

**North Triphammer Road Corridor Reconstruction
Committee Meeting
July 18, 1996**

Action items are **bolded**

The meeting of the Village of Lansing North Triphammer Road Corridor Reconstruction Committee (NTRCRC) was called to order by Chairman Fresinski. Committee members Tull, Sciarabba, Buck, Hickey, Jacobs, Lubin, Kiefer, Reis and Sciarabba were present.

The minutes of the last meeting were reviewed and approved.

Fresinski reviewed the list of items from previous meetings that need action:

1. Guideline booklet for IPP. **Jacobs will get one to the group if Cross does not have one.**
2. CISER: Fresinski contacted CISER and asked them about how they might put together a survey and how much they would charge. They have not yet responded. **Fresinski will follow up as soon as he gets in touch with them. Jacobs and Hickey were going to work on the wording for the survey.**

Sciarabba said that he can call a meeting of the Lansing Business Association, or around 60 businesses, and find out what they're interested in in terms of the Triphammer Corridor.

3. Tull said Pyramid Mall's survey information was done around 5 years ago, and the only records relating to their portion of that project would have been kept by the County. Fresinski said that what this group is doing is the only current planning effort related to the Triphammer Corridor.

Kiefer said that Cayuga Heights is anxious to do something on the other side of the bridge as well. Sciarabba said that that area has a residential area butting up against a commercial area and the Village of Lansing. They can't solve the Community Corners issue without a major effort. The Village of Lansing has development potential which is going to happen at some point in time. Basically, the Cayuga Heights portion of the Corridor is stabilized except for the impact of Kendal. Kendal will have about 160 of the 210 units occupied by the end of next year if they stay on schedule. Fresinski said he has not noticed any impact from Kendal at this stage. It's mostly employee traffic at this point.

4. Another item on the action list is a brainstorming session with selected Village residents. It is first necessary to have a basic design prepared. Kiefer felt that residents should be presented with options in design rather than being asked to react to only one design. Jacobs said that that would be ideal, but there is just not sufficient time to do multiple designs and still be able to get the proposal ready to go in time for the MPO. She suggested that the engineers prepare one design, most likely the three lane option, and then wait to get public input before beginning to design a second option. Sciarabba felt that often people that are affected by this haven't got the time to spend on evaluating all these options. Fresinski suggested that the design can present a single picture without a lot of definition. There are a lot of options that can come out of a single picture. For example, he could see showing a third lane, but not

articulating it as a turning lane. Hickey said that he thought the brainstorming would be on a conceptual level. They would be asking what people thought of a three-lane concept, and not asking them to make a decision. Jacobs said that in order for the engineers to do a realistic cost estimate, they have to do a detailed design. That means researching properties, looking for what kind of cost is involved for acquiring right-of-way, as well as to a fair extent understanding what they will be doing with that third lane. It is important to develop a good cost estimate, and it's going to take some time so they need to decide whether to focus on a three-lane option or to go on to another design.

Hickey suggested that they go ahead and prepare a three-lane model but not show it to the public until they have a two-lane model to show them also, but not cost out the two-lane model. Sciarabba said that traffic studies are showing that there has to be a minimum of three lanes, so why waste time? He suggested that if there is a problem with a three lane then they have to go to a four lane because a two lane won't work. Fresinski said that a wider two lane or more sidewalk on both sides is an alternative as well. He could envision sidewalks on both sides, a lot of green space, and two twelve-foot lanes. The tradeoff, as Jacobs explained previously, is that the traffic will increasingly use the side residential roads instead. Sciarabba said that he wants to make sure that the business community is going to stay healthy, and it will not stay healthy unless there is efficiency of access. Hickey said that there are also people in this community that do not want to see this road widened and they need to have a chance to look at the plan. Sciarabba reminded the Committee that this group is itself a cross section of the community. The Committee was charged with serving as a leader for the future and designing something that is going to make sense for the Village down the road. What is going to be right for the Village is what is going to make this road safer and more accessible because in reality it will become a commercial area. Hickey said that another reality is that the congestion on that road occurs at certain times of the day but not all day long, and we still don't know what the level of service is on this road - a D and E or an F. Jacobs said that the level of service varies with time and the two studies done show that during the peak time it is down to an F and during other periods the average is a B (**I think this should be "D"--please verify**). Kiefer said that Cornell is trying to get people to use Warren Road, and that has to have alleviated the traffic to some extent. Hickey confirmed that it has. Comparison of traffic counts done between 1992 and 1995 show a decline in traffic between those years which can be attributed to the improvements on Warren Road. However, this does not speak to the road's efficiency, and that decrease in traffic may or may not help the business community. It may be that the decrease in traffic makes access easier; or on the other hand it may be that people not driving through are less likely to stop and shop.

