

**GENESEE TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL  
QUARTERLY BOARD MEETING  
Radisson Hotel  
Henrietta, NY**

**September 8, 2010**

GTC BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Jeffrey Adair, Monroe County  
Maggie Brooks, Monroe County Executive  
Jerry Davis, Genesee/Finger Lakes Regional Planning Council  
David Dunning, Monroe County Supervisors Association  
Linda A. Faubel, Monroe County Planning Board  
Mary Pat Hancock, Genesee County (Chairperson)  
Paul E. Haney, Rochester – At Large  
James Hoffman, Wayne County (Vice Chairperson)  
Dan Hogan, Monroe County At-Large

ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT

Mark Aesch, Roch. Gen. Regional Trans. Authority, representing John G. Doyle, Jr.  
Angela Ellis, Livingston County, representing James Merrick  
Alinda Drury, City of Rochester, representing Robert Duffy  
E. Joseph Gozelski, Wyoming County, representing A. Douglas Berwanger  
Andrea Guzzetta, Rochester City Council, representing Lovely Warren  
Donald House, Yates County, representing H. Taylor Fitch  
Kristen Mark Hughes, Ontario County, representing Theodore Fafinski  
Scott Leathersich, Monroe County At-Large  
Edward G. Muszynski, Empire State Development, representing Dennis Mullen  
Douglas J. Tokarczyk, NYS Thruway Authority, representing Michael Fleischer  
C. Mitchell Rowe, Seneca County, representing Chuck Lafler  
Robert Traver, NYS Department of Transportation (NYSDOT), representing Stanley Gee

GTC BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT AND UNREPRESENTED

Philip Brito, Federal Aviation Administration  
David B. Callard, Orleans County  
Pete Grannis, NYS Department of Environmental Conservation  
Brigid Hynes-Cherin, Federal Transit Administration  
Jeff Kolb, Federal Highway Administration  
David L. Watson, Rochester City Planning Commission

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

Daniel Hallowell, NYSDOT – Region 4  
Richard Perrin, GTC staff  
Terrence Rice, Monroe County  
James Stack, GTC staff  
John Thomas, Rochester – At Large  
Chris Tortora, GTC staff  
David Zorn, Genesee/Finger Lakes Regional Planning Council

**1. Call to Order and Roll Call**

Chairperson Hancock called the meeting to order at 8:32 a.m.

James Stack, GTC staff, called the roll; a quorum was present.

Chairperson Hancock turned the meeting over to Monroe County Executive Maggie Brooks who asked for a moment of silence for Ed Marianetti whom had recently passed away. Ed was a GTC Board member for over a decade. He was a lifelong resident of the Rochester area. After military service, Ed spent his career serving the public.

**2. Public Forum**

No one from the public spoke during the Public Forum.

**3. Approval of Minutes**

**Dan Hogan moved for approval of the minutes from the June 17, 2010 Quarterly Meeting; Maggie Brooks seconded the motion. The minutes were approved as submitted.**

**4. Communications and Announcements**

Richard Perrin announced that Rochester City Planning Commission Chairman David Watson has designated Chuck Thomas as his alternate to the GTC Board.

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

- a. Planning Committee Report – Kristen Mark Hughes, Chairman

Kristen Mark Hughes provided the following report:

The Planning Committee met August 12 and recommends that the GTC Board:

- Amend the *Long Range Transportation Plan for the Genesee-Finger Lakes Region: 2007-2027 Update* and the *2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program* to include the Southern Corridor Improvement (including Kendrick Road Interchange) Project as an illustrative project;
- Accept the submissions of reports as evidence of completion of three Unified Planning Work Program tasks;
- Adopt twenty one amendments to the *2007-2012 Transportation Improvement Program* and the *2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program* as requested by the New York State Department of Transportation and the Rochester Genesee Regional Transportation Authority; and
- Adopt the revised *Transportation Improvement Program Procedures Manual*.

