If you have a disability that will require special arrangements to be made for you to fully participate in the meeting, please contact the City Clerk at 274-6570 at least 48 hours before the meeting.

Out of consideration for the health of other individuals, please refrain from using perfume/cologne and other scented personal care products at City of Ithaca meetings. Thank you for your cooperation and understanding.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Voting Item?</th>
<th>Presenter(s)</th>
<th>Time Alotted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Call to Order</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Chair, Deb Mohlenhoff</td>
<td>15 Mins*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Agenda Review</td>
<td>*Note: We will review the number of cards received at the beginning of each meeting and adjust time if needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Review and Approval of Minutes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Statements from the Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Council’s Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Consent</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Chamberlain – Waiver of Penalty on Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 YB – Amendment to Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Finance, Budget and Appropriations</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mike Thorne, Supt of PW</td>
<td>5 Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 DPW – Amendment to Budget for Internship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 DPW – Amendment of CP # 839 Dryden Rd Garage</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mike Thorne, Supt of PW</td>
<td>10 Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 DPW – Exchange of Property with NYS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Eric Hathaway, Transportation Eng.</td>
<td>10 Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 DPW – Establishment of Capital Project for Traffic Signal and Operations Improvements</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Eric Hathaway, Transportation Eng.</td>
<td>10 Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 YB – Grant for Cass Park Rink Enclosure</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Liz Klohmann, YB Director</td>
<td>5 Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 AOC Recommendations for 2020 Budget</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Rob Gearhart, Council</td>
<td>5 Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. City Administration, Human Resources and Policy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Liz Klohmann, YB Director</td>
<td>5 Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 YB – Amendment to Babe Ruth Contract</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 DPW – Amendment to Personnel Roster</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mike Thorne, Supt of PW</td>
<td>10 Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Discussion</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ducson Nguyen, Council</td>
<td>15 Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Shopping Carts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Budget</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>15 Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Dates and Special Topics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Meeting Wrap-Up</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>5 Mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Announcements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Next Meeting Date: May 15, 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Review Agenda Items for Next Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4 Adjourn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
.2 Consent
.1 Finance – Chamberlain – Request to Waive Penalty on Taxes

WHEREAS, the owner of property at 208 Kline Rd, tax map #6.-1-2.1 presented check #1569 in the amount of $4,529.28 on January 4, 2019, for payment of the County taxes on the property; and

WHEREAS, the check was $20.00 short of the $4,549.28 payment in full as is required; and

WHEREAS, the City Chamberlain’s Office attempted to call the writer of the check by using the telephone number on the check to inform him of the discrepancy; and

WHEREAS, the noted telephone number was not a working number; and

WHEREAS, the City Chamberlain therefore returned check #1569 on January 4, 2019, informing the owner that it was short and requesting submission of the correct amount; and

WHEREAS, upon receiving a notice of unpaid taxes in March 2019, the owner called to dispute the return of the original check and the accrued late penalties and fees but ultimately sent a second check on March 26, 2019 in the amount of $4,642.27 which included late penalties and notice fees due at that time; and

WHEREAS, this second check including March 2019, penalties and fees, has been received and posted by the Chamberlain’s Office; and

WHEREAS, the owner has requested the late penalties and fees be refunded, even though he admits he shorted payment in January; and

WHEREAS, refunding the late penalties needs committee approval; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the request to waive and refund penalty and fees on the 2019 Tompkins County Taxes for 208 Kline Rd, in the amount of $92.99, be hereby approved.
RE: County tax underpaid by 20 dollars. Appeal

Deborah Whitney
Sent: Monday, March 18, 2019 4:37 PM
To: Ronald J. Herring [rjh5@cornell.edu]

Thank you Mr. Herring. Could I also get a picture of your check? Feel free to fold over the routing and account information on the bottom, so it is not in the picture.

As suggested on the phone, I encourage you to pay this County tax in full, including March penalties. Total due is $4,642.27. We collect County taxes only thru March 31st, after which they are returned to the County for delinquent collection and significant additional penalties will apply.

Our City Administration Committee will meet on April 17th. I will get supporting documents and your appeal request to them. Common Council has final say at their May 1st meeting.

While this may seem like much ado to you, I hope you understand that I am called to do tax collection based on NYS Tax Law. Voiding late penalties, which is prohibited by tax law, is a conflict of interest for me, therefore, I rely on process’ set forth specifically for these kinds of determinations.

Deborah Whitney
City Chamberlain
108 E Green St.
Ithaca, NY 14850
dwhitney@cityofithaca.org
Ph: (607) 274-6583
Fax: (607) 272-7348

"Disability is not a 'brave struggle' or 'courage in the face of adversity.' Disability is an art. It's an ingenious way to live."
Neil Marcus (Actor and playwright, central figure in the development of disability culture)

From: Ronald J. Herring [rjh5@cornell.edu]
Sent: Monday, March 18, 2019 3:55 PM
To: Deborah Whitney
Subject: Fwd: County tax underpaid by 20 dollars. Appeal

This is my appeal as discussed today by phone of assessed penalty for $20 short on a check of $4529.28.

This was an error on my part copying the numbers. If it matters, I’m 72 years old and sight impaired and do make such errors with some frequency. I am happy to pay the $20 but feel the penalty is unfair. In fact, opening the note, I saw it was dated January 2018, put it aside for income tax preparation for 2018 due in a few weeks. Sorting papers to prepare taxes I noticed the error in payment was made in 2019, NOT 2018.

My error, but not deserving of penalty, I think. Thank you for your consideration. Ron Herring
Fwd: County tax underpaid by 20 dollars. Appeal
MEMO

County Tax

Trust Company

Tompkins

Pay to the

order of

Valerie J. Bunge

RONALD J. HERLING

ITHACA, NY 14850
208 KLINE RD. PH. 607-272-8246

Date

1-08-17

$15,293.85

PAY TO THE ORDER OF VALERIE J. BUNCE
Dear Property owner, your payment is being returned for one of the following reasons:

- Postmarked after due date
- Wrong amount for County installment option - service charge incurred. Please remit full amount by due date.
- Wrong amount on check or A-6 postcard is not in amount.

The correct amount is $3,000.00. Please enclose a check for the correct amount. The original check is returned.

Date: 1/1/18

City of Ithaca
Office of the Comptroller
100 South State St.
Ithaca, NY 14850
518-462-1518

Sent from my iPhone
.2 Consent
.2 YB – Amendment to 2019 Budget

WHEREAS, The Ithaca Youth Bureau applied for and received a Tompkins County Tourism Grant for Ithaca Bike Rental (IBR); and

WHEREAS, the money will be used to purchase adaptive bikes for use by community members and visitors and a storage unit for the bikes; and

WHEREAS, IBR has grown into a very successful program that provides summer youth employment to local teens, bikes to community programs, and rentals to visitors and community members to explore, enjoy and experience the Water Front and Black Diamond Trails; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Ithaca Youth Bureau 2019 budget be amended as follows:

Increase Expenses:
A7310-5460-01203  Program Supply  $10,475

Increase Revenues:
A7310-2070-01203  Donations  $10,475
To: City Administration Committee  
From: Liz Klohmann, Director  
Re: 2019 Budget Amendment  
Date: 4/17/19  

The Ithaca youth Bureau applied for and received a Tompkins County Tourism grant to purchase equipment for Ithaca Bike Rental. The grant will be used to purchase a vertical bike rack, recumbent bikes and other adaptive bikes. We are requesting that the 2019 budget be amended to reflect this award.

