The rest of the  
15 intersections are nominally in levels of  
16 service.

17 MR. GANNON: Somebody living on  
18 Dunsbach Ferry may disagree that it's a  
19 nominal change in service.

20 MR. SARGENT: Some of this is out of your  
21 control as through volumes increase on Route 9  
22 in the future. If you live on Dunsbach Ferry  
23 Road, you're going to be experiencing longer  
24 and longer delays if no additional land  
25 development is approved over the area.

1                   CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: But again, it could  
2 be self mitigating.

3                   MR. GRASSO: There are means to self  
4 mitigate. Like I said, there are very few cars  
5 that come out there and try to make the left  
6 now but when you do the analysis, it would  
7 show that they would have to wait during the  
8 p.m. peak hour. The other 23 hours of the  
9 day - they could probably go up there and take  
10 a left and there might only be a few cars. The  
11 few cars during the p.m. peak hour may learn  
12 that - you know, I might get up there and get  
13 stuck and I'll play it safe. I'm going to go  
14 up to Boght Road and come down Pollock Road  
15 instead of going this way (Indicating) and  
16 going out to Route 9 - they're going to go up  
17 to Boght Road and access the signal.

18                   Right turns can free-flow, like Mark  
19 said, if we just add the two lanes for left  
20 and right turn. Then those right turn vehicles  
21 can free-flow and won't get held up and  
22 experience the level of service F. That's not  
23 the way that it is right now.

24                   MR. SARGENT: As we go over the  
25 simulation, I'd like to draw your attention to

1 page four of your handout. That is a summary  
2 of some of the measures of effectiveness from  
3 the simulation model. One of the comments that  
4 we made at the last meeting - if you look at  
5 the very top row you see the total hours of  
6 delay on the network of all vehicles. Today  
7 there are 40 vehicle hours of delay, if we do  
8 nothing and these land uses are approved and  
9 the additional traffic hits the network, we  
10 said that delays will be increased by a factor  
11 of four. That will be from 40 to 166 vehicle  
12 hours of delay on the network. I think that  
13 someone on the board said, I don't believe it.  
14 This is an outlook from the model. We're going  
15 to show you the future development with the  
16 bypass with 100,000 square feet of development  
17 on Parcel 28. This simulation model is  
18 essentially the third column that's up there  
19 right now.

20 MR. GRASSO: Just to orient everybody  
21 this is Route 9R, (Indicating) Route 9 going  
22 north/south, Old Loudon Road, the intersection  
23 of Route 9 and Old Loudon Road. Further to the  
24 east, we'll see the new bypass connection  
25 intersecting opposite Johnson Road.

1 MR. SARGENT: So I wasn't very clear with  
2 that. What you're looking at is future  
3 development on the future network with the  
4 bypass -

5 MR. GRASSO: With development to 2020.

6 MR. SARGENT: In other words we're saying  
7 that things will work pretty good. When we  
8 look at this, this tells us that the system  
9 operates pretty well. If you have any  
10 questions with what queuing looks like, this  
11 is what queuing will look like.

12 MR. GANNON: Between 4:30 and 5:30 pm.

13 MR. SARGENT: Right. You can see that  
14 traffic does not queue up between 9 and  
15 Old Loudon Road right in here (Indicating).  
16 There is an additional lane that's  
17 recommended. It's a westbound through. There  
18 is a little bit of queuing southbound but not  
19 bad.

20 MR. STUTO: Is this with all of the  
21 recommended improvements?

22 MR. SARGENT: Yes.

23 MR. STUTO: Including the traffic light  
24 at Autopark?

25 MR. GRASSO: Yes. This is Autopark Drive

1 that comes in (Indicating). This is the  
2 bypass. This is Old Loudon Road. The colored  
3 cars are the left turn movements, the blue  
4 cars are the left turn movements, the green  
5 ones are the rights and the whites are the  
6 through ones.

7 MR. ROSANO: How many cars are actually  
8 going north of that intersection at this point  
9 that are not turning into Autopark?

10 I was a former manager of that big  
11 company for 13 years. I know what they do in  
12 the evening. If there are a lot of cars coming  
13 up and trying to go left, is that factored in?

14 MR. GRASSO: It is factored in.

15 MR. ROSANO: What's the difference  
16 between south of that at this point in time?  
17 How many cars are going north on 9 and how  
18 many are going in?

