

**PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**January 22, 2020**  
**Meeting Minutes**

**MEMBERS ATTENDING**

Mark Castiglione, Capital District Regional Planning Commission  
Maria Chau, Federal Highway Administration  
Peter Comenzo, Town of Rotterdam  
Donald Csaposs, Town of Guilderland  
Ross Farrell, Capital District Transportation Authority  
Stephen Feeney, Schenectady County, Vice-Chair  
Michael Franchini, Capital District Transportation Committee, Secretary  
Stephen Iachetta, Albany County Airport Authority, Chair  
Andrew Kohout, Village of Scotia  
Andrew Kreshik, City of Troy  
John Scavo, Town of Clifton Park  
Mayor Michael Stammel, City of Rensselaer  
Adam Yagelski, Town of East Greenbush

**STAFF AND OTHERS**

Gerard Amato, COHUHD COSTAR  
Chris Bauer, Capital District Transportation Committee  
Jacob Beeman, Capital District Transportation Committee  
Jen Ceponis, Capital District Transportation Committee  
Richelle Gosman, Federal Transportation Authority  
Brent Irving, Capital District Transportation Authority  
Liz Kormos, Village of Ballston Spa  
Teresa LaSalle, Capital District Transportation Committee  
Sandy Misiewicz, Capital District Transportation Committee  
Chris O'Neill, Capital District Transportation Committee  
Jordan Solano-Reed, Capital District Transportation Committee  
Andrew Tracy, Capital District Transportation Committee  
Carrie Ward, Capital District Transportation Committee  
Greg Wichser, NYS Department of Transportation - Region 1  
Michael Williams, Capital District Transportation Authority

**INTRODUCTION AND VISITORS' ISSUES**

Steve Iachetta opened the meeting at 9:31 AM.

**PRESENTATION - NEW VISIONS 2050**

Mike Franchini welcomed the attendees and noted that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss New Visions 2050. All of the topic area white papers are on the website. The first draft of New Visions 2050 will be

formally presented to the Planning Committee at its February 6<sup>th</sup> meeting, for approval to send to the Policy Board. The same will be brought to the Policy Board at its March meeting. There will then be a 60-day public comment period, after which the final draft will be brought to the Planning Committee and then the Policy Board.

Jen Ceponis presented an overview of the draft public outreach strategies. Chris O'Neill presented on the topics of Quality Region including plan scenarios, Infrastructure, Regional Operations and Travel Reliability and the Congestion Management Process, Safety and Security, and Complete Streets. Jen Ceponis presented on the topics of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Action Plan, Freight, Transit, Human Services, TDM/Mobility Management, and Environment & Technology. Chris O'Neill wrapped up the presentation with a discussion about the Financial Plan.

Adam Yagelski suggested clarifying and using consistent terminology related to connected and automated vehicles. For example, pedestrian safety looks different if vehicles are connected to each other and to stationary infrastructure, such as pedestrian signals, than if vehicles are just autonomous but not connected and must rely on separate, expensive sensors to detect pedestrian presence in a crosswalk. "Connected" also implies a bigger role for the public sector. Mark Castiglione said the topic areas have a good devotion to the importance of land use. He requested that the Quality Region section add an explicit connection between the growth scenarios and the recommendations. For example, we could encourage suburban center development. Chris O'Neill said that the Linkage Program does require a municipality to support New Visions principles in the study. Liz Kormos added that we should encourage urban center development. She also suggested that we recognize and understand different preferences of different age groups and other sub-groups.

In reference to the reliability graphs in the Regional Operations presentation, Andrew Kreshik suggested looking at reliability in segments less than 24-hour increments, for example 4-hour increments, with the idea that we could alleviate congestion by encouraging people to shift when they travel. Andrew also asked if New Visions is predicated on a growth paradigm. The presentation used the words "development" and "growth" a lot, but if growth doesn't happen, do the priorities change? In other words, how should New Visions respond under different scenarios, such as a population loss, no change in population, and population growth. Liz Kormos suggested doing market research to determine how to incentivize people to make choices that will support a desirable scenario.

Todd Fabozzi noted that it is a challenge to encourage local governments to understand their role in land use and transportation. He suggested drafting priority local government actions that could help to avoid missed opportunities. Greg Wichser said that not all municipalities embrace the strategies discussed in New Visions. For example, road diets have been embraced by some, but also strongly rejected by others. It would be helpful to make clear which strategies which municipalities support. Mark Castiglione asked if it is possible to formalize a relationship between formal municipal adoption of New Visions and the ability to receive federal funding. This would have the effect of

getting the word out about New Visions, and would also remind people of the plan with each interaction the municipality has with CDTC and/or NYSDOT. Ultimately, how can we incentive local action for implementation? For example, could we suggest that municipalities voluntarily adopt the New Visions plan? Mike Franchini answered that we could require New Visions adoption or study alignment for all CDTC studies, not only for Linkage Studies.

Liz Kormos asked why it was decided not to pursue a regional complete streets policy. Carrie Ward answered that the Complete Streets Advisory Committee was concerned about the ability to make one regional policy both inclusive of all municipalities and also meaningful for each of them. Steve Iachetta asked about the incentives for Environment and Technology. Jen Ceponis answered that the white paper outlines some possible ones, for example a vehicle miles travelled tax instead of the gas tax, but doesn't recommend which options to adopt.

Ross Farrell noted that the construction of senior housing and affordable housing in areas without any transit service is problematic because it often results in requests for CDTA to provide service in locations where transit is not viable. Andrew Kreshik noted that state agencies often have a role in the funding of those projects. Ross Farrell asked if CDTC can fund zoning updates and require certain elements to be contained within the update. Sandy Misiewicz noted that CDTC Linkage Studies can and have funded zoning updates, although for relatively small areas. Ross asked if CDTC could increase funding for the Linkage Program. Liz Kormos added that a guide of key pieces of zoning would be helpful for communities to make incremental code changes. Peter Comenzo said Rotterdam has used a Linkage Study to develop overlay zoning focused on development areas. He said that the Linkage program is an excellent tool for New Visions public participation, since regional New Visions concepts are best understood with local examples.

Maria Chau noted that FHWA and FTA do look at the connection between transportation and land use, and that it is important. She asked if there are other opportunities for local agencies, such as funding sources and groups outside of CDTC. Jen Ceponis said CDTC may be able to create a clearinghouse on land use related funding opportunities, and Sandy Misiewicz added that the Community Planner Forum that CDTC hosts could disseminate this information. Adam Yagelski suggested that the GEIS mechanism could be considered to tie projects and funding.

Andrew Kreshik asked if the NY378 Troy Menands Bridge Study will consider New Visions especially as related to population centers. He noted that the area to the North of the current bridge would spur better commercial and residential traffic flow. The area to the South would benefit traffic congestion. Greg Wichser answered that the study will consider all options, although replacing the bridge in kind is not likely to be feasible.

Greg Wichser said that NYSDOT will continue to provide specific comments and that the conversation has been productive so far. Mike Franchini thanked Greg and NYSDOT staff for their involvement and productive comments.

Mike noted that comments can be sent to any staff member, or to [newvisions@cdtcmpo.org](mailto:newvisions@cdtcmpo.org). He also asked everyone to take advantage of the funding poll, which was available in the packet and is online at <https://www.cdtcmpo.org/transportation-plans/nv2050>.

**Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 AM. The next Planning Committee meeting will be February 6, 2020.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael V. Franchini  
Secretary