Please approve the following amendment:

**Increase Expenses:**  
A7310-5460-01203 Program Supply $10,475

**Increase Revenues:**  
A7310-2070-01203 Donations $10,475

**Total - $10,475**
3. Finance, Budget and Appropriations
  .1 DPW – Amendment to Budget for Internship

WHEREAS, the City Engineering Office has identified an exceptional student for a summer internship opportunity; and

WHEREAS, the engineering budget cannot accommodate hiring an intern without the aid or work-study funds; and

WHEREAS, the identified student is not eligible for summer work-study assistance; and

WHEREAS, the current balance in the unrestricted contingency account is $99,000; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED, That Common Council hereby transfers an amount not to exceed $7,500 from Account A1990 Unrestricted Contingency to Account A1440-5120 Engineering hourly part time for the purpose of hiring an intern.
To: Common Council  
From: Eric Hathaway, Transportation Engineer  
Date: April 3, 2019  
Re: Summer Intern Request

Tim Logue (Director of Engineering), Kent Johnson (Assistant Transportation Engineer) and I recently interviewed an exceptional Civil Engineering Student from Cornell named Andrew Nkubito. Our intention was to hire Andrew as a work-study student for the summer to assist with the Vision Zero effort and other project work.

Andrew is originally from Kigali, Rwanda. His interest in Civil Engineering started several years ago when he read the strategic plan for Kigali and thought he could best serve his country by gaining the skills to one day be part of the engineering team that would turn that plan into reality.

Unfortunately, after our interview with Andrew, it was discovered that Andrew’s eligibility is for a work-study program that does not allow for summer work. Without the financial assistance that Cornell offers their work-study students, we do not have the budget to hire Andrew for the summer.

I am writing to request that Common Council use part of its discretionary budget to hire Andrew for a summer internship for a total of $6,250, with remaining $750 to be contributed by the Engineering Department. I firmly believe that Andrew’s skills will be a great help to the city and will equip Andrew to work towards his professional goals. Andrew's minor in Computer Science will be of great value as we use advanced analytics techniques to evaluate trends in our crash history.

Along with Cornell professors in the Planning, Public Health and Human Ecology Departments, we are applying for an “Engaged Cornell” grant that would enable us to fund students like Andrew for the next several years through a $40,000 grant. However, in the meanwhile, having Andrew work with us this summer would help to lay the groundwork for this future grant that would require no match from the City of Ithaca. Thank you for your consideration of this request.
3. Finance, Budget and Appropriations

.2 DPW - Amendment of Capital Project #839 for Dryden Road Parking Garage

WHEREAS, Capital Project #839 was established in 2017 at $51,000 for a Condition Assessment of the Dryden Road Parking Garage, and the report identified and prioritized capital repairs over a 5-year timeframe; and

WHEREAS, Common Council amended CP #839 by adding $375,000 to fund engineering and construction of several high-priority safety issues requiring immediate attention, including staircase, fire suppression standpipes, barrier strand cables; and

WHEREAS, bids were opened on March 26, 2019 for this scope of work, and the low bidder was Crane Hogan at $483,840; and

WHEREAS, Engineering staff is recommending award of the contract to Crane Hogan, conditioned on additional budget and completion of the full scope of work, plus an allowance for construction inspection and material testing and a contingency; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED, That Common Council hereby amends Capital Project #839 by $200,000 for the repair of structural and safety issues at the Dryden Road Parking Garage, bringing the total authorization to $626,000; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That funds needed for said amendment shall be derived from issuance of Serial Bonds.
To: Common Council  
From: Tim Logue, Director of Engineering  
Date: April 8, 2019  
Re: Request to Amend CP 839 for Dryden Road garage repairs

On March 26th, we opened bids for CP 839 for repairs in the Dryden Road garage. Our low bidder was Crane Hogan at $483,840. In order to award the contract and carry a small budget for construction inspection, material testing, and a modest contingency, we need about $200,000 added to the Capital Project.

Most of the scope of work is critical to keeping the garage open to the public. The work includes both stair towers, which are required egress. Particularly the eastern stair tower is in poor condition. If we had to close the stairs, it would call into question whether the building could remain open. Also, the fire suppression system, a dry stand pipe system, is non-functional. Under new state codes, the Fire Department needs to certify the building annually and a broken stand pipe system would be a life-safety failure. The rest of the scope of work is important the tension cable barrier strand repairs are for safety, and the floor drain replacement handles water that can otherwise damage the structure. We will likely do some limited concrete repairs, but will hold off on major deck work for another year, though that will probably come at us in the next year or two.

Based on these items, I am recommending awarding the contract to Crane Hogan and proceeding with the considered scope of work. A resolution is attached to amend the capital project.

Please note: I will not be available for your meeting on April 17th, though I will try to have someone attend in my stead. If you have any questions or concerns about this request, please contact Mike Thorne ahead of time so that he can be prepared. Thanks.
WHEREAS, upon staff recommendation, the City of Ithaca Board of Public Works recommended an exchange of right of ways between the State of New York and the City of Ithaca; and

WHEREAS, the right of way segments under consideration are:

- The City of Ithaca owned portion of Route 13, also known as Elmira Road, from the south City line to a point approximately 0.85 miles to the north, and

- The New York State owned portions of Route 79 in the central business district, including Green Street, Seneca Street and Seneca Way, from and including the Tuning Fork intersection (State/Green/Seneca Way) to Route 13 southbound (Fulton Street); and

WHEREAS, Common Council understands that there is a DOT Administrative Procedure that will evaluate the proposed exchange and will ultimately require formal action from Common Council and the NYS Legislature to effect the exchange; and

WHEREAS, the City of Ithaca would expect to modify the existing Arterial Maintenance agreement between the City and the State to include state owned roads segments after the exchange; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Common Council of the City of Ithaca hereby endorses the exchange of right of ways, including the rights and responsibilities thereto, with the New York State Department of Transportation for the abovementioned roadways; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Common Council of the City of Ithaca does hereby request the New York State Department of Transportation to undertake the assessment for a jurisdictional realignment in accordance with the NYSDOT Manual of Administrative Procedures for

- the City of Ithaca owned portion of Route 13, also known as Elmira Road, from the south City line to a point approximately 0.85 miles to the north, and

- the New York State owned portions of Route 79 in the central business district, including Green Street, Seneca Street and Seneca Way, from and including the Tuning Fork intersection (State/Green/Seneca Way) to Route 13 southbound (Fulton Street); and be it further

RESOLVED, That Common Council authorizes the Superintendent of Public Works to pursue said exchange with the State of New York and return with a final proposal from NYSDOT for local approval.
In August of 2018, I received your support to request a jurisdictional realignment through which the City of Ithaca would give NYSDOT our right of way on Route 13 (essentially the Elmira Road segment) in exchange for the segments of Route 79 that the State owns in the central business district (Green and Seneca Streets, from the Tuning Fork west to Meadow Street). I have attached those previous materials for your use.

Based on NYSDOT’s feedback, I made some minor modifications to the previous request to resubmit for their consideration. Per the attached map, we are now requesting that the City take over the blocks of W Green Street and W Seneca Street between Fulton Street and Meadow Street, so as to create continuous ownership of these roadways within the City. I would also now like to request that the City take over ownership of the traffic signals at the intersections of Taughannock Boulevard (SR 89) with State Street and Seneca Street (SR 79), as the City already owns these intersections, per the attached map.

