

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 January 11, 2011 at 10:46 p.m. at
the Public Operations Center
347 Old Niskayuna Road, Latham, New York 12110

BOARD MEMBERS:

PETER STUTO, CHAIRPERSON
THOMAS NARDACCI
LOUIS MION
MICHAEL SULLIVAN
PAUL ROSANO
KATHLEEN DALTON
TIMOTHY LANE
ELENA VAIDA, Esq., Attorney for the Planning Board

Also present:

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

1 CHAIRMAN STUTO: We're here tonight to
2 talk about the Boght Area GEIS and to update
3 the Board. This will be presented by Clough
4 Harbour.

5 How long do you think that your
6 presentation will take?

7 MR. GRASSO: Probably about 15 to
8 20 minutes.

9 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Are you going to start
10 with where we are in the process?

11 MR. GRASSO: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Let me just preface this
13 and say that when I started three years ago,
14 we were talking about this and this is
15 something that we really have to stick with.

16 MR. GRASSO: Just a follow up on my role.
17 I'm Joe Grasso with CHA. I was brought on by
18 the Town to look at the Boght Road traffic
19 update. The firm that actually did the traffic
20 analysis was Creighton Manning. With me
21 tonight is Mark Sargent, who has been doing
22 the traffic analysis all along.

23 The purpose of tonight is really to give
24 the Planning Board an update as to where we
25 are in the process, what we've done since the

1 last time that we were here, and what we plan
2 on moving forward with. We're going to delve a
3 little bit into some of the issues that we
4 discussed the last time we were here before
5 the Planning Board.

6 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Joe, let me interrupt
7 for one second.

8 Do the new Planning Board members know
9 what the GEIS area is, and what it's all
10 about?

11 MR. MION: I understand it.

12 CHAIRMAN STUTO: You understand it
13 generally, Kathy?

14 MR. DALTON: From what Joe gave me - I
15 read it.

16 MR. GRASSO: I can just update Kathy and
17 everyone else.

18 The GEIS is a very generic high-level
19 planning study that looks at development
20 within a whole area.

21 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Which is that area right
22 up there (Indicating).

23 MR. GRASSO: This area here outlined in
24 black at the northeastern part of town
25 (Indicating). We looked at a whole slew of

1 environmental impact issues. Basically, the
2 intent of doing a GEIS is to look at
3 cumulative impacts of development and figure
4 out appropriate mitigation for that as opposed
5 to looking at it on a project by project
6 basis.

7 The GEIS was done in 1989 and it looked
8 at a 20-year build-out area. So that takes us
9 to 2009. Not as much development has occurred
10 within the GEIS in the past 20 years and as
11 was contemplated in 1989. The issue that we're
12 trying to focus on right now is just looking
13 at the traffic study that was done, the
14 traffic projections, and looking at the
15 traffic mitigation issues that were previously
16 looked at in 1989 and see how that needs to be
17 updated to address currently proposed
18 development that's now on the books now and is
19 under consideration by the Planning Board and
20 will project out say another five or ten
21 years. So, we're taking that 20-year planning
22 period. We're trying to get us up to today and
23 then look at another five years and another
24 10 years.

25 The last time that we were before the

1 Board was last summer and we had actually a
2 public hearing. That public hearing was
3 actually adjourned. The public hearing remains
4 open with the thought being that we are going
5 to come back at some point with this Planning
6 Board with what we consider a final traffic
7 mitigation package, as well as a draft
8 findings statement for the Board to adopt.

9 Last summer there was considerable
10 discussion with the Planning Board over the
11 connector road.

12 I'm just going to jump up to the exhibits
13 that I have. I'm not going to walk around with
14 a mic. I'll just try to speak up.

15 This map over here shows all the
16 development scenarios that we contemplated
17 within the GEIS study area. This map was a map
18 that showed all the transportation improvement
19 within what we would consider the Route 9
20 corridor. They address both the short-term and
21 the long-term improvements. A lot of focus has
22 been on the installation of a traffic signal
23 right here which is at the intersection of
24 Autopark Drive and Route 9 where Old Loudon
25 road comes out on the north and to the right

