

**GENESEE TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL
SPECIAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
Rochester Genesee Regional Transportation Authority
1372 East Main Street, Rochester**

March 1, 2011

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Angela Ellis, Livingston County
Erik Frisch, City of Rochester – At Large
Tom Goodwin, Monroe County Planning Board
Andrea Guzzetta, Rochester City Council
Daniel Hallowell, New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) – Region 4
Scott Leathersich, Monroe County – At Large (Vice Chairperson)
Terrence J. Rice, Monroe County
Kevin Rooney, Wayne County
C. Mitchell Rowe, Seneca County
Douglas Tokarczyk, New York State Thruway Authority (NYSTA)
David Zorn, Genesee/Finger Lakes Regional Planning Council (G/FLRPC)

ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT

Doug Benson, City of Rochester
David Cook, Rochester Genesee Regional Transportation Authority (RGRTA), representing Mark Aesch

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT AND UNREPRESENTED

Robert Colby, Monroe County
James Fletcher, Monroe County – At Large
Todd Gadd, Wyoming County
Robert Griffith, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
Timothy Hens, Genesee County
Paul Holahan, City of Rochester
Kristen Mark Hughes, Ontario County (Chairperson)
Peter McCann, Monroe County Supervisors' Association
Edward Muszynski, Empire State Development Corporation
Henry Smith, Jr., Orleans County
Steven Urlass, Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)
(Vacant), Federal Transportation Administration (FTA)
(Vacant), NYS Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC)
(Vacant), Yates County

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

Josh Artuso, City of Rochester
Crystal Benjamin, RGRTA
Richard Perrin, GTC staff
Jody Pollot, GTC staff
James Stack, GTC staff

1. Call to Order & Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m. Scott Leathersich welcomed everyone and Members, Alternates, and others present introduced themselves.

2. Public Forum

No one from the public spoke during the Public Forum.

3. Action Items

a. Action concerning **approving the Draft Long Range Transportation Plan for the Genesee-Finger Lakes Region 2035** for public review

Richard Perrin provided a presentation on the *Long Range Transportation Plan for the Genesee-Finger Lakes Region 2035 (LRTP 2035)*. The presentation discussed the:

- Purpose of the *LRTP 2035* and associated federal requirements;
- Guiding Principles used to develop the *LRTP 2035*;
- Components of the draft document;
- Process for creating the draft *LRTP 2035* (i.e., the development phases);
- Current and projected socioeconomic and transportation characteristics of the region;
- Financial plan including estimated costs and reasonably expected revenues;
- Recommendations for the Preservation and Maintenance, Management and Operations, and Expansion categories;
- Illustrative projects to be advanced if additional revenues become available;
- Performance measures with associated benchmarks, desired directions, and likely directions; and
- Schedule and next steps for completing the *LRTP 2035*.

Scott Leathersich asked the Committee for feedback.

Terry Rice asked for clarification on how the plan is fiscally constrained while not identifying specific projects.

Richard responded that fiscal constraint is demonstrated by allocating funding to the categories of projects (e.g., preservation and maintenance, management and operations, and expansion) by percentages of the reasonably expected revenues. The LRTP is not meant to be a set of prospective future transportation improvement programs and, given the region's emphasis on preservation and maintenance of the existing system, it would be difficult if not impossible to identify specific reconstruction, rehabilitation, and preventive maintenance projects over a nearly 25-year horizon. Essentially, fiscal constraint for the *LRTP 2035* is about developing a realistic and credible framework and less about identifying future projects. This is not true for areas

that need to add capacity via new highways and rail lines where specific locations and costs can be determined.

Terry asked if there needs to be recognition of functionally obsolete bridges in the discussion of deficient bridges on page 30. Richard responded that the passage can be clarified to address this consideration.

Scott Leathersich asked about the timeline for comments from the Planning Committee. Richard stated GTC staff would like to receive all comments regarding the draft *LRTP 2035* from the Committee by March 9. This will allow GTC staff to edit the document and make it available for a 30-day public review prior to Committee recommendation to the GTC Board at the Committee's May 12 meeting.

David Cook asked how the performance measures will be used and if there will be an index or some other combined metric. Richard responded that an index may be created at a later date with significant input from the Planning Committee with respect to how to weight the various performance measures in terms of priority. Additionally, the next surface transportation authorization legislation may outline an altogether different set of performance measures that GTC will be required to use.

Dan Hallowell stated that the guiding principle of "Embracing Uncertainty" sounds as if we welcome it. He suggested that "Acknowledge" may be a better word choice than "Embracing".

Dan also suggested that the *LRTP 2035* should include a statement about expectation of maintenance of effort. The region should not invest federal transportation funds in a new facility and have the maintenance of said facility be neglected which creates a need for it to be replaced sooner than if the owner conducted the appropriate preventive and corrective maintenance.

Dan noted it may be worth considering or monitoring, via a performance measure, how much useful life agencies are getting out of a facility. Properly maintained facilities last longer and this should factor into future investment decision making. Richard responded that he does not see this issue as a performance measure, but that it should factor into the TIP project selection criteria.

Erik Frisch suggested the collection of bicycle and pedestrian counts should be considered in the future. The City of Rochester is already being asked for this type of information from potential developers.

Erik stated that some traditional highway reconstruction projects in the region do add capacity to address congestion issues which is effectively expansion of the system. Richard noted that there may need to be a discussion on what the expected capacity needs at Estimated Time of Construction plus 20 years (ETC+20) should be during the design phase that is based on a discussion of sustainable development with local governments that have responsibility for the demand placed on the system via land use regulations and associated development that is approved.

Dan Hallowell asked how the revenue projections were developed. Richard explained the methodology and further noted that the recommendations are based on projected revenues. If future transportation bills have significantly less funding, then the region will need to have a discussion on strategic divestment where there is redundancy or excess capacity on the highway and bridge network to allow for investments that expand public transportation services and bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

Richard discussed the next steps in the development of the *LRTP 2035*:

- All comments from Committee members and alternates should be received by March 9;
- GTC staff will maintain a list of changes to the draft *LRTP 2035* for reference purposes;
- A recommendation on improving and creating awareness regarding distracted driving will be added;
- GTC staff will complete all editorial and format changes as necessary;
- There will be four public meetings during the public review period;
- GTC staff is willing to make additional presentations; and
- The draft *LRTP 2035* will be available for public review at the GTC, NYSDOT-Region 4, and county planning offices, as well as the central repository libraries in the Rochester Transportation Management Area counties.

4. Public Forum

No one from the public spoke during the public forum.

5. Next Meeting

April 14, 2011 at the Ontario County Municipal Building

6. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:32 a.m.