19 MR. SARGENT: Mark is looking up that  
20 number.

21 MR. NADOLNY: There would be about 310  
22 cars making a left turn away from  
23 Autopark Drive going northbound.

24 MR. ROSANO: Thank you.

25 MR. STUTO: For the hour?

1 MR. SARGENT: Yes.

2 MR. GRASSO: About 2% of the vehicles are  
3 turning in.

4 MR. STUTO: That's 2%? I think you should  
5 recalculate that.

6 MR. ROSANO: That's about 22% or  
7 something like that.

8 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: Does the model also  
9 take into account right turns going into  
10 Rite Aid and Hess?

11 MR. SARGENT: In what sense? That traffic  
12 is in the model, yes. The additional  
13 turbulence created by cars turning in and out  
14 of driveways isn't really reflected in the  
15 model, but the volume of traffic is in here.

16 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: That's going to  
17 effect your queuing more than I think the  
18 model is taking into consideration. Right now,  
19 what's the average speed through two lanes?  
20 You must have that.

21 MR. GRASSO: That's 34 northbound and 32  
22 southbound and under the built condition of  
23 the connector it will be 30 northbound. So it  
24 goes down four miles an hour and drops six  
25 miles per hour southbound.

1 MR. ROSANO: So what's the peak time  
2 south coming out of Century Hill? What is that  
3 number at the peak time? We know that people  
4 that work in Century Hill and in that area  
5 will be on the Northway and they're going to  
6 come south on 9 to get onto the Northway. I  
7 don't think that anybody from Saratoga County  
8 is going to be coming south on 9 to go  
9 shopping.

10 MR. NADOLNY: So you're talking about  
11 Century Hill here (Indicating) making a right  
12 turn?

13 MR. ROSANO: Correct.

14 MR. NADOLNY: Right now there is 370  
15 people making that right and 1,175 going  
16 through. You've got pretty much 1,500 cars  
17 going southbound through the Latham Autopark  
18 Drive.

19 MR. ROSANO: The construction that's  
20 happened already - what's going to happen in  
21 the future there? How many cars do you think  
22 are going to be coming out of that cluster at  
23 4:30 to 5:00?

24 MR. NADOLNY: Out of Autopark Drive  
25 heading south?

1           MR. ROSANO: Right and Century Hill as  
2 well as the other places that might happen.  
3 That's further south and I'm talking north  
4 now. Coming out of Century Hill, headed south,  
5 when everything is built how many cars will be  
6 coming out?

7           MR. NADOLNY: When everything is built  
8 and we have Century Hill, there will be 375  
9 making a right coming out of Autopark Drive.  
10 With the Walmart parcel we'll have 450. So  
11 you're talking 375 and 450 -

12          MR. ROSANO: What's happening right now  
13 then before there's any more construction? How  
14 many cars have you seen? It seems like 300 is  
15 kind of light if everybody gets out of work at  
16 the same time.

17          MR. NADOLNY: Right now Century Hill  
18 Drive has right turners - 335 cars.

19          MR. ROSANO: So you don't think that  
20 anybody is going to scoot through to Century  
21 Hill to Autopark to come out Century Hill?

22          MR. GRASSO: And take a right?

23          MR. ROSANO: There would be no sense of  
24 doing that, but it might be the path of least  
25 resistance and they might try to scoot around.

1           MR. GRASSO: No. That line is not going  
2 to substantially increase.

3           MR. SARGENT: So now we're looking at the  
4 same traffic volume with that exact same  
5 number of cars. This includes all the  
6 development that we've been talking about in  
7 the long term over the next 10 years to 2020  
8 and the build out of the different land uses  
9 that we've talked about without any  
10 transportation improvements.

11           You can see that there is a problem at 9  
12 and 9R. This is the scenario that shows four  
13 times as much vehicle delay on the network.  
14 You can see here that queuing is a concern  
15 along Route 9; it's basically above capacity.  
16 You'll see in a minute that queuing on 9R is  
17 also a concern as this backs up through the  
18 Old Loudon Road intersection.

19           MR. NADOLNY: You can see that all of  
20 that white is all queue.

21           CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: What are the  
22 improvements south of 9R that solve the  
23 queuing?

24           MR. NADOLNY: Right now if one of the  
25 improvements was in the westbound thru-lane

1 and while putting in the west-bound

2 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: No, I'm talking  
3 northbound.