Jacobs felt that the three-lane design would be more acceptable to the MPO with respect to providing alternatives for the public review. It's important that the public understands how an option might impact traffic on nearby roads. It's hard for people to just look at a physical design. Four lanes is not really an option. The Hunt design was using an 80 foot right of way in case at some point down the line it was necessary to go to four lanes. If we're going to acquire right of way it would make sense to acquire it now so it would be in place if the Village needed it in the future. They have some costs on acquisition of right-of-way but they don't have any detailed documentation on whether the Hunt engineers actually went to the property owners. Sciarabba asked if it would it make sense to have a four lane going to a three and then back to a four? Jacobs said only if the right-of-way is acquired.

Jacobs said it is not clear to them how long it will take to get a response from the MPO. It may be a 9 or 10 month period, and even if the funding is guaranteed, you are not guaranteed any time frame for

that funding. Fresinski said it may be possible in that situation for the Village to operate with its own funds knowing that they would get reimbursement.

Fresinski said that they will wait until they have something specific before they present it to the public. In the meantime, they can engage them in a smaller setting with specific solicitation.

5. Hickey and Sciarabba had mentioned the desirability of a service entry into Cayuga Mall from Route 13. Fresinski asked Jacobs how that could be integrated into the overall planning. Would that be part of engineering this road or does that have to be a separate project? Jacobs said that it could be submitted as a suggestion along with supporting documentation, but the engineers wouldn't take the time to do a cost estimate. If it's on private property the Village couldn't undertake the project. Fresinski asked, then, how to convey that desire to the State - through the engineer's office, or through a letter from the Board? Jacobs agreed that those sorts of communication would be appropriate. **Once the preliminary cost estimate is prepared, then the engineers can start preparing that kind of supporting documentation for the odds and ends they think would be helpful such as that** . Fresinski asked if they should talk about it as an independent project? Jacobs said it's probably better to make it related because they are trying to show that this is a comprehensive project. Hickey said that if they were to make a case that the existing service road is not wide enough to handle delivery trucks as well as the ATM traffic that drives through the bank, a solution could be a service road that could be tied to this project. Jacobs agreed that it would be viable to tie it in to this project by showing how it would impact the project. So, as not to lose it, **Jacobs will put this in the engineers' queue** . However, on the engineer's behalf she said they would want to make sure that all the preliminary design work is complete and then augment it with that kind of thing. She said Boyd seems responsive to adding supporting documentation. It would only have a real negative impact if it were to increase the price dramatically. However, if Cayuga Mall were interested and willing to put some money up for that project, then the documentation could show that the Committee got them involved, and that may help the project.

Tull asked Jacobs if her office could give some indication of the feasibility of that type of project. There are a lot of DOT regulations as to what can and cannot come off that highway. **Jacobs will look into it. At least she can find out if it's allowable.**

6. Fresinski said that they had talked about a walkway/bikeway and ascertaining whether the Bike Coalition would be interested in having an independent bike path to be used with walkers. Hickey thought that that would require an awfully wide sidewalk. Jon Reis had provided Fresinski with the names of some people in that field to call for their opinion. Reis offered the Committee some information he had obtained titled "Guides for Development of Bicycle Facilities."

Fresinski noted that there is not a continual flow of either pedestrians or bikers through the Village. For this community, at this time, he would guess that the size of the bikeway isn't terribly relevant. Hickey said that they were only talking about a small stretch of road, and if they were to build a 10 foot wide walkway they would not build it all the way to the end of the Village line. The Committee discussed whether a bicycle belongs in the road or off the road. Hickey felt that a bicycle is still a vehicle by law and belongs on the road. Kiefer felt that may not be the safest way to accommodate cyclists. Lubin added that this is an issue where public opinion might come in to play. Jacobs said that if you're going to have a bike lane adjacent to the road, you really need one on both sides.

Fresinski said that the original strategy was to put the most sensible thing together that was more expensive so that if they backed off any feature of the design they still would not have difficulty getting it through. Taking that aim forward with respect to the sidewalk/bikeway, which one would be more expensive? Jacobs felt that probably two four-foot bike lanes and a five-foot sidewalk would cost more than if you just did a 10 foot sidewalk. She said that when they start going through the list of the desirables and decide what kind of space they have to work with, they will figure out what can really be done. As a preliminary step, they will figure out what they can't fit in and then examine the options.