Additionally, the Planning Committee took the following actions:

- Modified the *FY 2010-2011 UPWP* to reflect the contribution of corrected FY 2009-2010 rollover amounts;
- Approved an administrative modification to the *2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program* to change the name of the Downtown Transit Center project to Renaissance Square if it is determined by the Federal Transit Administration that it is necessary for the project to receive previously awarded discretionary funds;
- Approved Scopes of Work for four Unified Planning Work Program tasks; and
- Discussed the development of the next Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP).

b. GTC Staff Report – Richard Perrin, Executive Director

Richard Perrin provided the following report:

GTC staff will begin forming the steering committee for the regional freight study by sending a letter to the lead elected official in the nine counties of the region and the City of Rochester asking them to designate a member and alternate to the committee. The study will have a stakeholder outreach plan to engage related interests such as economic development professionals. To-date, GTC staff have been working with NYSDOT and the consultant to identify and obtain the necessary data (including proprietary information) regarding freight movements into, out of, and through the region, as well as develop project management and stakeholder involvement plans. Data collection efforts are being coordinated with the Mohawk-Erie Multimodal Transportation Corridor Study to minimize any duplication of effort.

Last Friday, GTC staff mailed the advance notice of the call for projects for the next Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). The call for projects for *the FY 2011-2012 UPWP* will be issued Friday, September 17 with proposals due Friday, October 22. A workshop for potential project sponsors will be held Wednesday, September 29 where GTC staff will provide a presentation on the UPWP and be available to discuss proposals with potential project sponsors. At this time, we expect that there will be approximately \$425,000 in Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and \$200,000 in Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Metropolitan Planning funds available to GTC member agencies and communities throughout the region.

At its June 17 meeting, this Board adopted the *2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program* (TIP) and the associated air quality conformity statement, demonstrating that the implementation of the *2011-2014 TIP* will not increase emissions of ground-level ozone precursors in the Rochester Nonattainment Area above 2002 levels. On July 23, FHWA and FTA issued a positive conformity determination for the *2011-2014 TIP*, allowing all projects included therein to be advanced.

c. Old Business

1. Southern Corridor Improvement (including Kendrick Road Interchange) Project Application to the Transportation Investments Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER II) Discretionary Grants Program Update

Richard Perrin reported:

At its June 17 meeting, this Board passed Resolution 10-50 endorsing the Southern Corridor Improvement (including Kendrick Road Interchange) Project as the region's highest priority for the TIGER II Discretionary Program and additional action to strengthen the application will be considered under agenda item 6.a.. NYSDOT prepared the application to the TIGER II program for this project. The vast majority of the effort to prepare a very thorough and extensive application by the August 23 deadline was borne by our regional NYSDOT office. It is certain that the competition for the \$600 million in funding through this program will be very intense - the first round of TIGER provided \$1.5 billion in funding and received 1,400 applications requesting \$57 billion. NYSDOT-Region 4 did an absolutely phenomenal job in coordinating the efforts of several parties, such as the City of Rochester, the University of Rochester, Rochester Institute of Technology, and GTC and their various consultants. The application that was submitted for this project is as solid an application as could be submitted thanks to their hard work.

Dan Hallowell commented that the partnership was key to making the application as strong as possible.

2. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Sustainable Communities Planning Grant Program Update

Richard Perrin reported:

This program was discussed at the June 17 GTC Board meeting based on the advance Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) that was issued on February 10. The final NOFA was released on June 23 with applications due August 23 and had significant additions to the advance NOFA issued in February. The most relevant of these additions to this region were 1.) that eligible applicants for the program were required to be consortiums that, at a minimum, included the MPO or regional planning council for the area, the principal city, the largest unit of local government outside of the principal city, and a not-for-profit institution; 2.) that there were eight mandatory outcomes for the regional plan for sustainable development that would be developed with funding from the program; and 3.) that other federal funds were able to be used towards the 20 percent cost-share.

GTC staff prepared a proposal outline and associated budget for the professional services needed to develop a regional plan for sustainable development, offered to provide 25 percent of the cost-share toward these services as well as provide all project management expenses (including hiring an experienced professional on a temporary basis to serve as project manager). GTC staff also developed a

resolution template that working group members and other potential consortium partners could bring before their respective governing bodies to get authorization to sign a partnership agreement, memorandum of understanding, or other instrument signifying their commitment.