If you agree with these recommendations, I ask that you endorse the attached resolution so that I can reengage with NYSDOT on this issue.
To: Ithaca City Common Council
From: Eric Hathaway, Transportation Engineer
Date: July 18, 2018
Re: Arterial Swap with NYSDOT

Per the attached memorandum from Director of Engineering, Tim Logue, to the Board of Public Works, I am requesting that Common Council endorse a trade of arterial ownership with the New York State Department of Transportation. Through this trade, or “jurisdictional realignment” (NYSDOT terminology), the City of Ithaca would give NYSDOT our right of way on Route 13 (essentially the Elmira Road segment) in exchange for the segments of Route 79 that the State owns in the central business district (Green and Seneca Streets, from the Tuning Fork west to Meadow Street).

I concur with all of Tim’s reasoning in the attached memorandum and would add that the street permitting process is another reason to pursue the jurisdictional realignment. After several years of significant construction projects along Green Street and Seneca Street, it is evident that temporary traffic control during construction projects has a significant impact on the traveling public. I believe that our staff is in a better position than NYSDOT to actively monitor such work zones and effect changes when needed. Now that the City is able to collect sidewalk and street closure fees (which do not apply to DOT owned streets), the permitting of such projects would not be an undue burden to oversee and would raise additional revenue for the financial calculations.

Also attached is a document outlining the NYSDOT process to perform a “jurisdictional realignment”. Due to the number of steps involved on NYSDOT’s part, I would assume this process could take some time. I look forward to discussing this further with you.

Finally, I have attached a fact sheet with information on the roadways and finances associated with this swap.
To: Board of Public Works  
From: Tim Logue, Transportation Engineer  
Date: February 3, 2015  
Re: Arterial Swap with NYSDOT

I am recommending that we begin the process to swap arterials with the New York State Department of Transportation. We've had some on and off again conversations about this topic over the past ten years, both within the City and with the NYSDOT, but I think it is time to move forward with the proposal. Before we move forward, we wanted to check in with the Board to see if you have any questions or concerns.

The proposal is to trade right-of-ways with NYSDOT. The City of Ithaca would give NYSDOT our right of way on Route 13 (essentially the Elmira Road segment) in exchange for the segments of Route 79 that the State owns (Green and Seneca Streets, from the Tuning Fork west, and the segment of West State Street between Fulton & Taughannock Blvd). NYSDOT has given us an official procedure for "jurisdictional realignment" that would cover the swap scenario, the first step of which is to have a formal submission to NYSDOT from the City. This formal submission must include a resolution from Common Council, but first there should be further discussions with the Regional Director about which segments exactly are under consideration.

In my opinion, the reasons why this swap would make sense to the City include:

- More control over streets in CBD and adjacent neighborhood as far as permitting, street or sidewalk design, coordinated signal timing, special events, building development, etc.
- Simplifies and clarifies ownership of Route 79 and Route 13 for staff and public alike
- Assuming DOT would want a maintenance agreement for Elmira Road, there would likely be little net impact on state transportation funding – CHIPS and arterial maintenance agreements

The only downsides to this proposal that I see are that the City would lose some control over access management and traffic control along Elmira Road, but this would be balanced with the increased control in the CBD. And, I think our
interests for the travelling public align with those of NYSDOT, so I don’t foresee conflicts about these types of decisions. If anything, NYSDOT may be able to bring additional resources to the corridor. Probably the larger downside is that the City would inherit more lane miles and traffic signals than we would be giving away. This means that over time, we would take on larger capital costs than we might otherwise see.

One recent event helps make this proposed swap more advantageous to the City. This past year Route 79, from Rt 13 east to I-81, was reclassified as a principle arterial, putting it on the National Highway System, and making it now eligible for funding from the National Highway Preservation Program (NHPP). Previously, the only roadway eligible to use NHPP funds was Route 13. This has proven especially restrictive locally since the last federal transportation legislation, MAP-21, reallocated funding such that approximately half of the available federal funding is now in the NHPP. I think this fact makes up for additional capital costs inherited by the City for the additional lane miles. With federal aid covering 80% of the costs, and state funding often covering an additional 15%, the ultimate City costs range from 20% to as low as 5% of the total project costs.

If the Board is interested in this proposal, staff will have a last conversation with the NYSDOT Regional Director, and then we will ask you to pass a resolution recommending to Common Council that the City and New York State pursue this “arterial swap” or “jurisdictional realignment.”
A comparison of arterials under consideration for exchange with NYSDOT

Physical Inventory

City-owned portion of Elmira Road (Route 13/34/96)

Length = 4,500 feet or 0.85 centerline miles.
At 60 ft wide = 270,000 s.f. or 30,000 s.y.
Two (2) lanes in each direction plus two-way center turn lane.
5 lanes over 4,500 feet = 22,500 lane feet or approximately 4.25 lane miles

A 2011 traffic count on Elmira Road showed an AADT = 17,000.

Four (4) traffic signals:
- Home Depot (ownership never transferred to City of Ithaca)
- Spencer Road
- Commercial Avenue
- Wal-Mart/Friendly’s (ownership never transferred to City of Ithaca)

One (1) non-signalized intersection at Southwest Park Drive.

Culvert for stream - Friendly’s/Honda to Wal-Mart parcel
Culvert for creek at U-Haul (343 Elmira Rd)/Midas (347 Elmira Rd)
Culvert at 371 Elmira Rd?

Pedestrian bridge over Route 13 at City/Town line.

State-owned portion of Green and Seneca streets (Route 79)
From, and including, Tuning Fork to Meadow Street

Length = 8,500 feet or 1.61 centerline miles.
At 40 ft wide = 340,000 s.f. or 37,778 s.y.
Two (2) lanes in each direction. Very short sections of 3 lanes in Tuning Fork.
4 lanes over 8,500 feet = 34,000 lane feet or approximately 6.45 lane miles

A 2010 traffic count on Green Street showed an AADT = 7,196 and for Seneca Street showed an AADT = 8,309. Total AADT = 15,505.
Nine (9) traffic signals:
- Green and Plain streets (flash mode/IFD pre-empt)
- Green and Albany streets
- Green and Cayuga streets
- Green and Tioga
- Tuning Fork system
- Seneca and Aurora
- Seneca and Tioga
- Seneca and Cayuga
- Seneca and Albany

Six (6) non-signalized intersections:
- Green and Corn
- Green and Fayette
- Green and Geneva
- Seneca and Geneva
- Seneca and Plain
- Seneca and Corn

There are no bridges or culverts in these segments.

Financial considerations for swap

CHIPs funding
For city, the swap yields 0.76 more centerline miles (1.12% of our existing 67.84 centerline miles) and 2.2 more lane miles (1.63% of our existing 134.88 lane miles)

In 2017, the City of Ithaca received $438,481 in CHIPs funding.

The City would likely receive about $4,300-$6,500 per year more with additional centerline and lane miles. For example, a 1% increase in CHIPs funding over our 2017 funding would be $4,300 per year; a 1.5% increase in CHIPs funding would be $6,500 per year. CHIPs funding has increased by $139,000 since 2007, or 26 percent.

Arterial Maintenance & Repair Agreement
Assuming NYSDOT wanted the City of Ithaca to enter into a maintenance agreement for Elmira Road and the square yards for Seneca and Green streets were deleted from the agreement:
Net 7,778 s.y., reduction @ $0.85/sy/yr = $6,611 less per year

However, we did change the terms of the agreement in regard to traffic signals. Each signal in the agreement is worth 195 sy x $0.85/sy = $165.75/yr. In the exchange, there is a net decrease of seven (7) signals (the two un-licensed signals can be licensed and annual maintenance payments would be made by the developer), so this would add $1,160.25 back into the agreement.

