

North Triphammer Road Corridor Reconstruction
Committee Meeting
May 16, 1996

Bolded items indicate action required

The meeting of the Village of Lansing North Triphammer Road Corridor Reconstruction Committee was called to order at 7:06 p.m. by Chairman Fresinski. Committee members Tull, Hickey, Buck, Kiefer, Cross, and Jacobs were present. David Boyd, Executive Director, MPO, was a guest at the meeting.

The Committee reviewed and corrected the minutes of the May 2, 1996 meeting.

David Boyd spoke to the Committee about the background and function of the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). The Committee was interested in his view on whether it would be worth their time pursuing federal funding for this project. Fresinski said that it is the journey that's going to be important to the Committee - to come up with a plan for N. Triphammer Road. The initial reason for the Committee to get together was to attain funding so it didn't fall solely on the Village taxpayers. Boyd will help the Committee to better understand what the process is, what the forms are, what the Committee would need to do if it were here solely to go after federal funding. The Committee needs to know when they get to a juncture or decision point, whether pursuing funding is going to change the character of the Village in an undesirable way. There are two types of funding - Enhancement and Improvement. One was designed to maintain the character of the municipality and the other has another criteria that is not necessarily focused on the maintenance or character.

Boyd addressed the Committee. The MPO is a county hosted, federally funded, transportation planning coordination entity. Federal funding passes through the State Department of Transportation and is derived from the federal share of the gas tax. MPOs are required in every urbanized area of the U.S. that has a population of 50,000 people or more. The term "urbanized area" is a census definition; it's an area that contains 1,000 persons per square mile. When census blocks add up to a density of 50,000 people, a new urbanized area has been formed. In the 1990 census Ithaca was one of a handful of areas that crossed that threshold - with a population of 50,132. This urbanized area serves as the core for the creation of this MPO, and this is the smallest of the nearly 400 MPOs.

One of the things that the MPO is required to do by federal legislation is to adopt a metropolitan planning area boundary, which is basically the area anticipated to be urbanized within 20 years. For a number of reasons (data handling, political boundary handling) it was decided that all of Tompkins County ought to be in this MPO's jurisdiction. They have a parallel relationship to the Tompkins County Planning Department. And, in some ways they provide specific transportation planning expertise countywide. The MPO is a very small organization. In 1992 it was agreed that Tompkins County would host this entity. It was created with the original membership representing only the urbanized areas (Villages of Lansing and Cayuga Heights, City of Ithaca, Town of Ithaca and Tompkins County). Cornell was there as a non-voting member. The State Department of Transportation is there actually through a string of appointments representing the governor. In April 1993 Boyd was hired.

The MPO is a three-tiered organization. At the bottom of the inverted pyramid is the staff, composed of Boyd, an administrative assistant and a technical person (now a new GIS person). They rely on a lot of assistance

from local governments. The second level is the Planning Committee, a technical advisory committee. Cross and his peers, including the Superintendents Of Public Works and planning directors are on the Planning Committee. At the top of the inverted pyramid is the Policy Committee, which is composed of the lead elected official from each of the participating entities and the Regional Director from NYSDOT (New York State Department of Transportation). Not all members on the Policy Committee are voting members. Cornell is not a voting member and the rural towns are not voting members. The voting members are those original founding members and they operate under consensus rule - all for one and otherwise it doesn't go. That's an interesting dynamic. Early on in the relationship it was kind of a veto power for the State Department of Transportation, but as the agency has matured, it has become a fairly good tool for forcing forthright discussion and getting things out on the table and making sure there is consensus.

The MPO is required by law to do 3 basic activities. First, every year they create a Unified Planning Work Program - an annotated budget of federal funds that are used to fund transportation planning. Any transit planning that the transit systems may be doing with federal funds is incorporated into that document. Also in the document is any type of planning within our area being done by the State Department of Transportation. Also in the budget is the MPO's own budget which is a little less than \$149,000, all federal money. The way these funds work is that the MPO gets federal cash, and it's an 80-20 split, with 20% being a non-federal match. The State Department of Transportation puts up 3/4 of the non-federal match, and the other 1/4 of it comes from local governments in the form of in-kind services. The Tompkins County share is largely the cost of putting a roof over their heads. There is no cash input to the MPO's general operations from the local governments.