The short timeframe for forming a consortium via adopted resolutions from the governing bodies and the fact that certain mandatory outcomes may not have been achievable or were not consistent with individual working group members' goals resulted in there not being unanimous agreement to submit an application for this initial round of the program.

There is interest in continuing discussions on regional opportunities and issues. GTC is proposing to do so via a regional planning working group that would meet regularly over the next nine months to one year. GTC is preparing a proposal outline for this initiative. The proposed approach will include a survey of working group members and others to prioritize opportunities and issues so that discussions among the group (both in-person and through e-mail) will be structured. GTC has discussed this with G/FLRPC and will be reaching out further to determine their level of interest and ability to partner. The likely deliverable from this initiative will be a white paper documenting the process and findings.

It is anticipated that by undertaking this effort, we will have a better understanding of how our limited regional planning resources can be best used and possibly be better positioned for future federal funding opportunities, including another round of the program that HUD anticipates advancing next year.

### 3. Federal and State Transportation Funding Update

Richard Perrin reported:

On July 29 the House of Representatives passed its version of the 2011 Transportation and Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Bill. The Senate version has passed the Appropriations Committee. The amount of funding for highways and transit proposed for 2011 is similar to those in the current bill that was adopted on December 16, 2009. Accordingly, this region can expect that similar amounts of funding can be expected next year for capital, operational, and planning purposes. There has been little movement on a multi-year surface transportation authorization bill due to the fact that revenues to the Highway Trust Fund (which is primarily the gas tax) are not sufficient to adopt a \$500 billion to \$600 billion multi-year authorization. The Congressional Budget Office recently announced that the Highway Trust Fund can be sustained at existing levels through 2013. This potentially pushes out a decision on a multi-year authorization until the next Presidential term.

As recently as this past holiday weekend, the President announced an outline for a six-year initiative that would provide a \$50 billion up-front investment to rebuild 150,000 miles of roadway, construct and maintain 4,000 miles of rail, and rehabilitate or reconstruct 150 miles of airport runways as well as a

communication system to reduce air traveler delays. In addition, the initiative would create a national infrastructure bank. Like every other bank, this one wouldn't provide funds but instead loan them, requiring repayment with non-federal funds over time. It is unclear as to whether or not this initiative is in addition to or meant to replace the next surface transportation authorization legislation (the successor to SAFETEA-LU that expired on September 30th, 2009). The Administration has not yet announced its guiding principles for the next authorization, this could be the initial effort.

You may recall the legislation that passed on August 10 that provided \$16 billion to provide funding to states for teachers' salaries and extending increased Medicaid funding. It's worth noting that \$2.2 billion of this \$16 billion came from the Highway Account of the Highway Trust Fund. According to NYSDOT-Main Office, the New York State portion (which is approximately \$100 million) will come from unobligated balances. This Board will take action later in the meeting to ensure to the maximum extent possible that none of the \$100 million comes from this region.

## **6. Action Items**

- a. Amending the *Long Range Transportation Plan for the Genesee-Finger Lakes Region: 2007-2027 Update* and the *2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program* to include the Southern Corridor Improvement (including Kendrick Road Interchange) Project as an illustrative project with identified federal discretionary fund source, associated non-federal matching funds, and commitment to maintain and operate / Proposed Resolution 10-51

Richard Perrin stated that based on the conversation at the June 17 GTC Board meeting, GTC staff suggested adding the Southern Corridor Improvement (including Kendrick Road Interchange) Project to the LRTP and TIP as an illustrative project to make a stronger application for funding under the TIGER II program. The project is consistent with a specific recommendation of the *LRTP: 2007-2027 Update* and action could be taken to amend the *2011-2014 TIP* at a later date.

GTC does not typically include illustrative projects in either its LRTP or TIP. This is done to ensure that the LRTP and TIP are credible products that present strategies, projects, and programs that the public, businesses, and other stakeholders in the region can reasonably expect to be implemented. GTC staff saw an opportunity to address an immediate need (i.e., strengthening the TIGER II application) while setting a framework for the consideration of illustrative projects in the future.

