

TRANSPORTATION IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

APRIL 26, 2016

Present: Neil Bettez, Allan Bowdery, Harry Ellis, Gail Gallerie, Tom Rocco, Mark Sherman and Tom Weiner

Also,: Town Planning Board Chair, Mike Calimano, Stacy Delarade and Josh Tabak

The meeting was opened at 7:00 p.m. in Village Hall.

Motion to approve the minutes of the March 22 meeting, as distributed, was approved unanimously

Chair's Report

Gail had made a request, through Tom R. and the Mayor, to have Village DPW include in its schedule the repainting of the new lane stripe that was done on Main St./Wurts Avenue last summer. New stripe has faded to the point that the old line is more prominent.

Gail had attended a meeting with the Village Planner and BPC Chair to discuss possible projects under the expected new TAP funding. It was agreed that bike/ped shoulders beginning at the town line on Rte. 299 and continuing along N. Putt and then Henry W. DuBois to the rail trail should be the priority. It was also agreed that the Village Planner should consult with the Town Highway Superintendent to synchronize with the Superintendent's 3 yr. plan for widening shoulders on HWDB.

Committee Reports

A. BPC

Cf. GG forward of BPC's recommendation that plans for implementation of sharrows move forward. Note was taken of Tom R's observations, during his recent trip, of the popularity of sharrows in Italy.

B. Loop Reports

Gail noted significant decline in ridership this March compared with 2015. Committee members felt that the difference may have been due primarily to the exceptionally mild weather this March. Discussion of continuing concerns about ridership levels concluded with Tom R.'s suggesting that the *Oracle* be asked to write an editorial urging students to use this service.

Harry had used the UCAT data to calculate a range of .8 to 2.8 riders for each Loop run. He suggested that the reduction in student and faculty ridership during the summer recess be used as an opportunity to serve needs for transportation to the area swimming pools, the Preserve, etc. Allan pointed out that the multiplicity of funding sources for the Loop service complicate making changes such as these. Neil spoke of efforts to interest the Preserve, HHS, etc. to

sponsor shuttle service. It was suggested that OSI should now be added to ideas for possible shuttle funding sources.

Old Business

A. Updates

1. So. Putt Corners Road project

- a. Shoulder signage. Cf. GG 4/20 forward of BPC recommendations . Allan moved and Harry seconded motion to endorse the BPC recommendations. Tom W. cautioned the committee to take into account that this project is for widening of shoulders on So. Putt and not for bike/ped lanes per se so that the BPC preferences for signage might not be allowed. Accordingly, Alan revised his motion with Harry's concurrence to endorse the BPC recommendations as consistent with the DOT standards. Motion carried unanimously.
- b. Crosswalk at Hampton Inn. Committee members concurred with BPC assessment that a crosswalk would be the "lesser of two evils" and with the problems that a crosswalk could create. After discussion, it was moved and seconded to endorse the BPC recommendation that a crosswalk be installed only if a pedestrian activated flashing light would also be installed and to urge Ulster County officials to seriously consider adding that light. Motion carried unanimously.
- c. Tree removal. Cf. Andrew Emrich 4/25 email. It was agreed that Ulster County's efforts to consult with property owners on the preservation of trees was commendable and should mitigate expected community concerns.
- d. Project publicity. Mark was thanked for his speedy follow-up with the *New Paltz Times* for coverage of this project in advance of tree removal beginning next fall.

2. Road Safety Press release

The draft prepared so helpfully by Stacy had been edited by the committee prior to the meeting. Discussion of the deadline for comments did not resolve in consensus and it was agreed that Gail would work with Stacy to provide a broad as possible language. Finalized edition to be posted on various town/village web sites as of April 27 and submitted to *NPT* for publication in the May 4 issue.

3. Multi-modal Transportation Hub

Tom R. and the Mayor confirmed that the Village has not yet received the final report from the county.

4. Main & Prospect St. crosswalk

Official Village request for DOT assistance with conceptualization still pending

5. Village Paving requests

Note was taken of the DOT's responsiveness to the Village's recent requests for repaving of certain portions of state roads, e.g. area near former Barnaby's on Rte. 32 N.

6. Bus Shelters

Another attempt to install the final panel of glass in the shelter at the Teen Scene had resulted in glass being broken. The Highway Superintendent had informed the Supervisor and TIC Chair that his department could not afford to commit any further funds or time to completing the shelter. The glass panels were \$300.@. Further correspondence resulted in Supervisor and Highway Superintendent agreeing to consider alternatives so that this shelter can become fully functional.

VI. New Business

A. Planning Board/TIC workshop discussion of transportation issues

Planning Board Chair, Mike Calimano, attended the meeting to discuss closer collaboration on transportation issues attendant to applications submitted to the Planning Board. The Planning Board Chair suggested that the proposed consultation could take the form of having TIC review site plans submitted to the Planning Board as the Environmental Conservation Commission does or the Planning Board could forward only traffic studies prepared in support of applications. Tom W. pointed out that TIC members are not in a position to serve as traffic experts but that we could be helpful in bringing to bear local knowledge and experience. It was agreed that this discussion had established the potential advantages of closer collaboration and that TIC members would welcome the opportunity to continue this discussion at a Planning Board workshop session.

In response to Chairman Calimano's question about the process for obtaining approvals for changes in speed limits, Tom W. explained that the Town Board would have to pass a resolution seeking the change and then forward that, with the completed form, to Ulster County for review. If the county approves the speed limit change, the Town's request would then be forwarded to DOT for review and final disposition. Any traffic studies needed would be conducted by DOT.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gail K. Gallerie