So the total annual reduction in arterial maintenance payments would be $5,450.75.

Other considerations

City completed project to mill and pave Elmira Road for approx. $280,000 in 2007.
The two city-owned signals (Commercial Ave & Spencer Rd) are in need of replacement at a cost of approx. $300,000. The other two signals have not been licensed yet.

8 of the 9 state-owned signals on Green & Seneca were built in 1988. The 9th signal (the Tuning Fork) was built in 2006. Though the poles and mast arms may last another 10 to 15 years, the signal controllers and cabinet would need to be replaced for this swap. NYSDOT would likely want (and we do not want) their 2070 equipment; the City would want to replace with NEMA equipment. The value of this trade out is on the order of $30,000 per signal, so approximately $270,000 in total.

NYSDOT has completed a project to mill & pave Green & Seneca streets between the Tuning Fork and Meadow Street in 2012. This work is valued at approximately $400,000.

Summary of Annual Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>+ for City</th>
<th>- for City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual CHIPS</td>
<td>$4,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Arterial Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td>- $5,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Annual Change</td>
<td>= approximately</td>
<td>- $1,150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By this accounting, the exchange is basically a fair trade for annual costs.
Capital Cost Comparison

For planning purposes, NYSDOT uses a figure of $1.68M/lane mile to estimate the cost for road reconstruction projects. This is for an urban section with curb, closed drainage, sidewalks and utilities. The construction costs for urban traffic signals are on the order of $100,000. Using these figures the capital value of these roadways would be:

Elmira Road = $7,340,000  Green & Seneca Street = $11,736,000

For preventative maintenance, NYSDOT uses $36,000/lane mile for a vender placed pavement type treatment and a $70,000/lane mile cost for a one course mill and pave. Adding one of each of these over a 40 year life adds:

Elmira Road = $480,000  Green & Seneca Street = $683,700

For a total cost of:

Elmira Road = $7,790,500  Green & Seneca Street = $12,419,700

A Capital Recovery Factor uses a discount rate (time value of money) and a useful life estimate to determine an annual amount that would be needed to replace the asset. For this analysis, it is assumed that the useful life of the pavement is 40 years. Using a 7% discount rate, the annual “cost” to own the roads would be about $580,000 for Elmira Road and $930,000 for Green/Seneca. Using a 4.5% discount rate (a little closer to our cost to borrow money), the annual “costs” would be about $425,000 for Elmira Road and $675,000 for Green/Seneca. In the former case, the difference is $350,000; in the latter, it is $250,000.

In the long run, owning Green & Seneca streets has a larger capital cost.

EAH
7/18/2018
I  PROCEDURE OVERVIEW

A. Jurisdictional realignment is defined as the equitable exchange of roadways between the State and a locality executed through legislation.

B. The purpose of this memorandum is to describe the process and provide guidance to Regions and the Main Office for reviewing jurisdictional realignment proposals.

C. The objective is to ensure a smooth transition of the transfer of New York State roadways between local and State ownership (maintenance and otherwise).

D. This MAP does not include discontinuance of state maintenance and/or abandonment or acquisition of portions of state highways covered by the Highway Law. For these, refer to MAP 7.9-2.

II  STEPS IN PROCEDURE

1. LOCALS/NYSDOT REGION

Formal Submission to NYSDOT

Proposals for jurisdictional realignment are limited to only those who own the road. They may come from the locality (county, city, town), the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) Regional Office or the NYSDOT Main Office. In all cases, the Regional Director (RD) is the point of contact with the locals for NYSDOT.

A. Preliminary Tasks - The proposing entity enters into discussions with all other jurisdictions involved in the transfer. Agreement is reached as to which sections of roads are to be transferred. The information required by the NYSDOT RD is obtained. It is at the RD's discretion to determine the scope and content of what is required. In addition, the Region will advise all localities that a resolution is required from all local jurisdictional governing bodies endorsing the exchange of the roads in question. The resolution must include a description of the roadway(s).

B. Justification - The proposing entity must include written justification for the realignment. Such justification should include the reasoning behind the proposal, descriptions and the length of the roadways in question. Also included are bridges on the roadways to be exchanged and how many, estimated traffic volume and the current roadway and bridge conditions of both systems to be exchanged.
In the event the Region is initiating the request, a formal proposal to the appropriate localities is submitted which includes the same information discussed above.

C. Submission to RD - The description and justification are forwarded from the originator of the proposal to the NYSDOT RD’s who have jurisdiction over the roadways in question. In the rare instance that the realignment involves two regions, the two RD’s should discuss and decide which one will have the lead for this process.

2. NYSDOT MAIN OFFICE - PLANNING & STRATEGY

Director of Planning & Strategy Provides Conceptual Approval

The Region submits the preliminary proposal to Main Office (MO) Planning & Strategy. Included in the submittal is a brief description of the proposal along with the RD’s recommendation. The Planning & Strategy Director reviews the proposal and provides conceptual approval. In the event that the proposal is not approved, Planning & Strategy informs the Region. It is the Region’s responsibility to inform the locality of the decision.

3. NYSDOT REGION

Regional Review of Jurisdictional Realignment Proposal

Upon review and conceptual approval of the proposal by MO Planning & Strategy, the NYSDOT Region is the lead NYSDOT organization to review the proposal. The Region acts as liaison not only with the local entity but also with the NYSDOT Main Office. The Region determines the proposal’s fairness and answers specific technical questions that may be raised by the proposal. The steps for Regional review are as follows:

A. RD Preliminary Review - The RD Office does a preliminary review to determine the soundness of the proposal. Upon concurrence of the Director of Planning & Strategy, the RD has the authority to determine if the Department should or should not advance the proposal. There are three determinations which can be made.

   - Rejected - If rejected on merits, the RD provides a notice of declination. It is at the RD’s discretion as to the level of formality in such a notice to the locality. However, for any formal proposal submitted by the locality to the Region which is rejected, the RD must inform the NYSDOT Main Office of the declination as part of its monthly report to the Commissioner.

   - Approved - If approved by RD with concurrence of MO Planning & Strategy, the proposal is distributed to the Regional group designated as lead coordinator (see Step B below).

   - A Counterproposal - The RD has the option to counter propose with an alternative proposal to the locality provided the alternative has the approval of Planning & Strategy.
B. **RD Assigns Regional Group as Lead Coordinator** - Traditionally, if the proposal is accepted, the Regional Planning Group coordinates the review of the proposal in the Region. However, the RD has the discretion to assign any group as the primary coordinator. There are two key responsibilities for the primary coordinator to determine. The first responsibility is to determine the appropriate units to review and solicit feedback from the proposal. The second obligation is to coordinate discussions on questions and issues raised by the Region with the jurisdictions involved in the transfer. The Regional groups involved in a review may include, but are not limited to:

- **Regional Planning Group** - The Group identifies the impact of the proposal to Regional operations. An analysis determining if the proposal serves as a logical link to the current State system of roadways is also performed. The question of the function of the facilities to be transferred is a key component of the analysis. Land use issues, a traffic volume comparison and, in partnership with the Regional Maintenance Group, a maintenance impact is all investigated. In addition, the current condition of the road and any cost and timing of when road repair will be needed is explored. The Group reviews potential Capital program implications. It also coordinates information with the MO Engineering Technical Services Group on National Highway System, STRAHNET and defense highway system to ensure compliance on clearance and connectivity requirements.