So, the design should include that which is most expensive and also takes the greatest right of way for future use . Jacobs said that if it is acceptable to the Committee, the engineers will initially look at a bike lane on each side and then a separate sidewalk. Fresinski said that the idea is to have a separate path for both. **To have sidewalks and bike lanes on both sides would clearly be the most expensive, but it's easy to take away.**

Fresinski asked Jacobs to speak to the Committee about the steps to be taken and the designated time frame. Jacobs said that Phase I is what they are finishing up now. The objective is to finish up tonight and to make sure that she really understands what the Committee wants in the design. The second step is to go through the draft letter to the Board of Trustees. The draft letter is a summary of what the Committee has accomplished in the Phase I Committee meetings, and it was written in such a way that it can be used for supporting documentation for the IPP. The letter will explain to people, who will be reading it at the State level, who got together and why, and the outcome of that work.

Phase II is basically the drawings and cost estimates that Jacob's office will be doing. They are fortunate to have two things to benefit them. One is all the input that the Committee has already outlined, and the other is the Hunt design, which they will be able to utilize in ways that will save them time. The engineers will take it through the preliminary design and will seek the Board of Trustees approval. At that point it could be presented to the public. Based on the discussion tonight the timeline may need to be altered to present the results of Phase II to the Committee and then talk about a two-lane alternative. If the Committee wants to develop a two lane model, that would probably take place through the month of November. The public meeting could then take place in January or February, since December is probably not the best time for it. The Committee might want to have Phases III and Phase IV. Phase III would be having the Committee's input on the three-lane alternative and if it is the design that is wanted, then do that.

Phase V would be the Final Engineering Cost Estimate after consensus has been reached on the development alternative and the public at large has been informed. The Committee would then make recommendations to the Board of Trustees and the Trustees would direct the engineers to do a final design. If that final design was substantially different, primarily in cost, they would want to add supporting documentation for that to the documentation that is already in the IPP proposal. Of course the engineers are hoping the cost will be more favorable.

The Committee reviewed the draft letter to the Board of Trustees. Fresinski asked about the statements on marginal safety and buried utility cables. Jacobs said that there were 21 accidents that are documented. Fresinski said he thought it was a powerful statement to be able to make and if it was questioned he wanted to be able to support it with documentation. Jacobs said that buried utilities also

refers to the water main, which has a lot of breaks in it and will probably need to be replaced.

Regarding documentation of safety issues, Lubin suggested that it is possible to map accidents by getting readily available information from the police and sheriff's offices. [Ed. Jacobs obtained a listing of the accidents on N. Triphammer and prepared a map showing the accident locations as supporting documentation.]

The Committee suggested several other changes to the draft letter.

Buck questioned a statement under "Preliminary Design Criteria" which suggested a traffic light "potentially" for Craft Road. Jacobs said that from an engineering perspective they questioned whether this is the right time to put one in at Craft Road. Buck said that there are six businesses up there, Montesorri School coming in, and 160 residents are scheduled to go in on the east side. He felt that the line of sight at that intersection was limited enough to warrant a light at this time. **Jacobs will modify the wording to reflect this.** It is possible to include the request for traffic signals in the IPP.

Kiefer felt that the timeline for the project as well as the revisions in the timeline should be included in the letter to the Trustees. Jacobs preferred to give them that information in a separate document, but refer to it in the letter itself. The letter is written in the appropriate form for the MPO to determine what the progress has been. Kiefer also asked about how the issue of having striped crosswalks would be included in the supporting documentation. Jacobs included this in a section on crosswalks, but it can also appear under "supporting actions."

Committee members discussed the value of distributing a press release regarding the NTRCRC to the local and regional newspapers. Most felt it worthwhile to let the communities know that a group is working on a plan and to let people know that there will be public information meetings coming up this fall.

Dooley Kiefer felt the press release was not detailed enough and that Committee members should be listed so people could call whomever they know. Other members felt they would not be prepared to answer questions at this time. Larry Fresinski said he'd be delighted to discuss any aspect of the plans with anyone that cared to discuss it. Jacobs thought we should wait until we have a design and financial numbers to present.

The press release will go out to several newspapers, list the Chair to ask questions of, and identify where people can get further information, both online and in the Village Office.

The meeting adjourned at 9:45 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: 8/16/96

Comments to: [Larry Fresinski](#)