4 MR. NADOLNY: I'm trying to explain that  
5 by putting in a westbound thru-lane where you  
6 don't need as much green time to get those  
7 westbound cars through. So say that they need  
8 currently 50 seconds of green time to get  
9 through the intersection and you only have one  
10 lane. By providing a second lane, they might  
11 only need 30 seconds of green time so you can  
12 move that green time to the northbound lanes.  
13 Additionally, this southbound left turn at 9  
14 and 9R, if you removed the majority of those -

15 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: Do you have what the  
16 cycles would change to?

17 MR. NADOLNY: Yes, and in the model it  
18 does have the signal timing changes. The  
19 signal overall would be 100 seconds -

20 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: Do you know what that  
21 is offhand?

22 MR. SARGENT: We can call it up.

23 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: I'm only interested  
24 in north/south.

25 MR. SARGENT: How much additional green

1 time that will be afforded to the north/south.

2 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: Right.

3 MR. SARGENT: The bottom is 50 seconds of  
4 green time northbound under this scenario.

5 MR. NADOLNY: It's hard to compare it  
6 because the overall length of the cycle has  
7 changed from 200 seconds down to 100 seconds.

8 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: I'm looking for a  
9 percentage - just roughly. I'm not holding you  
10 to that.

11 MR. NADOLNY: You will pretty much go  
12 from 30% to 40%; so it's a 10% increase. The  
13 signal is going to be actuated so you'll be  
14 able to retime it. Certain approaches will gap  
15 out. For that green time, you'll be able to  
16 shift potentially more traffic through the  
17 north/south bays -

18 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: It doesn't do that  
19 now?

20 MR. NADOLNY: If it's at capacity, it  
21 won't do that. It will use up all the maximum  
22 capacity of that approach. But if you add  
23 another westbound thru-lane you might be able  
24 to get all of those westbound cars through in  
25 a short amount of time. The signal will react

1 to that and put that time onto the major  
2 phases which is north/south.

3 What I was saying is if you could remove  
4 the majority of the southbound left turn and  
5 in essence put it onto the bypass, you almost  
6 don't even have to provide another long  
7 southbound left turn phase. So all of that  
8 green time would have been used for that to  
9 service the southbound unless they're not  
10 being serviced by the bypass and you would be  
11 able to put that time to the north/south  
12 phases and the other phases of the signal.

13 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: One other quick  
14 thing. Give me all the improvements that this  
15 model has taken into account. Another  
16 westbound on 9R, a light at Autopark with the  
17 connector -

18 MR. SARGENT: With additional turn lanes  
19 on Autopark and on the connector. I think that  
20 we had three lanes eastbound on Autopark; an  
21 exclusive left, a thru and a right.

22 MS. VAIDA: Are those listed on this  
23 table some place?

24 MR. SARGENT: They should be in that row  
25 of the final column under bypass conditions

1 under Latham Autopark.

2 MR. NADOLNY: I think right now there is  
3 a separate left and right turn lane from  
4 Latham Autopark and now there is a left and  
5 right. On the opposite approach it's only a  
6 right turn. That's the only movement you could  
7 make. In this scenario, you have a left thru  
8 with a separate right.

9 MR. ROSANO: Is that Loudon coming out  
10 onto the bypass and going to 9, or is it  
11 dying? It's still there, right?

12 MR. NADOLNY: It's still one way.

13 MR. ROSANO: So it's still one way going  
14 north and you're going to have the option to  
15 go -

16 MR. NADOLNY: To make a left. You'd still  
17 be able to do the same movement; you'd just  
18 have to make a left and a right.

19 MR. ROSANO: So you could go to the  
20 right. You could get yourself over to the  
21 light instead of having to come out that way?

22 MR. GRASSO: Yes, but this is only one  
23 way.

24 MR. ROSANO: Right, they could come out  
25 and get to the connector to get the light as

1           opposed to going down and not getting out.  
2           That is, however, staying one-way north.

3           MR. NADOLNY: The only other improvement  
4           is that you have to restripe a two way left  
5           turn lane to be an exclusive left turn lane to  
6           pull out onto the connector road. I don't  
7           think that would require any kind of  
8           construction because the lane is already out  
9           there. It would just be restriping it.

