

Wendel Duchscherer

140 John James Audubon Parkway, Suite 201
Amherst, NY 14228

MEETING MINUTES

Project Meeting

WD Project No. 4282-01

Project Title: City of Kingston Intermodal Facility

Meeting Date: January 18, 2007

Location: Kingston City Hall

Subject: Site Selection Analysis
Draft Program

Attendees:

Initials	Name and E-mail	Company	Telephone
DD	Dennis Doyle ddoy@co.ulster.ny.us	Ulster County Transportation Council (UCTC)	845-340-3339
DM	David Markowitz dmarkowitz@dot.state.ny.us	NYS DOT	845-431-5743
RR	Russell Robbins rrobbins@dot.state.ny.us	NYS DOT Region 8	845-431-5978
CR	Cynthia Ruiz crui@co.ulster.ny.us	Ulster County Area Transportation (UCAT)	845-340-3335
TJ	Tom Jackson tjac@co.ulster.ny.us	Ulster County Area Transportation	845-334-8421
SF	Steve Finkle sfinkle@ci.kingston.ny.us	City of Kingston	845-334-3960
TR	Toni Roser citibus@ci.kingston.ny.us	Citibus	845-331-3725
MB	Anne Noonan anoonan@trailwaysny.com	Trailways	845-339-4230
WT	Bill Tobin wtob@co.ulster.ny.us	Ulster County Transportation Council	845-340-3340
KD	Kathy Dewkett kdewkett@dewkett.com	Dewkett Engineering	845-876-5250
DZ	Dave Zielinski dzielinski@wd-ae.com	Wendel Duchscherer (WD)	716-688-0766
DG	Don Gray dgray@wd-ae.com	Wendel Duchscherer	716-688-0766

Item	Description	Due	Ball in Court
------	-------------	-----	---------------

1.00 **Data Collection to-Date:**

1.01 WD has collected a number of existing reports, existing GIS data, photographs and visual observation information from on-site visits. The two Washington Avenue Corridor studies obtained, one each for the Town of Ulster and City of Kingston, contain some of the more pertinent information that relates to this analysis.

2.00 **Evaluation Criteria:**

2.01 The Alternative Evaluation Criteria spreadsheet reflecting the Steering Committee's collective ranking of the eleven (11) main scoring criteria in the order of importance was discussed. In view of the fact "Intermodal connectivity" was ranked number one, "Parking" was ranked number two and "Vehicle access" was ranked third, a question was raised as to whether "Parking" should really be

Item	Description	Due	Ball in Court
	ranked as the number two criteria in order of importance. Another question was raised concerning the "On-site pedestrian access" criteria ranking as number five in order of importance, and the possibility this ranking was not reflective of it's actual level of importance. After some discussion, it was agreed to leave the criteria ranking as shown and trust the evaluation process.		
2.02	While the evaluation process being followed for this project is an analytical, objective, mathematical process, there is also an intuitive aspect to the process based on local knowledge, sound judgment, and recognized industry practices that will be used by the Committee members and consultant team in the decision making process.		
2.03	The "average" shown for each criteria in the Alternative Evaluation Criteria spreadsheet is the value to be used for the "Criteria Weight" in the more detailed Comprehensive Alternative Evaluation Matrix that will be used for grading (scoring) the sites.		
3.00	<u>Draft Space Program:</u>		
3.01	The draft space program was discussed. Based upon interviews with the users and operators of the new facility, it reflects a building of approximately 9,500 SF and a site of approximately 100,000 SF, for a total of 109,500 SF (2.5 acres).		
3.02	The program components and size will need to be reviewed and refined as the project progresses, as well as balanced with future construction budgets. When floor plans for the top two preferred sites are developed, this will present an opportunity for further discussion and refinement of the proposed program elements.		
3.03	The program provides for site and building expansion based upon 4% growth over a period of 10 years.		
3.04	One of the items needing consideration and final determination by the Committee is the capacity of the interior waiting area and the amount of parking to be provided. Currently the program provides interior waiting for sixty (60) people as well as parking for sixty (60) vehicles. Outside of the bus bays and bus circulation, these two elements will have the largest impact on the program size.		
3.05	If necessitated by the configuration of the preferred sites, a two-story facility was mentioned as a possibility. This would allow for a smaller building footprint on the site without reducing desired program space.		
4.00	<u>Initial Analysis of Potential Sites:</u>		
4.01	An aerial map of potential sites for the new facility within the defined study area was next presented and discussed. The potential sites presented were selected based on a combination of the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential sites identified by Abrams-Cherwony Report • Commercial properties that are currently vacant • Commercial properties of sufficient size to accommodate the program either by themselves or in combination with adjacent properties • Commercial properties that are not currently vacant but whose location is considered optimum due to highway access or surrounding context 		