1 (Indicating). That's the east side and the
2 construction of a new connector road which we
3 had recommended as a traffic mitigation
4 improvement measure. There was a lot of
5 concern with the Planning Board last summer
6 regarding the development of the connector
7 road, and the timing of it. We had recommended
8 it as a short term improvement as a way to
9 address some of the projects that are
10 currently under consideration by the Planning
11 Board. There is also concern about the cost of
12 the connector road, which I'll delve into in a
13 couple of minutes. The connector road
14 basically runs through what we consider Parcel
15 28. It's the 28th parcel that was looked at in
16 the original GEIS. We refer to it as Parcel
17 28. It's all owned by Mr. Weiss. The connector
18 road would bifurcate that property. There was
19 concern over what that connector road was
20 going to do to the Parcel 28 in terms of
21 increased value and why would development
22 within that corridor pay for that connector
23 road when Parcel 28 was going to reap a
24 benefit from the increased value of the
25 property. The concern at the meeting raised

1 some concerns regarding interconnection
2 between various properties that we propose as
3 a way of providing interconnectivity, through
4 the traffic network. There was also concerns
5 raised about pedestrian accommodations, which
6 are part of our recommended transportation
7 improvement plan. Also, last summer there were
8 concerns about that the level of improvements
9 and the timing of the improvements at the
10 intersection of Dunsbach Ferry Road and
11 Route 9. We had recommended that there were
12 some long-term improvements that could be made
13 at this intersection, and there were concerns
14 from the Planning Board members that those
15 should be moved up to short-term improvements.

16 Over the last few months I've met with
17 town administrations. We met with a former
18 Planning Board Chair and we actually, in
19 response to those meetings, looked at another
20 mitigation scenario that did not contemplate a
21 signal at Autopark Drive. It looked at
22 diverting traffic from Autopark Drive over to
23 Century Hill and then routing up to the signal
24 at Century Hill Drive and not building the
25 connector road. As we thought, that type of

1 traffic diversion level of improvement that we
2 could build into the transportation network
3 did not adequately mitigate traffic impacts of
4 full build-out in the corridor. As such, we
5 aren't currently considering that as a viable
6 alternative moving forward. We did look at it.

7 We also met with the Bergmann Engineering
8 group who is the traffic engineers for the
9 Wal-Mart project proposed along Autopark
10 Drive. Last summer, before we went before the
11 Board, the Wal-Mart project was under concept
12 review by the Planning Board. Since that time,
13 that project did not get concept approval, but
14 it was denied based on non-compliance with the
15 design standards. We've since met with
16 Bergmann to get an update on their project.
17 They still consider the Wal-Mart application a
18 viable application and they have a traffic
19 mitigation plan in place, which has been
20 reviewed by the Town's TDE, Barton and
21 Loguidice. They have also submitted that to
22 the DOT. We were hoping that by the time that
23 it came back to the Planning Board, we would
24 have a response from DOT regarding their
25 consensus, or any issues that had with the

1 mitigation measures in what I'll call the
2 Bergmann Study. We don't have answers yet. We
3 met with the Bergmann folks and they said that
4 they met with DOT. There was some initial
5 discussion regarding half-signals at the
6 Autopark Drive intersection. DOT was not
7 interested in consideration of that, but they
8 are looking now at the installation of a
9 traffic signal at Route 9. As we've said to
10 the Board in the past, we expect that DOT will
11 look for the Town to update the Boght traffic
12 study to include a list of comprehensive
13 improvements that would marry with the
14 installation of a traffic signal at Autopark
15 Drive in order to keep traffic flowing along
16 the Route 9 corridor. I know in a minute I'll
17 have Mark Sargent talk a little bit more about
18 the benefits of the connector road as it
19 relates to maintaining flow along Route 9.

20 We have a meeting scheduled with the
21 Technical Review Committee, which is primarily
22 New York State DOT and CDTC, where we're going
23 to update them on all the studies that we've
24 done over the last couple of years at the
25 request of the Planning Board. We'll discuss

1 with them the current improvement package and
2 discuss with them the connector road. We're
3 going to openly discuss with them the concerns
4 that the Planning Board has raised regarding
5 the connector road. At that time, we'll try to
6 get a sense from DOT and CDTC regarding the
7 overall scope of improvement, as well as get a
8 sense for their concurrence with the
9 installation of a traffic signal at Autopark
10 Drive. That meeting is scheduled for next
11 week. The next time we come back, the Board
12 should have a better update regarding DOT's
13 stance on this.

14 Regarding the connector road, these are
15 the pros and cons. We've tried to update this
16 based on the feedback that we've gotten from
17 the Town since we've been discussing the
18 connector road.