The second thing they are required to do is called the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The TIP under the law is at least a three-year document. Here in New York State they do five-year TIPS. The TIP is unique in that it is a fiscally constrained document which means that they look very carefully at what the financial resources are and how the projects that are selected will use those funds. The State Department of Transportation holds all the beans when it comes to federal construction aid, so there is a real need for a cooperative arrangement with the MPO. Sometimes the priorities that the DOT comes up with don't match the MPO's priorities, and then it's time to do some horse trading. One of the things to understand about the TIP is that if a project is going to use federal funds (the most common use is for bridges), it must be in that TIP and the TIP must be adopted by the MPO. If the State wants or needs to do a project they pretty much have to insure the cooperation of all of the voting members on the Policy Committee. There has been some horse trading over some specific aspects of projects in order to insure that, but everything is above the table and done at a public meeting.

The last thing that is a mandatory activity is a long range plan. In January '95 they adopted the first comprehensive long range transportation plan under the ISTEA regulations. It really focused on that core urbanized area because they hadn't expanded the boundary at that point in time. It is very much a policy oriented document as opposed to being a physical delineation of specific projects. It identifies a number of planning and other types of design work projects that should be done. It's very much a multi-modal document which tries to treat pedestrian, bicycle and transit use on a very inclusive basis with automobile and highway type planning. That long range plan that was adopted in January '95 was done by using 7 citizen task teams, which did an extensive amount of work in developing the goals, objectives, strategies, and specific actions to implement those strategies.

What they are doing now is beginning to build on the plan. They have recently done a comprehensive arterial

level trail study and have identified some big multi-use trail corridors throughout the County which local governments have found useful in applying for grants. There is a whole section on policy recommendations that are beginning to occur, such as reviewing local development regulations, developing a countywide economic development strategy and recommendations for bicycle and pedestrian ways, transit and highways. All these things have transportation relationships to them. They projected a 20-year estimate. Boyd believes that the estimates in the final document have changed substantially. They are looking at somewhere around \$666,000,000 in resources over 20 years -all across highway and transit, including maintenance, but again, just focused in this urbanized area.

One of the things that is in the policy recommendation is something called the Northeast Connector Subarea Study (used to called the Corridor Study). That is also in the TIP, which is the capital document. The TIP is the equivalent to a capital improvement program that a municipality may have. In theory the capital improvement program with a municipality is one of the mechanisms to accomplish the comprehensive plan for the municipality; it's the same sort of relationship. Capital funds were put into doing this Corridor Study. There are a lot of folks who think all they need to do is decide where to build the road. That isn't how things occur in today's transportation environment. There are some very specific comprehensive environmental regulations within the transportation realm itself. The MPO wants to be much more careful about making the decision to build new facilities, and to look also at different ways of doing small scale improvements - called Transportation Systems Management (TSM) and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) improvements. TSM type of improvements may be simple things like signalization, building turning lanes, channelization. TDM is, in economic terms, to try and effect the demand side.

At the MPO level, they have been talking about the Triphammer Corridor from point A to point B. This thought process started a couple of years ago when the the MPO was developing their first TIP and had solicited projects. John Rogers, Brent Cross' predecessor, turned in some projects at that end and Reinhart had done some projects on this end that included the three-lane proposal. The County had some pavement projects on this end, and the State was proposing to widen and replace the deck on the bridge. The MPO started to think that maybe we ought to take a comprehensive look at this whole corridor. The MPO is getting ready to develop the scope for another study and Boyd feels fairly sure that something along those lines is going to be part of the subarea study. How Triphammer Road functions is going to be affected by any type of outer loop proposal or even enhanced transit. You can expect one of the County departments, either Planning or Public Works, to include a budget request for next year. Boyd said that he hopes that the Towns of Lansing, Dryden, and Ithaca, as well as Cornell University and the other affected players will be able to split or take a proportionate share of the \$20,000 non-federal match for this project. That's coming down the road.

Fresinski asked how the MPO long range planning document is revised to reflect changing factors over that time period. Boyd said that it is a dynamic document and they are already in the process of amending it. The financial section is going to have to be reworked because the federal and state funding picture is changing rapidly. Fresinski asked, since Boyd had mentioned that by law the TIP plan has to be done in 3 years, why the MPO does it in five years. Presumably then there would be no monies available for the TIP process until 2001. Boyd said that the real world isn't that simple when it comes to roadway projects in particular; there are cost overruns and cost under-runs; there are projects that start and never get finished. There are constant adjustments. Fresinski responded that it's not a law then, but more of a guideline that the MPO would stick to if everything went according to plan. Boyd said that it is critical to understand that the State views a project's inclusion in a TIP as a commitment to that project. So once a project is in the TIP , it's very difficult to remove it. When it gets done, however, may be a different thing because there is a lot of latitude and many factors that

affect the availability of funding.