Item	Description	Due	Ball in Court
4.02	During the analysis it became apparent there are a limited number of properties / parcels within the defined study area that meet either one or a combination of the above criteria.		
4.03	Based on their internal analysis, the consultant team made an initial recommendation that four of the potential sites be advanced for further development. The goal is for the Committee members to review this recommendation and make a final determination which sites will be advanced for further consideration.		
4.04	The Committee decided to wait for the results of the 1-30-07 Public Information Meeting before deciding which sites should be advanced. The public input received will be factored into the decision making process.		
4.05	Between now and the next Committee meeting, Committee members were asked to individually consider the potential sites identified and give their feedback to WD. It was suggested this feedback include which sites seem most viable, which do not, and the reasons why. WD will collect this feedback, consolidate / summarize it, and distribute to all Committee members.		
4.06	Shortly after the 1-30-07 Public Meeting, the Committee will reconvene and decide the sites to be advanced for further consideration.		
5.00	<u>Public Meeting Format and Agenda:</u>		
5.01	WD will prepare a draft presentation for the County's review. The Public Meeting agenda outlined during the meeting was:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description and history of the project • Description of intermodalism • Explain why an intermodal facility would benefit Kingston and the County • Describe the evaluation process and show the evaluation criteria • Discuss the program • Discuss the defined study area • Seek public input regarding location and what services / amenities should be included in the new facility • Define the next steps, including future public meetings 		
6.00	<u>Next Steps:</u>		
6.01	The 1-30-07 Public Information Meeting.		
6.02	Reconvene the Committee soon after the Public Meeting to discuss and decide the sites to be advanced for further development and consideration.		
7.00	<u>Summary of items distributed and/or transmitted at this meeting</u>		
7.01	The Alternative Evaluation Criteria spreadsheet reflecting the Steering Committee's ranking of the scoring criteria.		
7.02	Draft space program.		
7.03	Aerial map showing WD's initial analysis of potential sites within the study area.		

Item	Description	Due	Ball in Court
8.00	<u>Summary of Action Items</u>		
8.01	WD to prepare a draft of the Public Meeting presentation for County review.	1-25-07	WD
8.02	Committee members to consider the potential sites presented by the consultant team and give their feedback to WD as described in item 4.05 above.	1-31-07	ALL
9.00	<u>Summary of attachments to these meeting minutes</u>		
9.01	No items are attached to these meeting minutes.		

Prepared by: WENDEL DUCHSCHERER

These meeting minutes represent our understanding of the items discussed and the thoughts expressed. If there are any modifications or corrections required to these minutes, please contact our office within ten (10) calendar days. Otherwise, these meeting minutes will be considered accurate and complete.

Signed: 
Donald E. Gray, AIA, Project Manager

Dated: 01-25-07

- C:
- All attendees
 - Mark Boungard Trailways
 - Susan VanBenschoten Fitzgerald & Halliday, Inc.
 - David Williams The Williams Group
 - Robert W. Lambert McFarland-Johnson, Inc.
 - WD In-house Team Members
 - WD file