19 The pros of it are improving the levels
20 of service at various intersections. Mark will
21 speak to that a little bit more in the future.
22 It will maintain the travel along US Route 9
23 to minimize overall delays along the corridor.
24 It does provide opportunities for increased
25 pedestrian connectivity across Route 9 and to

1 the adjacent properties. Another positive
2 impact of the connector road is that it does
3 not result in any unwanted diverted traffic
4 into residential neighborhoods. We've heard a
5 lot of concerns for the past couple of years
6 regarding the potential for increasing the
7 amount of traffic down Old Loudon Road or down
8 Johnson Road. Our analysis that we've done
9 does not identify that there wouldn't be any
10 diversions into residential neighborhoods. Our
11 findings are concurrent with CDTC, which looks
12 at traffic impact situations like this on a
13 more regional scale.

14 New York State DOT and CDTC have both
15 stayed consistent in saying that we're going
16 to allow development to occur within the
17 corridor, and we're going to allow access onto
18 Route 9. We need a level of improvement that
19 maintains travel through the corridor. This
20 provides that significant regional benefit.
21 Basically, they said we can't continue to
22 build our way out and add lanes onto Route 9.
23 We need another regional benefit. It's
24 important to note that the 1989 study actually
25 did have an east/west connector from Route 9

1 to Columbia Street Extension, but it was more
2 toward the northern part of the Town.
3 Canterbury Crossing's ability to build that
4 connector - that's no longer available to us.
5 So, now we're looking to put this on
6 Parcel 28. So, to be in succinct with best
7 practices, this is to try to provide
8 interconnectivity and provide options for the
9 traveling public regarding where they want to
10 travel to and keep Old Loudon Road one way.
11 One of our earlier alternatives was proposing
12 Old Loudon Road being converted back to a
13 two-way operation. This connector road would
14 allow Old Loudon Road to be kept one way.

15 Some of the comments of building the
16 connector road - it does require right of way.
17 I think that about two acres of right of way
18 would be required. That would be a public road
19 and most of that right of way would come out
20 of Parcel 28. It does carry a significant
21 price tag for that connector road and that's
22 something that we heard from the Town. Our
23 estimate that we did last summer looked like
24 about a five million dollar price tag to build
25 that connector road. Based on the concerns

1 that we heard from the Town, we would look to
2 try to reduce that cost to really
3 save. We looked at what was the minimum width
4 of the connector road that we would build in
5 order to accommodate the objectives that we
6 need from a diversion standpoint off of
7 Route 9 and not build this connector road to
8 serve Parcel 28. Any additional widening or
9 turn lanes that would be required of the
10 connector road would be pushed onto Parcel 28
11 when that was claimed for development.

12 As I say, the connector road was
13 predicated on a signal being installed on
14 Autopark Drive along Route 9 and we know that
15 adding a signal there will cause delays along
16 Route 9. When you look at the connector road,
17 at the same time you have to look at that
18 signal going in at Autopark Drive. That would
19 result in some additional delays along that
20 section of Route 9. That area is mostly
21 undeveloped. There are federal wetlands on
22 that property and we know that the
23 construction of the connector road would
24 result in some federal wetland impacts that
25 would have to be mitigated somewhere on

1 Parcel 28 or in other ways. With the the
2 construction of the connector road, based on
3 the timing of that improvement as well as the
4 timing of Parcel 28, we could be required to
5 provide a level of coordination between these
6 projects.

7 Joe has had some meetings with the owner
8 of Parcel 28. We do anticipate that land owner
9 will come in with proposed development plans
10 at some point in the future. The owner is
11 aware of the Town's consideration of a
12 possible connector road and it looks like they
13 will try to accommodate a connector road into
14 their development plans. At least now we've
15 got some indication that the property owner
16 could be a willing participant in the
17 development of our connector road across
18 Parcel 28.

19 MR. DALTON: Can I ask a question before
20 you go on?

21 MR. GRASSO: Absolutely.

22 MR. DALTON: Why is Old Loudon Road a
23 one-way road? What is good about that?

24 MR. NARDACCI: Joe, I'll answer that.
25 Just so you know - there was a lot of

1 discussion that took place about Old Loudon.
2 The main primary concern was that making Old
3 Loudon two way would encourage north/south
4 traffic to take it to go south, increasing
5 traffic in that neighborhood. So, instead of
6 doing that, as he said, people were looking
7 for different ways to get to Latham. So
8 instead of pushing traffic there, we keep them
9 on 9.

10 MS. DALTON: Got it.

11 MR. GRASSO: Mark is just going to jump
12 in and talk about the connector road and the
13 effects on levels of service.