Fresinski said that since the MPO is the focal point for these things getting done in the County, then at least any projects associated with this Corridor would be in Boyd's office. One of the things this Committee was interested in was what other projects were going on around us so that we're not stepping on other people's plans. Boyd said he is only aware of a project if federal funding is being requested. It's not necessarily the magnitude of a roadway project as much as it is the classification of the roadway facility. Only certain roadways and all of the bridges in Tompkins County are eligible for federal aid. There is a federal aid functional classification system. Its primary function is funding eligibility. In the Village of Lansing, those roads would be Warren Road, Triphammer Road, Cayuga Heights Road, Route 34, and Brown Road to the airport. The MPO also has a public information project underway to identify local construction projects for the purpose of informing the public of projects that would present a potential inconvenience to drivers.

Boyd distributed a brochure and book which the Committee might find interesting because it begins to identify and discuss land use and transportation relationships. It articulates five design principles that the Committee will want to think about. Boyd said that the Committee will no doubt wrestle with how this roadway will look and with commercial access and development. Part of what this information says is that the most successful municipalities are those that are the most successful in maintaining their Village culture and focus on transit related development versus auto related development. Statistical research says that people in America are moving to smaller and mid-sized communities, that they are interested in quality of life issues, and that home buyers are overwhelmingly now demanding low traffic streets, pedestrian amenities, and natural areas to walk and bike more than they are demanding traditional amenities like golf courses and tennis courts. Walking paths are an absolute prerequisite for subdivisions to be successful. The transit related development picture doesn't negatively impact businesses. All it does is create a more aesthetically pleasing streetscape. It's being done in places all over the country. This type of development is eligible for federal aid. The federal government and the State Department of Transportation are becoming more flexible. They will require that certain standards of construction be met but they are becoming much more understanding about the mechanics of pedestrianism, of the need for a functional streetscapes, etc.

Boyd said that the actual process of soliciting projects is extraordinarily complicated. It is also a parallel process; it is one that the New York State Department of Transportation and the MPOs are wrestling with. The State does something called a goal oriented program. The latest federal transportation act is the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA). ISTEA was also an appropriations document, so not only did it totally revise the thinking and the planning requirements, but it also provided authorizations through the federal fiscal year 1997, which means that it's about to expire. The view of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials is that MPOs and citizen participation are not needed. They think the money should just be given to the states because the states know what to do with it. On the other end of the spectrum are people who are saying that this worked very well, that it improved democracy, and that people's lives are improving because of the planning departments. ISTEA legislation also totally changed the funding categories and now that everything has flexible provisions where you can use highway money for transit and vice versa. It reduced the number of categories of the different types of funding. We were eligible for funds called National Highway System Funds, which are for those facilities on the national highway system. We only have one facility, Route 13. The catch-all highway program is called the Surface Transportation Program (STP). There are also some sub-programs, including something for small urban areas like us. The enhancements program is actually a set-aside. It's a requirement that State Departments of Transportation spend at minimum 10% of their STP funds on ten specific types of projects called

Enhancements - largely bike and pedestrian trail facilities, some historic transportation facilities, beautification, and landscaping. The Town of Lansing has a big piece of enhancement funding and the City has some. The rehabilitation of the Newfield covered bridge and the Forest Home bridges is enhancement money at work. There are a couple of new projects as well, such as the Black Diamond Trail project. The approval process is a little bit different because there is an advisory committee that covers the upstate area that actually reviews the applications in addition to the MPO's review. If the Advisory Committee selects a project, and that project is in the MPO area, then the MPO must also select the project or it doesn't happen. Enhancements may not survive the reauthorization. Boyd urged everyone to contact their congressmen and urge them to keep enhancements in the program.