10          MR. GRASSO: Is that a decel lane on  
11          Century Hill?

12          MR. SARGENT: I thought so but I don't  
13          see it now.

14          MR. NADOLNY: Right, I don't think that I  
15          put it in. There was a right turn lane that I  
16          think was for the a.m. peak hour. It was  
17          really necessary for this movement, but I  
18          think that the GEIS identifies a southbound  
19          right turn lane at Century Hill and that's  
20          where the traffic is going in the morning.  
21          That's the a.m. peak rush in the morning. The  
22          p.m., obviously you really don't need it  
23          because there is not a lot of people going  
24          into Century Hill due to the office nature of  
25          the park.

1 MR. ROSANO: Can you go back to  
2 Old Loudon again at the connector?

3 So you're coming down and headed north.  
4 How do you get over to that other lane? How do  
5 you get out there?

6 MR. SARGENT: This would be going away  
7 (Indicating).

8 MR. ROSANO: I was hoping that it was.

9 MR. GRASSO: The connection from the  
10 Kirker's site right on the connector - there  
11 is a portion of the connector that would be  
12 abandoned.

13 MR. STUTO: Is the connector that goes to  
14 Old Loudon one way or two way?

15 MR. GRASSO: That section of it is one  
16 way.

17 MR. STUTO: Because the traffic looked  
18 like there was traffic going south on that.

19 MR. NADOLNY: I can't take this off the  
20 way that the model is set.

21 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: The picture was  
22 further down because you're still going to  
23 come out right from the businesses.

24 MR. GRASSO: They're not coming down  
25 Route 9 and making that movement. They're

1 coming off of these driveways. They're not  
2 expressively modeled as driveways.

3 Could you run the model with the 500,000  
4 square feet?

5 MR. NADOLNY: Sure.

6 MR. GRASSO: We took a look at this  
7 parcel again - the original '89 study that  
8 looked at 985,000. We have it evaluated at  
9 100,000 square feet based on constraints.  
10 There was concern raised by the board that the  
11 new connector road is going to increase the  
12 development potential. We said, then, let's  
13 look at it at 500,000 square feet. Obviously  
14 there is a lot more constraints that we know  
15 of today than we knew in 1989. When you look  
16 at the development potential of the property  
17 the connector road is probably going to  
18 decrease that development potential. It's  
19 going to take a lot of right of way out of  
20 that parcel. We're going to take a lot of the  
21 developable part. When you look at access to  
22 that parcel, the parcel is afforded excellent  
23 access the way that it is now. It's got the  
24 frontage on three roads; two state highways.  
25 It's got access on Route 9. It's got access on

1 Old Loudon Road and it's got access on 9R. The  
2 access on Route 9R is across from  
3 Johnson Road. We would expect that if that  
4 parcel is developed, they would probably be  
5 required to put a traffic signal up at the  
6 Route 9R/Johnson Road intersection.

7 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: Joe, some of that is  
8 true, but the mitigation of those wetlands  
9 isn't difficult with that parcel.

10 MR. GRASSO: That's why we said when you  
11 look at the constraints, we don't think that  
12 it's going to accommodate a million square  
13 feet. It's going to be much less.

14 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: No, your contention  
15 is that with the connector, it's less  
16 developable and I'm saying no way. Now, you're  
17 splitting and you're actually making three  
18 buildable -

19 MR. GRASSO: You are. You're making very  
20 developable padded sites.

21 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: With road access.

22 MR. GRASSO: And assuming that we could  
23 accommodate a good access onto the connector  
24 road, you're right. I'm not going to disagree  
25 with you. I'm just saying that I don't think

1           that development potential of the property is  
2           going to get increased by the connector road  
3           in terms of the greater number of traffic out  
4           of that site.

5                   CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: The cost of that land  
6           goes up about four times with the value of the  
7           land because you're not having to self  
8           mitigate with your development.

9                   MR. GRASSO: The value in terms of the  
10          land that's left over - I can see that the  
11          value is going to increase. But the property  
12          has excellent access right now, the way that  
13          the property has its frontage and where the  
14          access points would be developed. We're taking  
15          advantage of one of them.

16                   CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: So this is the one  
17          with 500?

18                   MR. SARGENT: This is the one with 500  
19          that shows the 9/9R intersection operates  
20          fine. You see no real queuing in this area  
21          (Indicating) and it's a lot better than the  
22          previous simulation.