14 MR. SARGENT: These two boards should
15 look familiar to most of you. We presented
16 them at previous meetings. What they convey is
17 the overall operational benefit of the
18 connector road. There has been some question
19 about whether the connector road would be
20 really worth it. What it comes down to is the
21 critical intersection here of Route 9 and 9R.
22 We analyzed traffic operations in terms of
23 levels of service. All of the other
24 intersections operate at acceptable levels of
25 service under a development scenario. But this

1 critical intersection without the connector
2 road fails significantly in the future. It
3 becomes level of service F with two minutes of
4 delay. There needs to be some additional
5 improvement. By building the connector road,
6 it diverts traffic away from the intersection
7 southbound with the turning traffic and takes
8 this connector road out into this direction,
9 thereby bringing up some green time here for
10 the other critical movement, the northbound
11 through movement and the westbound left turn
12 movement. It allows that intersection to
13 upgrade more efficiently, and it cuts the
14 delays by one-third at this critical
15 intersection. It's a pretty significant
16 benefit for traffic operations here.

17 Overall, that same conclusion is drawn
18 with this bar chart (Indicating). These bars
19 show the overall vehicle hours of delay for
20 motorists traveling on Route 9, both
21 northbound and southbound. So, today, the
22 overall vehicle hours of delay on Route 9 is
23 on the order of 20-vehicle hours of delay in
24 the peak hour. That's an accumulation of delay
25 of all vehicles. If we approve the development

1 shown on that land use map that Joe had shown,
2 delays will increase by about a factor of
3 three from 209 vehicle hours to 60-vehicle
4 hours. If we simply install a signal at Latham
5 Autopark Drive without a connector road, you
6 can see along with some other spot
7 improvements -- without the connector road you
8 will see some benefit, but there will still be
9 a degradation in operations delays from a
10 290-vehicle hours northbound, close to 50.
11 That's one and a half times.

12 The overall delay with the connector road
13 is this. It's as good as we can get it.
14 Overall operations are going to degrade a
15 little bit; about 50 percent. It will increase
16 from 20-vehicle hours of delay to about
17 30-vehicle hours of delay. That also includes
18 a lot of additional vehicles on the network.
19 So, with that you're going to see some
20 additional delay. You can see that we're
21 mitigating significant delays by pursuing the
22 connector road. It makes sense, from a traffic
23 standpoint and for all the other pros that Joe
24 has discussed.

25 MR. GRASSO: I just wanted to talk a

1 little bit about the costs again. This map
2 shows the boundary of the GEIS study area
3 (Indicating). All of these red circles are
4 intersections that are going to have
5 improvements under our - I'll call it the
6 long-term improvement plan. It also shows the
7 connector road. The total cost of all the
8 improvements is about 15.5 million dollars.
9 When you look at the cost of all of the
10 increments as they were estimated in 1989 and
11 you take those of the 2010 dollars out, that
12 improvement package was worth about 21 million
13 dollars. So, we're not too far off. We're a
14 little bit less, but not too far off there.
15 What we were proposing for short-term
16 improvement - that was worth about
17 10.3 million dollars. Long term was
18 5.2 million dollars.

19 Going back to the short-term, the
20 10.3 million dollars - that included the
21 connector road, which I've said before was
22 worth about 5 million dollars. What we're
23 looking to do is possibly take this connector
24 road and shift it from a short-term
25 improvement to a long-term improvement. The

1 reason why we're doing that is because of the
2 concerns raised by the Planning Board. We can
3 provide some additional time to coordinate
4 with the development of Parcel 28 to work out
5 a cost sharing and a right of way acquisition
6 plan. We can see what development materializes
7 and when to better gage the timing of when
8 that connector road would go in the ground. We
9 can also look at other public funding
10 opportunities.

11 Like I said before, there's going to be a
12 public share part of the improvement package.
13 When you look at a five million dollar
14 improvement, we were estimating a public share
15 of about 20 percent; something to be verified
16 by CDTC. Let's say one million dollars. It
17 gives us additional time to seek public
18 funding sources in order to come up with that
19 million dollars of public share.

20 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Joe, on that issue,
21 public funding doesn't necessarily come from
22 the Town. It could come from state grants
23 which are ultimately federal grants.

24 MR. GRASSO: That's right.

25 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Do we know where this

1 stands with CDTC? They're the local group that
2 funnels federal and state money. Do you have
3 any idea? Is this on their radar?

4 MR. GRASSO: It's not. It would need to
5 be adopted by the Town and supported by CDTC
6 and DOT.

7 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Would that be something
8 that would move along fast on their agenda or
9 does it depend?