- **Traffic & Safety Group** - Provides feedback based on expertise. Examines issues such as High Accident Location (HAL), Priority Investigation Location (PIL), etc. on portions of roads to be exchanged.

- **Maintenance** - Maintenance estimates the incremental cost of maintaining new roads and the reduction in costs of not needing to maintain the roads to be transferred to the other entity. It identifies any need to strategically reorganize the Region residencies to maintain new roadways or if the transfers will result in greater efficiencies in maintenance operations. It also summarizes equipment management impact, etc. With the Regional Planning Group, Maintenance determines the current condition of the road and any cost, timing, etc. when road repair will be needed. Often repairs are done prior to the transfer of the roadway. Repairs of the roadway(s) and bridges may be part of the negotiation involving the RPPM in coordination with Maintenance.

- **Right of Way Mapping** - Right of Way Mapping provides a general description of the roadways and bridges to be exchanged. Mapping specifies the length of the roadway and illustrates all roads affected with a detailed map. The group determines what section of law the roadway is being exchanged under. It also identifies the specific start and end pieces of all roadways affected.

- **Real Estate** - Plays an advisory role in process. Real Estate is consulted for any unknown or ongoing real estate issues for the roads.
Jurisdictional Realignment Checklist

To facilitate jurisdictional realignment, included is a checklist of key components for the RD and Region to consider in advancing jurisdictional realignment.

- **Ground Rules** - Work out ground rules for the exchange early in the process. For example, exchange a similar quantity of lane miles that are in similar condition. Of course, the condition of a bridge will affect how to count it, so where possible, match those bridges in similar conditions. If such a match is not possible, find another means of making an equitable trade off with other sections of roadway.

- **Condition Ratings** - Provide information to local governments from the highway sufficiency files and condition ratings that help identify proper roads and streets for exchange. Often, Regional staff and local highway officials know these roads well. If not, drive the segments proposed for the exchange to become familiar with them.

- **Maintenance Costs** - Determine if the exchange reduces annualized maintenance costs and for whom. Also, determine if the exchange complements NYSDOT and local highway department operations.

- **Equitable Exchange** - Check the condition of the highway and bridges to be exchanged. Determine if the exchange includes highways and bridges in similar condition. Further, calculate if the exchange is fair and beneficial to the State and to the local governments.

- **Local Resolutions** - Request the county, town and village legislatures of the governments involved to pass resolutions authorizing the exchange.

- **Transfer Dates** - Establish a convenient date for the exchange to take place. Make sure to avoid a date in the middle of a construction (summer) or maintenance (winter) season. Remember to take into account the length of time needed to advance the proposal through the State Legislature and Governor’s Office. MO Governmental Affairs is available to assist in providing an estimate for such a transfer date if needed.

- **Regional Concurrency** - Make certain that all appropriate Regional program areas concur with the transfer prior to sending it to the MO for review.

- **Wait for Sponsorship** - Do not solicit sponsorship of the transfer from a State legislator until legislation is drafted and the MO has received authorization from the Governor’s Office to proceed.

- **Unique Roadways** - Ensure clearance and the connectivity requirements of the National Highway System, the Strategic Highway Network (STRAHNET) and the defense highway system. Impacts on these systems, if applicable, should be addressed.

- **Federal Aid Eligibility & Functional Classification** - Any change in the Federal aid and functional classification of the realignment should be noted as part of the application.

C. **Formal Recommendation from the Region to the MO** - Based on input from Regional groups to advance the proposal, the RD submits the proposal to the MO. Justification for its support must be included in the submittal to the MO. The proposal, which includes a summary of the analysis performed in the Region, is advanced to Planning & Strategy with a cc to the Chief of Staff.

If it is determined that the proposal is not to be approved, the RD follows the Step 3 of Section A under “rejected.”
Contents to Include for the Region’s Submittal

**Recommendation** - A proposal which correctly describes the highway portions to be exchanged is drafted. Included in this proposal should be:

- **Descriptions** - 1) Identification of the roads to be transferred using the official name of the roadways (NYS routes are identified in Article 12, 12-A or 12-B of the Highway Law) 2) touring route or common names of the road 3) the start and end points of the section of roadway to be transferred (e.g., Fleetwood Ave, the section of Route 812 between Main Street and Second Street, etc. in the town of x) 4) A layman’s characterization of the roads to be exchanged including location, mileage, along with the number of bridges 5) the condition of the roadway 6) an estimated current and future maintenance cost. Include the State Highway #'s of the state highways to be transferred. In addition, include any appropriate identifying numbers for local roads.

- **Agreements** - Any commitments to improve segments of roadway, prior to the takeover, should be identified. While there may be no such commitments, sometimes such improvements are negotiated particularly when a road to be transferred is in far better condition than a road to be received.

- **Jurisdiction** - The government(s) transferring and receiving each highway piece and the portions of the roadway each is to transfer or receive must be correctly specified.

- **Justification** - Justification for the transfer (e.g., improves the efficiency of maintenance forces, is more consistent with the function of the roadway, etc.) must be included.

- **Effective Date** - Include any preference for an effective transfer date of the roadways. This is usually based upon maintenance lead time requirements.

- **Maps** - Include maps clearly identifying highway segments to be transferred. The maps must include village streets if they are being exchanged. Note that county highways become village or city streets when they cross into an incorporated government. In such a case, the county does not have the authority to transfer them as the village needs to be involved in the transfer.

- **Resolution(s)** - Resolutions passed by each involved municipality correctly specifying the highway portions to be transferred away and/or received.

- **Fiscal Impact** - This would include both costs or benefits to the State and to the municipalities engaged in the transfer.

### 4. NYSDOT MAIN OFFICE - PLANNING & STRATEGY

**MO Review of Submittal** - MO Planning & Strategy has the lead coordination role for proposals in the MO. Prior to distribution in the MO, a review of the submittal is done to confirm it is complete.

**MO Distribution** - Once Planning & Strategy is satisfied that all appropriate information has been submitted by the Region and they have performed a precursory review, a formal distribution to Assistant Commissioners for review and feedback is undertaken.
5. **NYSDOT ASSISTANT COMMISSIONERS**

Policy-based review of the Proposal in the MO

It is important to note that the Region is responsible for the thorough review and primary analysis of the consequences of the proposal prior to its submittal to the MO. Regardless, the MO is responsible for considering statewide implications of the proposal.

Each Assistant Commissioner has the option of recommending or not recommending the proposal. No Assistant Commissioner, however, has the power to veto. Concerns should be identified in writing and all reviews must be transmitted to Planning & Strategy **within 15 business days** of receiving the proposal. In cases where the NYS Legislature is in session, Planning & Strategy may request a shorter review time.

A. **MO Reviewers** - The list below illustrates the key, but not all, NYSDOT Main Offices that may be involved in the review. Examples of possible review items include:

- Office of Budget & Finance - Verifies that the cost implications are accurate and complete. Assesses the impact on CHIPS allocations.
- Office of Operations - Reviews the operational implications of the realignment, verifies that the Region’s assessment is accurate and thorough, notes any statewide operational implications of the realignment.
- Planning & Strategy - Reviews any long and short term statewide or multi-regional consequences of the proposal, ascertains that the realignment is consistent with the functional class of the roadway, identifies potential connectivity concerns with other State roads and any mobility factors.
- Office of Engineering - A number of Divisions may be involved in the review of the proposal. They may include:
  - Traffic & Safety Division - for identification of potential HALs and PILs.
  - Environmental Analysis Bureau - for identification of potential hazardous waste vulnerabilities.
  - Governmental Affairs - Reviews the proposal for consistency with the Department’s mission and to ensure the proposal is complete. Notifies Planning & Strategy of any political machinations associated with the proposal.
  - Legal Affairs - Reviews the proposal for consistency with the Highway Law and other laws.