By including the Southern Corridor Improvement (including Kendrick Road Interchange) Project as an illustrative project in this manner, GTC would set a standard for only including illustrative projects that have 1.) an identified federal funding program; 2.) the pledged non-federal matching funds; and 3.) the commitment of the project's owner to maintain and operate the facility(s) being constructed, reconstructed, and/or rehabilitated.

Terry Rice asked if parts of the project were still in the TIP. Richard responded that the parts of the project that were previously programmed in the TIP remain in the TIP. If TIGER II funds are awarded, they would allow for additional improvements consistent with the overall plan for the Southern Corridor, which is the most congested in the region.

John Thomas asked if a particular year needed to be identified. Richard responded that the funds would need to be obligated by September 30, 2012.

**Dan Hogan moved to approve Resolution 10-51; Scott Leathersich seconded the motion. The motion passed unopposed.**

- b. Accepting the submission of reports as evidence of completion of various UPWP tasks

Chairperson Hancock suggested that proposed Resolutions 10-53, 10-54, and 10-56 be considered as a single action; no Member or Alternate objected.

- (1) Accepting the *Land Use Report for Monroe County, New York – 2009* as evidence of completion of UPWP Task 4210 / Proposed Resolution 10-53
- (2) Accepting the *2009 Regional Land Use Monitoring Report* as evidence of completion of UPWP Task 4220 / Proposed Resolution 10-54
- (3) Accepting the *Route 31 Corridor Study* as evidence of completion of UPWP Task 7571 / Proposed Resolution 10-56

**Paul Haney moved to approve Resolutions 10-53, 10-54 and 10-56; Jeffrey Adair seconded the motion. The motion passed unopposed.**

- c. Adopting amendments to the *2007-2012 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)* and *2011-2014 TIP* / Proposed Resolutions 10-57 through 10-77

- (1) Amending the *2007-2012 TIP* and the *2011-2014 TIP* by changing the FFY 2010 and FFY 2011 phase costs and schedules of select TIP Projects / Proposed Resolution 10-57

Richard Perrin stated that the proposed action protects the obligation authority to use federal transportation funds within the region for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2010. NYSDOT – Region 4 worked with project sponsors to identify project phases that are unlikely to be obligated before the current FFY ends. The action defers phases on 38 projects from FFY 2010 to FFY 2011 and advances phases on six projects from FFY 2011, FFY 2012, and FFY 2013 to FFY 2010 in corresponding amounts.

**Dan Hogan moved to approve Resolution 10-57; Paul Haney seconded the motion. The motion passed unopposed.**

Chairperson Hancock suggested that proposed Resolutions 10-58 through 10-72 be considered as a single action; one Member objected to including Resolution 10-67.

Chairperson Hancock then suggested that proposed Resolutions 10-58 through 10-66 and Resolutions 10-68 through 10-72 be considered as a single action; no Member or Alternate objected.

- (2) Amending the *2011-2014 TIP* by adding the FFY 2012 Railroad Crossing Block Program project / Proposed Resolution 10-58
- (3) Amending the *2011-2014 TIP* by adding the FFY 2013 Railroad Crossing Block Program project / Proposed Resolution 10-59
- (4) Amending the *2011-2014 TIP* by adding the FFY 2014 Railroad Crossing Block Program project / Proposed Resolution 10-60
- (5) Amending the *2011-2014 TIP* by adding the High Risk Rural Road Improvements for 2011 project / Proposed Resolution 10-61
- (6) Amending the *2011-2014 TIP* by adding the NYS Route 20 at Genesee County Road 35 (East Rd.) project / Proposed Resolution 10-62
- (7) Amending the *2011-2014 TIP* by adding the High Risk Rural Road Improvements for 2012 project / Proposed Resolution 10-63
- (8) Amending the *2011-2014 TIP* by adding the High Risk Rural Road Improvements for 2013 project / Proposed Resolution 10-64
- (9) Amending the *2011-2014 TIP* by adding the High Risk Rural Road Improvements for 2014 project / Proposed Resolution 10-65
- (10) Amending the *2011-2014 TIP* by adding the Intelligent Transportation Systems project / Proposed Resolution 10-66
- (12) Amending the *2011-2014 TIP* by adding the Midtown Redevelopment Transportation Infrastructure Improvements project / Proposed Resolution 10-68
- (13) Amending the *2011-2014 TIP* by adding the Butterhole-Seneca Park Rail Trail Project / Proposed Resolution 10-69
- (14) Amending the *2011-2014 TIP* by adding the Rochester Safe Routes to School Program project / Proposed Resolution 10-70
- (15) Amending the *2011-2014 TIP* by adding the Jefferson Avenue Rehabilitation Project / Proposed Resolution 10-71
- (16) Amending the *2011-2014 TIP* by adding the Iroquois National Wildlife Refuge Road Improvements project / Proposed Resolution 10-72