Any bridge in Tompkins County is eligible for federal bridge money. The federal standards for building bridges tend to be pretty high. There has been discussion about how the County got into a federal aid bridge project, but by the time they got done building it to State Department of Transportations' standards, they had spent more on their 20% than they would have if they had just done it themselves. Boyd said he can understand how that happens. The circumstance that Cross' submissions ran into is along those lines, but was more of a difference of opinion in terms of the necessary treatment that was needed.

The State's process is to solicit project proposals which are initially turned in on the initial project proposal forms (IPP). Then they go through this process of quantifying and evaluating and coming up with performance measures. The priorities and goals are safety first, maintenance projects, and then dealing with capacity issues - improving the efficiency and performance of facilities. They look at different performance measures. The performance measure for safety is the number of people killed in a given time period. Capacity has to do with flow of vehicles per dollars of investment. The way they look at bridge projects is the condition of the bridge - those most likely to fail in a dramatic manner - and the volume of traffic over the bridge. They are concerned with high efficiency investment - the more people using it, the higher the priority. With Cross' project, a maintenance project, they start looking at these efficiency ratios - length, cost, number of vehicles, and when you take the cost figure and increase it by 500% you fall down the line quite a bit on efficiency.

This particular proposal which Reinhart and Ted put together for the Triphammer Road Business District was estimated at \$2.17 million. The State came back with \$3.1725. Hickey asked what basis the State uses for changing the numbers. Cross noted that they didn't even come to look at the site. They did this work from Syracuse. Hickey added that if you increase the cost and don't change the number of people affected, you decrease the efficiency, and therefore it gets thrown out. It could be an underhanded way of not pursuing a project. Boyd said that they do have a lot of experience with these proposals, and since they do all these projects, they should have the expertise to know on a comparative basis.

The Triphammer Road project was interesting because it was cross-listed, and this was one of the points the MPO tried to make. It had a marginal safety record - there were 21 accidents in the year that it was submitted. It has some capacity flaws so it was showing up as a capacity issue. It also showed up with some pavement issues. It fell just below the cutoff line in two or three of those categories, but the case the MPO tried to make was if it's rated high in three categories, maybe there ought to be some kind of measure of cumulative impact.

Boyd said that the MPO had developed their own TIP evaluation and process. They went through the same solicitation process, using the IPP form so it didn't have to be filled out again. Then, they took the projects and evaluated them using weighted points on a 100 point scale. They gave points for physical condition, functional

classification (the bigger the road, the more points), the volume (the more volume, the more points), safety, congestion relief (the ability of the project to relieve congestion), mobility improvement (does the project significantly increase the ability to move people and goods), land use compatibility, energy use, air quality, noise, community impacts, ecological impacts, modal integrations, special destinations (ISTEA designates special designations such as historic sites, airports, freight facilities), enhancement projects (does it promote enhancement projects), private participation, and economic impacts. They had a number of individuals representing different transportation interests who evaluated all the project proposals and rated them. The scores were summed and averaged and passed on to the Planning Committee who was then given the opportunity to change things around if they wanted. They then handed it off to the Policy Committee, the final decision-making authority, and the Policy Committee was given the opportunity to rearrange the priorities based on their expert knowledge. Then they began the process of creating this TIP document. Some of the projects that they thought were very high priority may not have been the projects that the State thought were high priority and vice versa. Some things were traded around and in the end they got their first TIP.

Ordinarily, it would be time to begin a new document. Unfortunately, there was a sweeping change in Congress and in the State of New York last year and consequently, information is not flowing. While they know how much federal funds are available, there are some questions related to how the State of New York is going to implement the federal transportation funds. To the best of Boyd's knowledge, there has not been any information that has come to the regional DOT headquarters or to the MPOs in terms of how they are going to begin to put this capital program together.

ISTEA is an authorizing document. Authorization is the amount of money that you're allowed to spend under the law, but it's subject to annual appropriations. Annual appropriations have been 80-90% of the authorization levels. All of the TIPs and all of the capital programming done by New York State were done on the authorization levels in ISTEA because it was a 5-year program. It hasn't materialized that way. There has been less money available than they anticipated. Now they are in year 4 and 5, and they are very concerned about what they will be able to finish. They should be soliciting for projects right now for a new TIP document but they can't do that until they get some information and a go-ahead from the governor and the State DOT. Boyd has been notified by a high ranking officer in the DOT that "until further notice the TIP process is in abeyance." The projects listed are moving, but they are projects that are in process. There are all kinds of other compounding factors like the annual State budget war and how that is affecting transportation. The Comptroller has a stack of contracts on his desk from DOT that he won't touch because he doesn't have a State budget. It doesn't matter that they have federal funds behind them or local funds committed to them.