6. **NYSDOT MAIN OFFICE - PLANNING & STRATEGY**

Collection of Assistant Commissioner Feedback

A. **Nonconcurrence Resolution** - To address concerns expressed by the MO, Planning & Strategy coordinates resolution between the MO and the Region of outstanding issues and notes outstanding issues.
B. Strategic Review - Following the Assistant Commissioners' review, the Director of Planning & Strategy conducts a final review to ensure that all issues have been explored and questions have been addressed.

C. Executive Policy Committee Determination - The Director of Planning & Strategy determines if the proposal warrants advancement to the Executive Policy Committee (EPC). If EPC review is warranted, see Step 7. If it is determined that EPC review is not required, see Step 8.

7. NYSDOT MAIN OFFICE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE (EPC)

Final NYSDOT Approval

A. Final Review & Approval by the EPC - For jurisdictional realignment proposals approved by the Region and MO and required to be reviewed by the EPC, final approval on behalf of the Department is obtained here.

B. Notification to MO Governmental Affairs - Planning & Strategy informs MO Governmental Affairs and the Region upon the final decision of the EPC. If the proposal is not approved, Planning & Strategy will inform Governmental Affairs and the Region of the reason for nonconcurrence along with any other issues which the EPC raised.

If the proposal is not approved by the EPC, the Region informs the locality citing the specific impasses with the proposal. The correspondence must be copied to the Chief of Staff, Governmental Affairs and Planning & Strategy.

8. NYSDOT LEGAL AFFAIRS & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Preparing Legislation

A. Drafting Legislation - If the proposal is approved, Governmental Affairs and the Office of Legal Affairs draft legislation.

B. Share Draft with RD - Upon completion of this draft, the legislation drafted by Legal Affairs along with a support memorandum prepared by Governmental Affairs is shared with the RD for review and approval prior to advancing. The draft may also be shared with other Offices as warranted (Example: Engineering, Operations, Finance, etc.) and must be approved by Planning & Strategy.

C. Seek Legislative Sponsor - Governmental Affairs gets authorization from the Governor's Office to seek Assembly and Senate sponsors within whose jurisdiction the transfer occurs. In partnership, Governmental Affairs and the Region will seek out the sponsor. Governmental Affairs will be available to assist the sponsor in advancing the bill.
C. cont. If the bill is introduced, a Home Rule message may be needed by the localities. Such Home Rule messages are handled by the Legislative staff sponsoring the bill. The bill is then submitted for passage by the NYS Legislature and the Governor.

If the bill does not pass in the NYS Legislature or dies with the Governor, Governmental Affairs coordinates informing the MO and the Region.

9. NYS DOT MAIN OFFICE - GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

MO Distribution Following Passage by Legislature and Governor

Distribution of Legislation - When the bill becomes a law, Governmental Affairs notifies appropriate Regional and MO personnel. This includes MO Program Management Division, MO Operations, MO Structures, MO Mapping Group and Planning & Strategy. Also included are the following distributions:

- Executive Management - Commissioner, First Deputy Commissioner and Chief of Staff.
- Assistant Commissioners
- Regional RD's

10. NYS DOT MAIN OFFICE - OFFICE OF OPERATIONS

In partnership with the Region, an Official Order is drafted

A. Official Order - The Region is the originator of the Official Order draft (MAP 2.5-1-1, p. 11-13). Once a draft is completed, it is submitted to the Office of Operations who coordinate whatever review is warranted in the MO.

Following an Official Order signature by the Assistant Commissioner of Operations, Operations submits the Official Order to Business Services Bureau. The Business Services Bureau distributes to Executive Management, Assistant Commissioners, Regional Directors and the specific groups identified in Step B of this section.

B. Implementation of Legislation - Once the jurisdictional realignment becomes law and an Official Order is authorized by the Assistant Commissioner of Operations, there are a number procedures which must be implemented. These include:

- MO Technical Services Division - The Division updates the inventory of State roadways.
- MO Budget & Finance - Update any CHIPS - local highway mileage used for CHIPS formulae.
- Program Management Division - Informed of realignment as these changes could affect the data inputs/estimates used in the allocations (e.g. functional class, mileage).
B. cont.

- MO Structures - When ownership/maintenance responsibility for a bridge changes, information is recorded in the Bridge Inventory and Inspection System (BIIS) which is maintained by MO Structures.
- MO Mapping Group - Update mapping data as needed.

II. NYS DOT REGION

Final Implementation

A. Regional Director - The RD coordinates the transfer of the roadway in partnership with localities adhering to the date designated by law. The Region provides a copy of the legislation and notifies the locals/municipalities of the official date and confirms all maintenance agreements are in place. The RD makes any necessary adjustments to the Regions maintenance plans to ensure the newly acquired highway is maintained.

III RELATED AUTHORITATIVE SOURCES

Authoritative sources pertinent to the procedure:

Highway Law
Other NYS Agency Policy and Procedure Manuals
NYS DOT Official Orders
NYS DOT Manual of Administrative Procedures

IV ATTACHMENTS

Attached is a flow chart which outlines the process for NYS DOT Jurisdictional Realignment approval.
Portion of NYS Route 79 Owned by the State of New York Under Consideration for Exchange with City of Ithaca From Fulton Street to and including the Tuning Fork

Approximate Length of Arterial Under Consideration is 9,600 feet
Portion of NYS Route 13/34/96
Owned by the City of Ithaca

Approximate Length of City of Ithaca ROW on Route 13 is 5,200 feet

Approximate Limit of City of Ithaca Maintenance Jurisdiction (to South) and NYSDOT Maintenance Jurisdiction (to North)

NY State Plane, Central GRS 80 Datum
Map Source: Tompkins County Digital Planimetric Map 1991-2019
Data Source: City of Ithaca Department of Public Works, 2019
Map Prepared by: GIS Program, City of Ithaca, NY, March, 2019
3. Finance, Budget and Appropriations

WHEREAS, the City Engineering Department has identified grant funds available through Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), which would improve traffic signal operations through the use of advanced detection equipment and crowd-sourced travel information; and

WHEREAS, the City will submit a $700,000 grant application for said project, which would require a 20% city match, estimated at $150,000; and

WHEREAS, the majority of the City of Ithaca’s traffic signals are not able to respond to traffic demand from any users; and

WHEREAS, this operation leads to inefficiencies and frustration; and

WHEREAS, advanced signal detection equipment can improve traffic safety by better reacting to all modes of traffic; and

WHEREAS, along with already funded communications improvements, this technology would improve response time to traffic signal malfunctions; and

WHEREAS, crowd-sourced traffic data would greatly improve the quality and quantity of data that the City is able to use in prioritizing transportation infrastructure; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED, That Common Council hereby establishes Capital Project #867 Traffic Signal and Operations Improvement in the amount of $700,000, for the Federal Highway Administration’s “Accelerating Innovations Demonstration” grant to equip 30 traffic signals with advanced detection equipment and purchase one year of crowd-sourced traffic data; and be it further

RESOLVED, That this project be undertaken with the understanding that the final cost of the project to the City will be 20% of the total project costs, currently estimated at $150,000; and be it further

RESOLVED, That funds needed for said project shall be derived from the issuance of serial bonds; and be it further

RESOLVED, That said project funding shall be contingent on the approval of the FHWA grant.
To: Common Council  
From: Eric Hathaway, Transportation Engineer  
Date: April 3, 2019  
Re: Transportation Innovations Grant Proposal  

I have identified a grant available through the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) that I believe will enable the City to vastly improve traffic signal operations through the use of advanced detection equipment and crowd-sourced travel information. The grant is offered through their Accelerated Innovation Demonstration Program. The grant requires a 20 percent match from the local sponsor, which in this case I estimate to be $150,000.