Paul Haney asked if the Butterhole-Seneca Park Rail Trail Project is a good idea. He expressed concern that the project goes through a high crime area.

Richard Perrin responded that people are already using the corridor for non-motorized transportation. This project would turn the corridor into a formal multi-use trail. This project is not just a recreational facility as this area has a high incidence of zero vehicle households and the trail would likely be used for transportation. Trail projects alone will not make good neighborhoods bad or bad neighborhoods good. Richard referenced Jane Jacobs' concept of "eyes on



the street” leading to reduced criminal behavior, and that the same would apply to this trail to some degree.

Alinda Drury added that the neighborhood groups along the corridor are strongly supportive of the project.

Joe Gozelski asked whether local roads are eligible for the High Risk Rural Road projects.

Richard Perrin responded in the affirmative noting that these projects set aside blocks of funding for projects to be determined later. NYSDOT – Region 4 will work with the counties to identify eligible projects to be considered for funding.

Dan Hallowell added that NYSDOT has had trouble identifying roads eligible for these funds due to a lack of data. There are anecdotal reports of roads with safety issues but unreported crashes cannot be used to evaluate locations under this program.

**Dan Hogan moved to approve Resolutions 10-58 through 10-66 and Resolutions 10-68 through 10-72; James Hoffman seconded the motion. The motion passed unopposed.**

- (11) Amending the *2011-2014 TIP* by adding the Inner Loop East project / Proposed Resolution 10-67

Paul Haney noted that the funds for this project are for design activities. He asked what the engineers will be asked to design.

Dan Hallowell responded that the City of Rochester has submitted a scoping report that is under review. The funds for engineering activities will not be obligated before the end of the current FFY. This action protects the funding for the project.

Paul Haney noted that he doesn't think raising the Inner Loop is the solution. He believes the problem was created when the project was designed, namely the lack of a direct connection from I-490 westbound to the southern portion of the Inner Loop. Drivers currently have to exit I-490 and proceed on City streets through multiple traffic signals before they can access the Inner Loop.

**Alinda Drury moved to approve Resolution 10-67; Andrea Guzzetta seconded the motion. The motion passed with one Member opposed.**

Chairperson Hancock suggested that proposed Resolutions 10-73 through 10-77 be considered as a single action; no Member or Alternate objected.

- (17) Amending the *2007-2012 TIP* by renaming and increasing the cost of the FFY 2008 & FFY 2009 Jobs Access/Reverse Commute project / Proposed Resolution 10-73

- (18) Amending the *2007-2012 TIP* by adding the Medical Motor Service Transportation ACCESS (TRAC) project / Proposed Resolution 10-74
- (19) Amending the *2007-2012 TIP* by adding the Automated Phone System Individual Bus Stop Coding project / Proposed Resolution 10-75
- (20) Amending the *2007-2012 TIP* and the *2011-2014 TIP* by adding the Purchase and Operation of an Accessible Bus project / Proposed Resolution 10-76
- (21) Amending the *2007-2012 TIP* by adding the RGRTA New Freedom Program Administration project / Proposed Resolution 10-77

Richard Perrin discussed the purpose of the Job Access and Reverse Commute and the New Freedom programs. RGRTA is the direct recipient of these funds in the Urbanized Area. The individual projects were selected via a competitive solicitation of projects.