23                   When you go to the north and you look at  
24          Latham Autopark, you can see some problems  
25          just being a development by the measures in

1 the table. It operates adequately at level of  
2 service D, but you'll see some queuing  
3 starting to develop in this area.

4 With an additional 500,000 square feet of  
5 development here (Indicating), this southbound  
6 left turn becomes a much larger movement. It  
7 requires more green time which opposed the  
8 critical northbound thru-movement. So, again,  
9 you start to reach a condition where this  
10 intersection would degrade. Instead of  
11 operating at a level of service C, it will  
12 operate at a level of service D. There are  
13 longer delays, but still okay. You'll notice a  
14 difference here.

15 As you can see it's now queuing up a  
16 little bit more there than we did in the  
17 earlier simulation.

18 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: Now that  
19 southbound - is there a left turn lane?

20 MR. SARGENT: Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: So that center median  
22 is going to be gone?

23 MR. GRASSO: Yes.

24 MR. SARGENT: It will be restriped.

25 MR. GRASSO: There is a center turn lane

1 out there right now which will be restriped to  
2 a dedicated left turn.

3 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: And then what happens  
4 to it further south of there?

5 MR. SARGENT: It will be restriped to a  
6 northbound lane. That same two way continuous  
7 left turn lane would become an exclusive left  
8 turn lane for the intersection movements.  
9 Further away it would revert back to the same  
10 as it is now.

11 MR. ROSANO: Do you have all the  
12 southbound cars on that simulation are going  
13 straight through? No one is taking a right  
14 hand turn from Autopark?

15 MR. SARGENT: They're disappearing. There  
16 are some cars covered in yellow here that  
17 would turn right.

18 MR. ROSANO: Okay, thank you.

19 MR. NADOLNY: There are about 100  
20 vehicles that do that in a course of an hour.  
21 Once they make the right turn, they turn into  
22 a dark blue color.

23 MR. SARGENT: So we draw a couple of  
24 conclusions from the simulating models. There  
25 were a number of questions that were asked at

1 the last meeting. They're on your handout.

2 Question one - about what happens if  
3 there are additional trips on the network.  
4 That's really answered here in the analysis of  
5 the difference between the 100,000 square foot  
6 and the 500,000 square foot scenario. What  
7 we're saying is that there will be delays and  
8 some intersection levels of service will  
9 worsen. However, there will still be  
10 immeasurable benefit to a bypass under every  
11 scenario.

12 Question two specifically asks about the  
13 difference between the 100,000 and the 500,000  
14 square foot scenarios. We have shown that in  
15 the simulation model.

16 Questions three is another issue.

17 Question four we have already talked  
18 about; the detailed levels of service.

19 Question five shows graphically the queue  
20 that is associated with the connector road. We  
21 have done that by showing the simulation  
22 models. You get a feel for how the traffic  
23 will flow and what the queue would look like.  
24 So, that model is really intended to answer  
25 four of the first five questions.

1           MR. GRASSO: I just want to go back to  
2           the comment three. The question regarding  
3           identifying all the improvements recommended  
4           in 1989 and how that compares with the current  
5           traffic update. We have provided that in table  
6           two. We're not going to go through all of it.  
7           There is a lot of information, but it's all  
8           there. It's an item by item comparison  
9           regarding what was recommended and the '89  
10          GEIS both at the 10 year planning period and  
11          the 20 year planning period that takes us to  
12          2009 and then what's currently recommended in  
13          the 2010 update both in the short term which  
14          is five years; 2015 and the long term which  
15          takes you up to 2020.

16          CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: You must have costs  
17          for these.

18          MR. SARGENT: As of a couple of years ago  
19          we had costs for all of these and we just  
20          started to develop a -

21          CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: Just use a multiplier  
22          of year over year.

23          MR. GRASSO: Some stay the same. It  
24          wasn't too long ago when we got those. It was  
25          in 2009 -

1                   CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: For the next time,  
2 I'd like to see the costs.

3                   MR. SARGENT: The areas highlighted in  
4 yellow here (Indicating) are the focus of the  
5 current effort - the Route 9 focus area.

6                   MS. VAIDA: I just wanted to ask you a  
7 question. I missed a little bit of the  
8 beginning so you may have explained this. When  
9 you go to your sort of conclusion table, it  
10 has the level of service summary and the 2020  
11 section where you have the existing known  
12 improvements versus bypass condition with  
13 improvements. With improvement, are you  
14 speaking of all of the improvements listed on  
15 the prior pages under short term and long  
16 term, or are you talking about something other  
17 that that?