10 MR. LANE: They have a slew of projects.

11 MR. LACIVITA: I think that the next open
12 round is coming up in September to get this
13 on, possibly.

14 CHAIRMAN STUTO: That's just to even get
15 it on the list.

16 MR. LANE: Yes, because that list is
17 long.

18 MR. LACIVITA: Again, they don't
19 entertain that. That wouldn't even be
20 entertained without an approval.

21 MR. GRASSO: So in terms of the next step
22 and moving forward, we have that Technical
23 Review Committee meeting. That's scheduled for
24 next week. Assuming that they're supportive of
25 the plan as we have presented it, they may

1 come back and say, look, there's another
2 option that the Town hasn't fully considered
3 that wasn't previously on the table. They
4 could come back and say, well, we want you to
5 try this other alternative. We may come back
6 to the Planning Board and say, before we do
7 anything else, we want to talk to you about
8 what the Technical Review Committee told us.
9 If they don't and they're supportive of the
10 plan, we do have some work to do to finalize
11 the study to try to address these last rounds
12 of concerns that we heard from the Planning
13 Boards. We need to document that and get that
14 in the hands of the Technical Review Committee
15 for a review of that. We would expect that by
16 the time we filed the report and get it to
17 them and get it reviewed by them, that's
18 probably a couple of months.

19 So, some of the things that we will look
20 at when we finalize the study is we'll look at
21 the connector road as a long term improvement.
22 We'll also look at the cost share of the
23 connector road in order to try to reduce the
24 public share. We'll validate that
25 public/private share split with CDTC.

1 Following that, assuming that everybody is
2 still supportive of the final findings, we
3 would then bring it back for the Planning
4 Board to try to adopt the amended SEQRA
5 findings statement along with the GEIS. That's
6 probably a two-month time frame there. So,
7 we're looking at the middle of 2011 for a
8 final update to the GEIS. Assuming that we get
9 to that point, then as new projects come
10 before the Planning Board within a study area,
11 you will review those projects against the new
12 traffic improvement plan and traffic studies
13 that make up the update. You'll be able to
14 assess the mitigation fees against those
15 projects in accordance with the new formula as
16 opposed to using the first formula from the
17 1989 study.

18 That's where we see things now and where
19 we see things in the immediate future. I'd be
20 happy to try to field any questions that you
21 have.

22 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Board members, any
23 questions?

24 MR. NARDACCI: First of all, I think that
25 you guys have done a really good job over the

1 last three years that we've been looking at
2 this and it's a lot of hours and a lot of
3 time. I know more about traffic than I thought
4 I'd know in my life. It's been a true learning
5 experience. We try to read through all those
6 big thick books, but we can only get so far.

7 A couple of specific things that we
8 talked about in the past - first of all, Joe,
9 on the GEIS finances, if we could get a copy
10 of that before the final?

11 MR. LACIVITA: I've talked with Craig
12 Blair and he's trying to update that for us.

13 MR. NARDACCI: I just think that it would
14 be helpful for the Board to understand as we
15 understand the GEIS is. What does this mean?
16 As projects come in, is it \$1,000 or is it
17 \$10,000? Where is that money going and what is
18 it budgeted for? Where does it stand now and
19 then? How will that picture change because of
20 the mechanism for funding changes?

21 Also it's good to understand that the
22 connector road represents five million out of
23 15 million. It's important for us to
24 understand what are each of these things.

25 I'm interested to see that bar graph.

1 It's like, what's the value of this connector
2 road? What does it mean? I can see
3 cumulatively what it means; 20 hours to 60. Is
4 that the high peak?

5 MR. SARGENT: That's right.

6 MR. NARDACCI: Whereas if the connector
7 road goes in, it's 20 to 30. That's with the
8 full build-out of all the projected
9 development in the area.

10 MR. SARGENT: This was actually the
11 short-term. The trend is exactly the same with
12 the long-term.

13 MR. NARDACCI: I think that it's very
14 helpful to see. The other thing is with
15 regards to the connector road. It's important
16 to show that the idea behind the connector
17 road isn't to push traffic into neighborhoods.
18 This is a good map to look at to see. For the
19 folks that don't know the area, no one is
20 going south by heading down Johnson Road. It
21 facilitates the traffic that's going there
22 anyways. So, it's going to help that back up
23 at 9 and 9R - to help that stacking.

24 It indicates a four-way intersection,
25 which was the first discussion way back when

1 about making Old Loudon a two way. If they
2 need a warrant for a red light, or whatever,
3 that's part of that discussion - the four way.