**Jerry Davis moved to approve Resolutions 10-73 through 10-77; Mark Aesch seconded the motion. The motion passed unopposed.**

- d. Adopting the revised *Transportation Improvement Program Procedures Manual* / Proposed Resolution 10-78

Richard Perrin distributed copies of Exhibit 4 – Guidelines for TIP Project Change Requests, which was inadvertently omitted from the meeting package that was mailed out.

The results of the TIP Project Delivery Review were presented to the GTC Board at its June 19, 2008 meeting. The three primary actions that were identified as part of that review were:

1. Obtaining updated cost estimates for projects in the current TIP;
2. Reviewing and, if necessary, modifying our TIP management process to better account for activities that occur outside the purview of GTC; and
3. Using the next TIP update to “right the ship” and allow the region to move forward with reduced liabilities against future federal funds.

The first action was accomplished in late-Summer/early-Fall 2008 when GTC staff and NYSDOT – Region 4 staff solicited updated costs and schedules from project sponsors for existing TIP projects. The third action was accomplished when the GTC Board amended the *2007-2012 TIP* by changing the FFY 2010 phase costs and schedules of select TIP Projects and adopted the *2011-2014 TIP*.

The second action was to review and (if necessary) modify the current GTC TIP management process to better account for activities that occur outside of the federally-required metropolitan planning process but have the potential to compromise the ability to fund new projects in the TIP. The TIP Development Committee (TDC) and Planning Committee agreed that the review and associated revision of the current GTC TIP management process should also include consideration of measures that allow GTC to better monitor the progress of projects and make adjustments as necessary in a timely manner to ensure to the maximum extent practicable that projects are delivered on time and within budget.

Table 4 clarifies the guidelines for changes to the TIP. The changes provide the authority for GTC staff to make changes to projects where the change in total project cost is less the \$250,000 or 25 percent, whichever is less, and to add non-federal funds to projects.

Section 4.8 revises the monitoring and reporting of programmed schedules and costs to allow GTC, via the TDC, to discuss project progress with sponsors to improve adherence to programmed project scopes, schedules, and costs.

**Dan Hogan moved to approve Resolution 10-78; Paul Haney seconded the motion. The motion passed unopposed.**

## **7. New Business**

- a. Federal Highway Administration "Staffing and Administrative Capacity of Metropolitan Planning Organizations" Report

Richard Perrin provided a presentation on the findings of the "Staffing and Administrative Capacity of Metropolitan Planning Organizations" report and how GTC compares.

The research report was commissioned by FHWA and conducted by the Center for Urban Transportation Research at the University of South Florida. The purpose is to assist MPOs in evaluating their governance systems, organizational structures, and budgeting/staffing needs. The findings are based on a survey of all MPOs nationwide with a 35.5 percent response rate.

This is the first comprehensive report on MPO governance, administrative, and staffing characteristics. Prior analyses have been limited to technical planning activities with administration and staffing addressed in case studies. This report provides new insights and validates the conclusions of the peer review conducted by GTC staff in 2007-2008.

With regard to MPO governance, MPOs have an average of 16.1 voting Board members overall with MPOs over 1 million population having an average of 25.4. GTC has 24 voting Board members. Approximately 54 percent of MPO Boards meet monthly. GTC meets quarterly, like 17.3 percent of all MPOs.

Since MPOs are funded on a reimbursement basis. Accordingly, MPOs usually have a host agency that provides "capital float". With regard to MPO administration, approximately 37 percent of MPOs are hosted by a Regional Council while approximately 58 percent are hosted by a County or Municipality. In the case of Ohio, MPOs are required by state law to be hosted by Regional Councils. GTC is hosted by a modal authority (RGRTA), which is not common (approximately two percent of MPOs responding were hosted by a modal authority). The relationship between GTC and RGRTA is governed by a Memorandum of Understanding with clear distinctions between responsibilities for administrative functions and policy matters.

