

Village of Lansing
Public Information Meeting Minutes
North Triphammer Road Corridor Reconstruction Project
November 19, 1997

Presiding

[Larry Fresinski](#);

Trustee, [Village of Lansing](#) &

Chair, North Triphammer Road Corridor Reconstruction Committee (NTRCRC)

and

[David Herrick](#); Engineer, TG Miller

Approximately 30 people attended the Village of Lansing's Public Information meeting regarding the proposed plan for the reconstruction of the North Triphammer corridor. Trustee Fresinski stated that the Village of Lansing's Department of Public works notified the Board of Trustees that the North Triphammer road from the bridge to the North was in serious need of repair. Further, the cost of such a repair would be at least \$500,000 and closer to \$1,000,000 if any amenity was added (bike or walkways). Plus, there would be additional expense to repair the water system underneath the same stretch of road. An initial investigation of acquiring public funds indicated there was no funds available until the year 2001 and there would be severe competition for these funds. Working closer with the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) we identified a small opportunity to squeeze into the system if our project qualified.

At the onset the NTRCRC was determined not to alter the character of the Village while providing safety, walkways, bikeways, green space, stop lights, and better managed traffic flow via a turning lane. The preliminary plan presented meets these criteria for just under \$4,000,000. The federal ISTEA funding has approved this preliminary plan which means that the project gets 80% of the funds from the program while the Village must finance the other 20%. As the project reaches a certain stage it can then qualify for Marcheselli funding for another 15% leaving the the Village left to fund the project at a cost of about \$200,000.

David Herrick presented the preliminary plan.

Points made include:

1. No zoning changes would be made
2. Traffic lights are suggested for the intersection of Graham and Craft roads
3. The design is specifically to manage traffic safely at the speed limit while providing pedestrian safety. It does not provide for faster traffic flow.
4. This plan is preliminary. However, it cannot be reduced in scope if we want the federal funding. Some alterations are allowed, however.
5. Sidewalks would be maintained by the Village
6. Construction could start in the year 2000 with completion in 2001 and completion in 18 months (2 construction seasons).

Questions raised:

1. Is it safe to have a middle turning lane for such a short distance while the line-of-sight is not straight? Don't you need 5 lanes for this to work like on Rt 13 near McDonald's?
 - Some people that it would be safe and others thought it would be a problem. We will need a traffic engineer to help us with this one.
2. Is it reasonable to combine driveways to accommodate aligned intersections?
 - Yes. We will work with property owners to assist with the details of such a cooperative arrangement..
3. Have parallel access roads in the business district been considered to minimize flow on N. Triphammer?
 - Yes. However, the East side of N. Triphammer already has densely established properties making it nearly impossible to create a parallel access road.
4. Is it necessary to construct the project to Brook Drive? Why not stop it sooner?
 - It is not necessary, but that's how far previous construction has gone in the past. We still think it is appropriate to build the project out that far.
5. Brook Drive is hard to get out of now when there's continuing flow from the North. Won't it be more difficult if a traffic light is put in place at Craft by causing the stacking of cars past Brook Drive?
 - This could be a problem. Maybe the center lane could be used for turning left out of Brook Drive? An engineer would have to study this issue.
6. Will the construction improve the flow of traffic on the ramp coming onto the bridge from Rt 13 by minimizing stacking on the ramp?
 - There is no definitive data that suggests the changes will minimize the stacking on the ramps. However, we do not think the project would make it worse.
7. Is there consideration for routing traffic flow off N. Triphammer to Warren Road?
 - No. In particular, we want to minimize the amount of West to East traffic through residential areas.
8. It appears as though bike lanes end abruptly. Can the plan provide for continuous bike lanes?
 - This does not appear to be a problem, but an engineer/consultant should look at it closely.
9. Is there sufficient space for buses to pull off the roadway?
 - Yes. There are indents in the curb to allow for buses to pull off the roadway.
10. Will there be pedestrian signals to stop traffic. And, if so, how will they affect the traffic signal synchronization?
 - There will be pedestrian signals. A similar resynchronization will be necessary as the present lights on N. Triphammer.
11. Will the Northeast Transportation Study Area impact our study area?
 - We do not think so off-hand, but it is something the MPO will need to look at.
12. Are there plan to change the number of lanes on the bridge?
 - the state was planning to add a lane to the bridge but we have no definitive plans from them at this time.
13. Will the Village borrow money to accommodate the plan?
 - This is a serious consideration so we can manage the progress of the project.
14. Is there a possibility for the government to impound money that's already approved for the project?
 - We will have to defer this issue to our attorney.