4 We talked a lot about Parcel 28. The
5 initial report that came in projected
6 100,000 square foot build-out. We talked about
7 it and that was changed to 500,000 square feet
8 of potential build-out. In looking at the
9 parcel, there are some wetlands and some
10 constraints. Is it likely to be 500,000 square
11 feet? I don't know. Well, I can see when a
12 developer comes in.

13 One of the questions that Joe and I
14 talked about is the concern that I had about
15 additional retail. Does this parcel lend
16 itself to more big retail? The answer was
17 based on the zoning -

18 MR. GRASSO: Based on the current zoning
19 of that, retail is a permitted use.

20 MR. NARDACCI: That's 30,000 square feet.

21 MR. GRASSO: Right, a 30,000 square foot
22 maximum building footprint.

23 MR. NARDACCI: Because part of this
24 creating this new connector road - there are
25 traffic trips, there is visibility and it

1 becomes a destination. Someone says, well, I
2 should be on that road because I'll get the
3 visibility. More likely it seems that it lends
4 itself to more commercial office or something
5 like that in terms of development.

6 Those are the major issues that I raised
7 over the last couple of years. I think that
8 we've come a long way.

9 Dunsbach Ferry Road - we talked about that.

10 MR. GRASSO: That would be moving to a
11 short-term improvement.

12 MR. NARDACCI: Right there is an
13 improvement. The restriping - we can ensure
14 that people are getting in and out safely and
15 then monitoring down the road if SEQRA becomes
16 an issue with increased traffic.

17 It's more a lot of comments, but I just
18 wanted to let you guys know where I was at
19 based upon past commentary.

20 MR. GRASSO: I just want to follow up on
21 one thing, and that is when we talked about
22 develop ability of Parcel 28. The original
23 1989 study looked at 985,000 square feet of
24 development on Parcel 28. Over the last
25 20 years there are a lot more regulations in

1 place where there are rules regarding the
2 wetlands. We took another look at that. We
3 feel that it will accommodate somewhere
4 between 100,000 and 500,000 square feet of
5 development. We won't know exactly what that
6 is until those plans come in. But we did a
7 traffic analysis based on 100,000 square feet
8 as well as 500,000 square feet to make sure
9 our mitigation package can still accommodate
10 that level.

11 MR. DALTON: Do you have a question with
12 regard to what was considered and how it
13 effects funding? I think that I know this
14 route pretty well because of all the people
15 that get off Alternate Route 7 and come up
16 there and try to make U-turns and go back.
17 From my perspective, the state didn't properly
18 plan for how big that was supposed to be. What
19 does everyone else think about the volume of
20 traffic that we get? That really shouldn't be
21 there at all, and it's there because the state
22 didn't properly plan. Does the state have any
23 responsibility for helping us to mitigate the
24 problem that they created?

25 MR. NARDACCI: That's a good argument to

1 make when we go into CDTC and ask for funding.

2 MR. DALTON: It's huge.

3 MR. NARDACCI: It's not Town traffic.

4 MR. GRASSO: There is a reason why
5 Route 9 is a state road. It's a state road and
6 DOT owns it. They control access to it. It is
7 a relief valve for the Northway. The traffic
8 flow along Route 9 is vitally important to
9 DOT. They understand that it goes through the
10 Town of Colonie and that these properties
11 should be allowed to develop in accordance
12 with the Comprehensive Plan and the zoning
13 that the Town is looking for. They just want
14 to make sure that their responsibility for
15 maintaining traffic flow through the corridor
16 is for not only the residents of the Town, but
17 everybody else that uses the Route 9 corridor,
18 and that is maintained. This is why you do
19 these types of projects and there is a joint
20 agreement. This is why public funds can be
21 made available for this kind of project.
22 Hopefully DOT will understand that they have
23 some responsibility regarding that.

24 MR. DALTON: If you want me to write that
25 justification, just let me know.

1 CHAIRMAN STUTO: You definitely have the
2 passion for it.

3 MR. NARDACCI: Your map captured a great
4 stacking. The stacking going north starts at
5 the light and extends over the bridge and down
6 to Target.

7 MR. GRASSO: Any other questions?

8 MR. SULLIVAN: I did have one question.
9 The short-term is roughly five years, and
10 long-term is 10 years?

11 MR. GRASSO: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Thank you.

13

14

15

16

17 *(Whereas the proceeding concerning the*

18 *above entitled matter was concluded at*

19 *11:21 p.m.)*

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, New York
State Approved Transcriber and 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 February 2, 2011