Only 49 percent of MPOs indicated they are able to meet their federal requirements with the federal funds they receive to conduct metropolitan planning. GTC is able to meet its federal requirements, conduct value-added activities, and share federal funds for metropolitan planning with member agencies and communities throughout the region.

Many MPOs use local funds to supplement federal funds for metropolitan planning. GTC does not receive local funds except to supplement federal funds for projects conducted by or on behalf of local agencies. These funds are not used for GTC staff activities.

With regard to using local funds to support MPO activities, 87 percent of MPOs use local funds to advance federal requirements. Federal funds cannot be used to lobby federal officials. Therefore, GTC does not conduct lobbying activities while 27 percent of MPOs use local funds to conduct lobbying activities.

Sixty-eight percent of MPOs use local funds for employee training. GTC supports employee training with federal metropolitan planning funds and a small amount of federal Statewide Planning and Research as part of a shared cost initiative of all MPOs in New York State.

Forty-five percent of MPOs use local funds to meet state mandates and programs. GTC conducts a greenhouse gas emissions and energy consumption analysis of the LRTP and TIP in support of the New York State Energy Plan using federal metropolitan planning funds.

Monroe County provides an in-kind contribution of office space and utilities (excluding telecommunications) to GTC. The value of this contribution is used to satisfy a significant portion of the local match of federal metropolitan planning funds. In contrast, 68 percent of MPOs use local funds for office operation.

With regard to staffing, the national average for MPOs is one employee for every 47,963 residents. GTC has one employee for every 141,128 residents of the region. For MPOs with four to nine employees, the average number of employee departures is 0.76 employees per year. Over the last three years, GTC has averaged 1.33 departures per year. Of the four employees who left GTC, two went to work for member agencies while two left the region for personal reasons.

Richard concluded his presentation with four major findings for GTC:

- (1) Extensive technical committee engagement provides full participation by member agencies and allows the Board to be more efficient during its meetings;
- (2) While not common nationally, GTC staff is hosted by an authority (RGRTA) and accrues the benefits of being part of a larger employer without bureaucratic rigidity;

- (3) The GTC operating model results in highly-cost effective delivery of services, allowing member agencies and communities to utilize federal planning funds; and
- (4) The GTC operating model limits upward mobility within the MPO, which may be a factor in employee turnover.

Maggie Brooks stated that this report validates what the GTC Board feels about the operations of the organization. She added that Board meetings are efficient due to the staff support that is provided. Richard responded that way the GTC Board conducts itself by applying a truly regional approach makes this possible.

John Thomas noted that he came to Rochester from an MPO in Ohio. He found it unusual that GTC did not collect local funds and that it shares federal metropolitan planning funds with local agencies. He added that there may be a need to review the relationship between GTC and the Genesee/Finger Lakes Regional Planning Council (G/FLRPC) to avoid duplication of effort. Richard responded that GTC staff works closely G/FLRPC staff to eliminate any duplication of effort.

Paul Haney asked how many MPOs are in New York State. Richard responded that there are 13 MPOs in New York State and many of them serve smaller areas than GTC in terms of both population and area. Paul expressed surprise that there were so many and assumed that GTC was typical in size and composition.

Terry Rice noted that the way GTC works with NYSDOT – Region 4 is very unusual in New York State. Strictly speaking, the MPO only covers the Transportation Management Area and NYSDOT covers the rest of the region. GTC and NYSDOT – Region 4 have a unique relationship that benefits the region.

Kris Hughes noted that the structure of GTC allows for good dialogue on major issues.

Dan Hallowell noted that NYSDOT is shifting its investment focus to the overall transportation system and the GTC structure is well suited to this new focus.

Bob Traver noted that the relationships in this region are key and cannot be developed quickly or mandated.

Dan Hallowell announced that Marvin Kleinberg, a longtime NYSDOT – Region 4 employee who regularly interacted and worked with GTC Board Members has retired.

## **8. Next Meeting**

The next GTC Board meeting will be held Thursday December 9, 2010 at 8:30 a.m. at the Radisson Hotel in Henrietta.

## **9. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 9:51 a.m.