The MPO will solicit projects at some point. This Committee needs to submit the IPP form at that time if they want to go after federal funding. Funding types are irrelevant - that is something that the State Department of Transportation and the MPO wrestles with. All of the landscaping and pedestrian facilities are eligible components of that type of project.

Boyd said that the State Department of Transportation is building sidewalks and providing green space and snow space and tree space. They're getting better about working with local governments and trying to produce quality projects. They're also very impressed with local over-match, where the community provides more than the minimum 20%, and in public-private partnerships.

This particular scenario is already determined to be an eligible scenario because we know that it was included in the DOT process and it was scored, and wasn't kicked back. Jacobs said that her group had just submitted

a project for HUD funding, but they had to submit it 3 times, because it kept coming up right under the cut off. The third time it did get funding. That is a possibility here - that it's ranked on what else is submitted with it. Boyd agreed. He said that in the DOT process you are competing with a large area which includes Syracuse.

The idea of treating the project in a comprehensive manner certainly ups the ante in making it difficult for the State to fight against it. There have been some concerns about what type of standard the State would enforce. Basically, the engineers decide on the basis of the AASHTO (American Association of State Highway & Transportation Officials) guidelines, which are pretty widely accepted. They do that largely because of legal and funding responsibilities. I assume that whatever comes out of this is going to be designed within those guidelines. Those guidelines won't necessarily dictate that you have a 5-lane freeway running through the Village. It is possible to design either two lanes with a turn base or even two lanes. Boyd is not a big fan of a continuous center turn lanes but it is an acceptable standard. Again, there is flexibility within the design. The project should include not only the needs but the desires of the community.

Reinhart has been trying just to get the Village's computerized traffic signals coordinated. Hickey said that the Village was told when the area by Triphammer Mall was redone that they had to get certain chips to go into the lights because that's what the State was going to get to put into the lights on the bridge. The Village bought the chips but is still waiting for the chips to go in over the bridge. **Boyd said that is an issue that should be pursued and they can certainly be of assistance.** That is one of those bandaid improvements that will really help the Corridor now. It's cost-effective, and the State likes those kinds of things. Hickey said that he didn't understand why a right hand turning approach lane wasn't put in to get off on Triphammer so you can get directly to Cayuga Heights off of Route 13. Boyd doesn't have an answer for that. Boyd said that the response that they would get through the New York State DOT is to bring that through the MPO forum. And, in some ways that is an appropriate response. Some of the very simple changes that occurred when the Warren Road intersection was redone (move some pavement, move the stripes, change things a little bit to make them work better) was one area where the MPO was able to convince them that for a very small increment of cost they would get big benefits. Hickey said that they had been arguing for Warren Road improvement for a long time, and the argument that came back was that the numbers don't justify the investment. Boyd said the MPO process and the forum, particularly the Policy Committee, has a fairly good track record in getting them to review and in some cases revise those types of circumstances. The MPO forum is a very important tool for helping the Committee to accomplish their needs. There will be cases where you get rejected and your numbers get changed around, and you don't get what you think you deserve out of it, but don't give up.

Cross asked if something like the signalization project would have to start right here at the IPP level? Boyd said he would suggest it because the State DOT speaks a certain language. Cross said that in the IPP process he had participated in, he had simultaneously submitted a separate one for the actual Community Corners as a separate project. Aside from the cost factor and the efficiency ranking, they wouldn't have done it anyway because their argument was they didn't want to spend \$1.75 million on this section of road and dump all this traffic on an intersection that wasn't going to handle it. Would they say the same thing about this project - that one end or the other isn't going to handle the change? Boyd said that his fear with Cross' point of looking at larger implications is that the price tag will be too high and the efficiency rating will suffer if you put together something that long and that comprehensive. Jacobs said that what they have to do to counter that is to look at it as an issue the whole way and provide that supporting documentation, but show that the focus is the Village line. Cross said there is a difference because once you go north to the Town and south to Cayuga Heights it's transitioning back into a residential district. Boyd added that it's also suburban residential versus rural residential. Fresinski asked if it should be submitted on three separate IPPs that showed