18                  MR. SARGENT: It should be one for one  
19 under the improvements in the yellow  
20 highlighted section.

21                  MS. VAIDA: So assuming that all of the  
22 improvements in the yellow are made, that  
23 would be the result.

24                  MR. SARGENT: Yes.

25                  MR. GRASSO: The levels of service

1 summary really only touches on certain  
2 intersections. There are certain intersections  
3 that have been looked at previously and that  
4 isn't part of this update. The recommended  
5 improvements are minor based on changes to the  
6 volume.

7 MS. VAIDA: Would the improvements that  
8 need to be made just the ones in yellow?  
9 You're not assuming the other ones?

10 MR. GRASSO: That's right.

11 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: And the cost of those  
12 yellow improvements?

13 MR. SARGENT: It was roughly 15 million  
14 dollars a couple of years ago.

15 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: Right, but that  
16 didn't include the connector road.

17 MR. SARGENT: That's right. when you put  
18 the connector road number in here  
19 (Indicating), it's 3.8 million, not including  
20 right of way or engineering which you could  
21 add - we'll get up to about 5.5 million here.  
22 That would include a roundabout on the  
23 southeast end of it. That intersection could  
24 be a roundabout or a signal. A roundabout has  
25 some issues. It takes up some more space. It

1 takes a little more land because of the acute  
2 angle of Johnson Road. It really doesn't fit  
3 perfectly. It could be that a signal is a  
4 better alternative there, less expensive and  
5 fewer impacts and still operates fine. For  
6 now, the process includes the possibility of a  
7 roundabout.

8 MR. SULLIVAN: Does the \$500,000  
9 simulation have the roundabout?

10 MR. SARGENT: The simulation doesn't have  
11 the roundabout. We do have a picture.

12 MR. SULLIVAN: I was just wondering.  
13 Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: So it's going to be  
15 5.5?

16 MR. SARGENT: That includes our estimate  
17 for the right of way and  
18 everything - engineering, inspection and  
19 everything.

20 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: Well, you're not  
21 going to build a connector road without it.  
22 The whole number - if it was 15 a couple of  
23 years ago, it's close to 20.

24 MR. SARGENT: The number in the '89 GEIS  
25 was between 15 and 20. So, if you think that

1 in 20 years in the future -

2 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: But that had more  
3 improvement.

4 MR. GRASSO: The only thing that we need  
5 to bid out is -- the improvements have been  
6 made.

7 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: From the '89.

8 MR. GRASSO: Right, so we have to make  
9 sure that those are not included in that. We  
10 have to understand that the mitigation fees  
11 still need to be collected for those  
12 improvements for the new development, but we  
13 need to separate them as money that has  
14 already been spent and money that is going to  
15 be needed for the balance.

16 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: Maybe it's me here  
17 and I'm missing something, but the  
18 improvements in terms of the model that you  
19 just showed us - those improvements include  
20 the westbound, the light out of Autopark with  
21 the connector road, three lanes eastbound on  
22 Autopark and obviously the connector to  
23 Johnson. Those total costs are estimated at?

24 MR. SARGENT: Not sure. That's a subset  
25 of the entire table.

1 MR. GRASSO: More than the five million,  
2 but less than the 20.

3 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: So those things are a  
4 portion of the 20 that we're talking about and  
5 that doesn't include further down to the Boght  
6 Study?

7 MR. GRASSO: Right.

8 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: Okay, just so that  
9 I'm clear.

10 MR. SARGENT: We've hit on question six  
11 that was a cost issue.

12 Seven we've also hit on, which was the  
13 long term recommendation for Dunsbach Ferry  
14 Road.

15 Question eight had to do with looking for  
16 additional back up from CDTC about the  
17 diversion associated with Dunsbach Ferry Road.

18 We did reach out to them again and ask  
19 them to confirm and they stand by their  
20 diversions. They said that the assumed model  
21 which was their regional demand model, which  
22 they are obligated to maintain as part of  
23 their federal obligations of an MPO, indicates  
24 that when the new connector road was built, it  
25 would divert traffic in a fashion consistent

1 with existing counts. That is, it will not  
2 increase east/west or north/south traffic  
3 through the corridor or into the Johnson Road  
4 neighborhood.