**Signal Detection Equipment**

The existing signal system in the City of Ithaca is primarily a pre-timed system, meaning that traffic signals do not respond to traffic demand. I have found this to be inefficient, especially during off-peak times when demand on main and side streets is more equally balanced and unpredictable than during peak times. By adding advanced detection equipment to traffic signals primarily in the urban core, the traffic signals would be able to respond to demand changes from pedestrians, bicycles and automobiles.

I believe this change would improve safety and efficiency and significantly reduce idling. Detection equipment is now sophisticated enough to differentiate bicycles from automobiles and gives practitioners the opportunity to program traffic signals to respond appropriately to each mode. The detection equipment would also automatically count all modes of users to give us an accurate picture of mode share and how it varies throughout the year.

In coordination with a funded 2019 capital project that will allow the City traffic signals to communicate with each other, this technology would allow us to know, in real time, when a traffic signal loses power, or malfunctions. This knowledge would greatly reduce response times to these potential safety threats.

In addition, by reacting to changes in pedestrian, bicycle and automobile demand, I anticipate that delay for all of these modes will be significantly reduced.

**Crowd-Sourced Traffic Data**
It is now possible to analyze a robust set of transportation data for all modes by collecting crowd-sourced data. This data includes travel time and speed, volume of traffic, as well as origin-destination information. I propose that we would invest in one year of data from one of several companies that offer this service. This would allow the City to make more informed planning and engineering decisions. Not only will this give us a better sense of seasonal variation in traffic conditions through the City, but will provide information previously impossible to decipher.

For instance, this data can tell us what percentage of traffic entering the City on Route 13 is traveling through, versus traveling to points in downtown or other neighborhoods. It can also help us to quantify concerns that we hear from neighborhoods about cut-through traffic. It would allow us to analyze long-term speed evaluations at any time of year, which our existing equipment cannot do.

**Conclusion**

By investing $150,000, the City can receive $700,000 in traffic signal equipment and strategic data to inform our future decisions.
3. Finance, Budget and Appropriations

.5 Youth Bureau – Authorization to Apply for New York State Consolidated Funding Application Grant for Cass Park Rink Enclosure Project

WHEREAS, the Ithaca Youth Bureau would like to apply for the Environmental Protection Fund (EPF) Grant Program for Parks, Preservation and Heritage, Consolidated Funding Application (CFA) 2019, for the Cass Park Rink Enclosure Project on behalf of the City of Ithaca; and

WHEREAS, The Cass Park Rink serves as the hub of all Cass Park facilities and programs, serves thousands of Ithaca area residents on a year round basis, and is widely recognized as a valuable public asset; and

WHEREAS, the City has completed a series of Rink improvements as recommended in structural and operational reports to complete Phase 1 and Phase 2; Year 1 of the planned 3 Phase renovation project; and

WHEREAS, The Friends of the Ithaca Youth Bureau (FOIYB) has been actively fundraising in the community; and

WHEREAS the grant funds would enable the City to move forward with the help of FOIYB to complete Phase 2; Year 2 of the project which will enclose Cass Park Rink as recommended for optimal operations; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Director of the City of Ithaca Youth Bureau, is hereby authorized to file an application for funds in an amount not to exceed $500,000 for the Cass Park Rink Enclosure Project from the New York State CFA and, upon approval of said request, to enter into and execute a project agreement with the State for such financial assistance to the City of Ithaca for the Cass Park Rink Project; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That The City of Ithaca is authorized and directed to agree to the terms and conditions of the Master Contract with OPRHP for such Cass Park Rink Enclosure Project.
3. Finance, Budget and Appropriations

.6 Access Oversight Committee (AOC) Recommendations for 2020 Budget

WHEREAS, Section 15.12 of the Franchise Agreement of January 2003 between the City of Ithaca and the franchisee Time Warner Entertainment-Advance/Newhouse Partnership (TWC), subsequently assigned to Charter Communications, Inc. (d/b/a Spectrum Networks) after Charter's 2016 acquisition of TWC, requires the participating municipalities (City of Ithaca, Town of Ithaca, Village of Cayuga Heights) to provide the franchisee with an annual written budget for Public, Educational and Governmental access operations (PEG) by June 30 of each calendar year; and

WHEREAS, the City of Ithaca's Ordinance #2003-17, Par 18-4-G, requires the Access Oversight Committee (AOC) to provide the Participating Municipalities with a recommended annual budget by May 31 of each calendar year; and

WHEREAS, in 2017 it was resolved not to use the 2018 Budget funds but have them become part of the 2019 Budget; and

WHEREAS, in 2018 it was resolved not to use the 2019 Budget funds but have them become part of the 2020 Budget except for a contingency of $5,000.00; and

WHEREAS, the AOC has reviewed PEG’s current equipment and anticipates that only a limited amount of new or replacement equipment will be needed; and

WHEREAS, the AOC anticipates the replacement of computers and the current playback system in the next few years; and

WHEREAS, such purchases would exceed the available funds of one budget year; and

WHEREAS, at their regular meeting on April 2, 2019 the AOC recommended earmarking up to $10,000.00 as contingency to purchase equipment as needed for the functioning of PEG operations, and to let the remaining 2018, 2019 and 2020 Budget funds accumulate and become part of the 2021 Budget; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Common Council of the City of Ithaca accepts the AOC recommended budget for Spectrum TV’s 2020 annual budget for Public, Educational and Governmental access operations.
4. **City Administration, Human Resources and Policy**

**.1 YB - Amendment to Revocable License for Use of City Real Property between Ithaca Babe Ruth and the City of Ithaca**

WHEREAS, Ithaca Babe Ruth utilizes Union Field 8 at Cass Park to operate the Cal Ripken Youth Baseball program and currently licenses from the City certain storage spaces to support its public recreational activities in accordance with a revocable license agreement approved by Common Council on June 1, 2016; and

WHEREAS, the current shed at Union Field 8 provided by Babe Ruth is old, has sustained damage over the years, and is no longer weather or rodent proof; and

WHEREAS, the existence of this shed assists Ithaca Babe Ruth in offering quality affordable youth baseball opportunities to local youth; and

WHEREAS, Ithaca Babe Ruth is currently in an Agreement/Revocable License for Use of City Real Property that will be adjusted for the additional 36 square feet of shed space; and

WHEREAS, Ithaca Babe Ruth will provide a new 12’ x 12’ shed and remove the existing 9’ x 12’ shed at their own expense; and

WHEREAS, the Ithaca Youth Bureau, the Parks, Recreation, and Natural Resources Commission, and the Board of Public Works are supportive of this proposal, and the Superintendent of Public Works does not anticipate any conflicts in the near future with public works uses or needs; and

WHEREAS, City Code Chapter 170 “Use of City Real Property” vests in the Common Council sole authority to grant approval of any license to make non-transitory use of City parkland; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED, That Common Council finds that Ithaca Babe Ruth’s proposal to replace the existing shed continues to support the broader public recreational activities in Cass Park provided by Babe Ruth under the above-referenced Agreement/Revocable License for Use of City Real Property; and

RESOLVED, That Common Council hereby authorizes the Mayor, upon the advice of the City Attorney, to amend the license agreement to permit replacement the existing 9’ x 12’ shed with a 12’ x 12’ shed in the existing location at Union Field 8, including installation and maintenance thereof.
Date: March 6, 2019  
To: Jim D’Alterio  
Deputy Director, Ithaca Youth Bureau  
From: Jim Yaggie  
President, Ithaca Babe Ruth, Inc.  
Re: Proposal for F8 shed at Cass Park

Pursuant to the “Agreement/Revocable License for Use of City Real Property” dated April 11, 2017 between the Ithaca Babe Ruth League and the City of Ithaca, we are requesting further consideration for placement of a shed at Cass Park Field 8.