some kind of relationship. Boyd said his personal strategy would be to submit one plan with prioritized section-type projects and cost components. He would probably also submit the various chunks and see if they bite on the whole thing. They may kick it out and say this is repetitive. But to be realistic there are areas that are going to have higher needs within this Corridor. There are a lot of issues that need to be wrestled with in this Corridor. Cross said that when you submit the IPP you're not only submitting a design, you're submitting a budget. Boyd said that therefore you're not locked into a design. Of course, they're going to want to go through a preliminary design, which is another way of saying planning and scoping and talking about how you want to identify what the appropriate treatment is. If they get approval on that then they go to final design which is where they actually start doing the geometric designs. There is a manual that tells step by step how the State starts out going through the preliminary design, final design, right of way acquisition, etc. Jacobs asked if they actually do a preliminary road design. Boyd said yes, in most cases they will. That means that if the Committee chooses to pull that out of the project and fund it locally, that cost would not have to be included in their estimate. Jacobs asked if this group comes up with some conceptual idea showing the whole Corridor and improvement area, does that enhance their chances? Boyd said that he thinks part of the role of the MPO is to ensure that it enhances it. The IPP should certainly communicate that this level of locally funded collaborative process is going on. The State is very much interested in new partnerships. What can we invent to lower costs and the use of federal funds? That's really what they're after - ways to make their program go farther. The IPP is just the basic form. You can attach whatever argument you want to make to the form. They are trying to take a pro-active approach to addressing some very specific, inter-jurisdictional transportation problems. You have a specific section that you're primarily worried about. It has aesthetic and economic and a lot of other issues at stake. A new State DOT has to be appreciative of your efforts and give some weight to them. Part of the strategy is to provide numbers to them that are credible and defensible.

Steve Vedder is the Regional Planning and Program Manager. He's the head of the section that deals with these issues out of the Syracuse office. He works for a new Regional Director, Charles Moynihan, who has been very attentive to local needs and desires. Vedder may have some specific advice. **The Committee might want to invite him or Mr. Moynihan to a meeting.**

Cross asked how the Committee can continue to keep Boyd's expertise and guidance involved. Fresinski said that given their electronic contact that he would assume Boyd would be willing to watch what the Committee is doing and apprise them of any wrong turns and keep connected that way. Boyd said yes, he would like to keep informed of the Committee's work. However, he has taken the position that he's not able to work on local projects until the MPO gets to the point with big world things that they can start doing specific technical assistance. They are now developing a computerized travel demand model as a computerized tool that both their office and local governments will be able to use. Tonight Boyd is here to offer local technical assistance. **Boyd also suggested that the Committee invite Rebecca Lubin, the circuit rider for the County, to participate .**

Jacobs suggested that even if the Committee were successful in getting federal funding for the project, the reality is that it wouldn't be available until 1999 or 2000. In the meantime, the Village has to do some maintenance. Is there a maintenance budget that they can go for now? Boyd said that if you call it maintenance they will reject it. But there are activities that one can construe as maintenance, for instance, putting new pavement skin on pavement. They actually have a lot of flexibility in doing those kind of things. Boyd had talked about prioritized segmentation and the traffic signals. Certainly, those small scale bandaid projects are eligible activities. Boyd said the thing he fears about paving is that if the New York State DOT paves the road, would that mean that they won't consider any reconstruction for another 15 years because they've just put

paving into it? They don't like to redo things.

Fresinski thanked Boyd and said that he helped the Committee to understand just what the situation really is so they will be able to package the program appropriately. He thought that Boyd's strategy of going simultaneously for independent programs and a comprehensive one at the same time was particularly helpful. That way, if the whole proposal doesn't make sense at this point in time, perhaps one part of it does. The Committee would like to document a comprehensive plan, even if the funding might come from different sources. The rules suggest that in one area it might be overdoing it to go after some kind of funding.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:08 p.m.

Meeting Agendas

[May 2, 1996](#) | [May 16, 1996](#) | [June 6, 1996](#) | [June 27, 1996](#) | [July 18, 1996](#)

Meeting Minutes

[May 2, 1996](#) | [May 16, 1996](#) | [June 6, 1996](#) | [June 27, 1996](#) | [July 18, 1996](#)

[\[TOP of Page](#) | [Village of Lansing Home Page](#) | [NTRCRC Newsletter](#)]

Last modified: 6/12/96

Comments to: [Larry Fresinski](#)