5 So, in boiling that down it means it's  
6 going to divert traffic from the critical 9/9R  
7 intersection to the new light. It's not going  
8 to bring traffic into the area. It's not a  
9 regional road that is going to attract new  
10 traffic.

11 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: And then theirs is  
12 going to be no left turn at 9R/9 south.

13 MR. NADOLNY: No, you can still do it but  
14 the amount of traffic will be much less  
15 because people have the option of using the  
16 bypass.

17 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: Why would we take up  
18 cycle time? What sense does that make?

19 MR. SARGENT: Well, if you go shopping at  
20 Walmart and you live in the old New Loudon  
21 Road neighborhood and you want to go home -

22 MR. GRASSO: Actually that question was  
23 asked of Mark Kennedy. He would not permit a  
24 total restriction of left turns onto 9R from  
25 Route 9 southbound. There are other cars that

1 can come on to the network and not use the  
2 bypass. There are other businesses there.  
3 There's the Acura dealership, but he was  
4 adamant that he would not fully restrict left  
5 turns onto 9R off of Route 9. So, we can  
6 shorten up the lane there and we can predict  
7 that there is not going to be many vehicles  
8 that are going to do that because they're  
9 going to be encouraged to use the bypass. We  
10 can't predict that everybody is going to use  
11 the bypass. Not everybody that comes down  
12 there is not going to want to take that left.  
13 Then, you create an unsafe situation.

14 MR. SARGENT: The final question had to  
15 do with the concept of the new road and how  
16 the intersection light looked.

17 Again, this could be a signal or a  
18 roundabout. We've shown it here conceptually  
19 as a roundabout just to see how it would lay  
20 out. We talked about the constraints and the  
21 difficulties of actually building a roundabout  
22 here. Because of the property and the acute  
23 angle of Johnson Road - we're not convinced  
24 that this is the preferred alternative, but we  
25 did lay it out to understand what the impact

1 would look like. You have a copy of that in  
2 your handout also.

3 MR. GRASSO: So with that, we're at the  
4 end of the hour. We like the board to take  
5 some more time and go through our responses  
6 and see if there are additional follow up  
7 questions for us to answer.

8 In terms of the overall process, the next  
9 step would be for us to put together a report  
10 that encompasses all of the work that's been  
11 done as part of the update. It identifies all  
12 of the improvements. It identifies the costs  
13 for all of the different improvements. Then  
14 get that in the hands of the Planning Board  
15 and make it available for public review.

16 The next step of the SEQRA process would  
17 be for us to put together an amended statement  
18 of findings that references the document that  
19 we referred to which would become part of the  
20 official statement of findings; assuming that  
21 the statement of findings gets adopted by the  
22 Planning Board. If the report is acceptable,  
23 it can be a document that you can review  
24 projects against in the future and they will  
25 be required to comply with the new statement

1 of findings.

2 MS. VAIDA: I have another question. The  
3 summary does assume the roundabout.

4 MR. SARGENT: The last table has a signal  
5 or a roundabout. The last level of service  
6 summary table has a signal or a roundabout. It  
7 shows it both ways, which was the table that  
8 we started with tonight. In the lower right  
9 hand corner is the level of service summary;  
10 table three. It is the 9R/Johnson Road bypass  
11 as an overall level of service B for the  
12 signal. There will be 16 seconds of delay.  
13 That has an R for roundabout and it has an  
14 overall level of service of B with 11 seconds  
15 of delay.

16 MR. GRASSO: From a traffic impact  
17 scenario, the roundabout works. Mark talked  
18 about that there are some other constraints  
19 out there that you can deal with when you talk  
20 about the roundabout; the area, the impact on  
21 the adjacent properties, a commercial plaza  
22 across the street that has to be maintained.  
23 Those things have to be worked out and may  
24 land us to recommend a signal as opposed to a  
25 roundabout. From an operational standpoint, it

1 works. It doesn't create a queuing problem at  
2 any other intersections. Those are things that  
3 we wanted to vet out first.

4 CHAIRMAN O'ROURKE: Thanks, Joe. Thanks,  
5 Mark.

6

7

8

9

10 *(Whereas the proceeding concerning the*  
11 *above entitled matter was concluded at*  
12 *6:59 p.m.)*

13

14

15

16

17

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 31, 2010**