The objective of that agreement was to gain approval for a new shed (approximately 144 square feet) at Field 9. Since, we have added the structure and it has been a tremendous asset. We request that you consider the placement of a similar shed (12’x12’) at Field 8 to expand our ability to store & maintain equipment essential to our care & use of the fields. As part of this proposal, we would commit to removal of the old 9’x12’ shed and place the new shed in its footprint.

We understand that a new agreement for the proposed shed would alter the April 11, 2017 document and any related fees associated with the new square footage.

If you have any questions related to this proposal, please email me, directly, at jyaggie@att.net or call my cell at 858.349.8512.
City of Ithaca –

Parks, Recreation & Natural Resources Commission

March 12, 2019

To: Jim D’Alterio Deputy Director Ithaca Youth Bureau

And

Jim Yaggie, Ithaca Babe Ruth, Inc.

And

City of Ithaca Board of Public Works

From: Monika Roth, Chair, PRNR Commission

RE: Shed Agreement – license for use of City Property

The City of Ithaca Parks, Recreation and Natural Resources Commission met on Monday, March 11 2019. Jim D’Alterio brought the matter of this agreement to our attention for review and comment to BPW.

Our group discussed the agreement and are in support of the City moving forward with a license agreement between the City and Ithaca Babe Ruth that will enable them to build a 12x12 shed (similar to Field 8 shed) at Field 9 for storage of their sports supplies. We understand the group will cover the cost of this shed and any associated costs.

Our commission vote will be reflected in the official minutes of the meeting where our vote was unanimous in support of updating the agreement to allow for a new shed on Field 9. Debbie Swartz is the Administrative Assistant for our Commission should you want a recording of the vote take.

Thank you for your action on this request.
4. City Administration, Human Resources and Policy

.2 DPW - Request to Amend Roster

WHEREAS, the City of Ithaca Sidewalk Program’s 2019 Work Plan and Budget was passed by Common Council on November 7, 2018; and

WHEREAS, the Sidewalk Program Manager needs assistance for construction inspection duties, preparing engineering estimates, and preparing engineered drawings; and

WHEREAS, the cost analysis for extending an annual seasonal position to a full-time permanent position is marginal, and is a significant savings against hiring a consultant; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Personnel Roster of the Engineering Division of the Department of Public Works be amended as follows:

Add: One (1) Engineering Technician (40 hours)

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the above changes shall be funded from Account S5410—Sidewalk Assessment District.
To: City Administration Committee

From: Tim Logue, Director of Engineering
    Johnathan Licitra, Sidewalk Program Manager

Date: April 3, 2019

Re: Request to an Engineering Technician to the Personnel Roster

We have hired a seasonal Engineering Technician each year for the past five years of the Sidewalk Improvement District (SID) program, primarily focused on sidewalk inspections, investigating complaints, and inspecting sidewalk repair and construction. We have been lucky enough to have a returning seasonal employee a couple times, but rehiring and training a new person is an otherwise time-consuming process. As our work has grown, particularly with recent grant award successes such as Hector Street and South Aurora Street, we have come to the conclusion that there is plenty of work to do through the winter and it would be appropriate to convert the seasonal position to a permanent rostered position. We believe there are a number of reasons to create a perennial position:

1. Reduces the need for out-of-house costs associated with small topographic surveys and engineering drafting for sidewalk replacement or new construction
2. Having the same person year after year will increase familiarity with City of Ithaca and NYS DOT construction standards and DPW personnel – better coordination across DPW divisions
3. Efficiency in preserving institutional knowledge and procedures.
4. Hiring an out-of-house consultant for construction inspection is very expensive (on the order of $75,000 for 6 months), so it makes sense for us to do this in-house. Having the person on the roster eliminates the “winter furlough” and provides better continuity with planning and budgeting, designing, and bidding, and then heading into construction season.

Funding for this position has been budgeted within the 2019 SID Work Plan under the Construction Inspection/Engineering Technician line item. No additional funding is needed to bring this position on full-time.
1. Project Title, Description and Background

Give this project a title, describe how it came about, the purpose, and who is involved.

Shopping Cart Ordinance Update

Residents (particularly downtown) have identified abandoned shopping carts as a blight to neighborhood aesthetics, a hazard to the public, and an obstruction to pedestrian and vehicular traffic. City staff finds the current ordinance time-consuming and ineffective. We have proposed ordinances changes and received initial feedback from retailers. Council would like a well-researched and well-vetted recommendation for updates to the existing ordinance.

2. Project Deliverables

Please check off and describe below the exact deliverable(s) you are expecting from the Commission, and add details as needed.

- Research the topic and provide a summary report on your findings. Include any recommendations along with reasons for the recommendations. (Requires a vote of the commission)
- Review a program, process or legislation from Council and provide feedback on the pros and cons. Report back should indicate whether the commission supports the program, does not support the program, or is neutral, along with the reasons why. (Requires a vote of the commission)
- Arrange for a public presentation on the topic, gather feedback, solicit questions, and synthesize feedback in a findings report. (Vote of commission not required)

- Gather feedback from retailers on the proposed ordinance change
- Gather feedback from people most likely to take shopping carts and/or the organizations that work with them
- Propose a change in legislation (likely based off draft already presented to City Administration)
- Propose ways to mitigate the impact on populations who need ways to transport their groceries
3. City Staff Participation

Describe below the expectations of City Staff to support this work. List names of City Staff assigned to assist.

Jeanne Grace, the city forester, and her crew are responsible for picking up abandoned shopping carts when they’re unable to perform other work. Jeanne can provide insight into the shortcomings and issues with the current shopping cart ordinance and what her preferred solutions would be.

4. Resources/Materials

List below any existing materials or resources that should be reviewed by the Commission as part of their work.

Alderperson Nguyen presented a draft of a new shopping cart ordinance to the City Administration Committee, sent letters summarizing the changes to retailers known to have significant shopping cart inventories, and has feedback from two of those retailers. The Twitter account @ithacascenery documents abandoned shopping carts around the city.

5. Other Stakeholders or Community Partners

List below any other parties that should be included in the discussion or planning of this topic.

Ithaca Housing Authority operates Titus Towers, which houses one of the largest collections of shopping carts in Ithaca outside of a retailer. Their residents have a clear need for ways to transport their groceries.

6. Timeline and Milestones

Please complete the preferred dates for the following milestones. Please use the MONTH/YEAR format.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progress Report 1:</th>
<th>MONTH/YEAR</th>
<th>06/2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Progress Report 2:</td>
<td>MONTH/YEAR</td>
<td>08/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Input 1:</td>
<td>MONTH/YEAR</td>
<td>07/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Input 2:</td>
<td>MONTH/YEAR</td>
<td>08/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Deliverables Due:</td>
<td>MONTH/YEAR</td>
<td>Sep 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>