

Responses to Comments - Public Meeting #2

<b>Project:</b> Albany Hospital Area Traffic Study	
<b>Meeting Date:</b> Monday March 25, 2019	<b>Reviewer:</b> Various

Comment #	Comment	Response
<b>A. Aron Cepler</b>		
1	<p>I have not seen the documents from the meeting, as I was out of town, and they are still not posted, however, WAMC did have a story on this (although the figures they posted were quite poor in quality).</p> <p>Traffic circles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Are all three needed? Perhaps just Manning and Buckingham.</li> <li>-If circle is needed at Krumkill, the city will need to cut down many trees.</li> </ul> <p>Will the city commit to placing new trees at the new sidewalk?</p> <p>Without traffic circles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-New striping is welcome. Nobody knows how many lanes of traffic there are on New Scotland, and where it is permissible to park at the curb.</li> <li>-At Buckingham Drive, going towards NS, there is no clear indication of where the driver should stop to set off the sensor. Before the crosswalk? After the crosswalk?</li> </ul>	<p>The meeting summary from Public Meeting #2 can be found on the project website at <a href="https://hospitalareastudy.weebly.com/documents">https://hospitalareastudy.weebly.com/documents</a>. This is a traffic planning study that is evaluating various alternatives to address concerns raised in the area.</p> <p>Roundabouts were examined for this study as a means to address vehicle capacity concerns while providing traffic calming. Roundabouts would improve vehicle operations at all three intersections, with the biggest benefits at the New Scotland Avenue/S. Manning Boulevard and New Scotland Avenue/Krumkill Road intersections. There are no commitments to build any of them at this time.</p> <p>-Impacts to existing landscaping will be quantified if/when specific proposals move forward. The intent will be to avoid, minimize or mitigate any adverse impacts.</p> <p>Comment noted regarding striping.</p> <p>Drivers should always stop at the striped stop line or in advance of a crosswalk.</p>
2	<p>I was out of town during the most recent public meeting. Are the documents that were discussed at this week's meeting available online?</p> <p>Thanks, -Aron</p>	<p>Yes. See response to comment A1</p>

Comment #	Comment	Response
3	<p>Buckingham, driving east to New Scotland –it is unclear where to stop to set off the traffic light. If you pull too far forward, light will not change. My wife pushing my 13 month old daughter was nearly hit by a car at the crosswalk. If there was a solid white line, it would make it much safer. Congestion pricing to encourage people to use alternate routes?</p>	<p>See response to Comment A1. Striping alternatives considered as part of this study include stop lines.</p> <p>Congestion pricing is beyond the scope of this study. Some Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies will be discussed in the report, such as incentives to use transit.</p>
<b>B. Deborah Trupin</b>		
1	<p>I am writing to express my thoughts AGAINST the proposed circles on New Scotland. These are an inappropriate idea for the older, small scale, mostly residential, and pedestrian-friendly neighborhood. I hope you will not implement the proposed circles.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<b>C. Jim Geddis</b>		
1	<p>I commute through this stretch of New Scotland everyday on my way from the Helderberg neighborhood to Schenectady. My concern is that this stretch begins to resemble the area by Albany Med with tons of unsynchronized lights which leads to drivers gunning their engines and speeding to try to make the next light. I think it is very important to synchronize the lights on New Scotland in front of St. Peters (Manning and Allen). I also think that street parking should be prohibited in this stretch of New Scotland. This is often a choke point for traffic especially when someone is trying to turn into CVS after going through the Manning intersection. If there were no parked cars other cars would be able to safely maneuver around the car trying to turn. In addition to these parked cars causing a hindrance for the flow of traffic through this particular choke point they also create a very real hazard for pedestrians. Nearly every day I drive through this area I see pedestrians trying to cross the street in the middle of the road (not at a crosswalk) and often times come out of nowhere when they run into the road from in between the parked cars. This is very dangerous for pedestrians and drivers alike and I think limiting street parking in this area could mitigate this danger. Another issue with the Manning/New Scotland intersection is that when you are coming from the direction of 85 through the intersection toward Albany Med there are three lanes, one left hand turn, one straight, and one left turn only. Nearly once a week and just this morning I had someone fly down the right hand only lane and then go straight. This is extremely dangerous and I think any changes to this intersection should include an island that separates the straight only from the right hand only lanes to prevent this kind of dangerous driving.</p>	<p>Signal progression is already implemented on New Scotland Avenue. It is not possible to guarantee green signals for every driver in both directions along the length of the corridor.</p> <p>Enforcement can help address some of the unsafe driving behaviors mentioned, which has been referred to the City.</p> <p>Opportunities for new pavement markings, striping, and limits of parking are being considered for sections of New Scotland Avenue as part of this study. We do not anticipate significant changes to the parking in the section between Manning and Allen.</p>
<b>D. Debra Hartman</b>		

Comment #	Comment	Response
1	<p>I am unable to find the Traffic Study anywhere online. Can you please send me a link to the complete study? Thank you.</p> <p>I strongly object to the proposed roundabouts along the New Scotland Ave corridor.</p>	<p>Available materials are on the project website. See response to comment A1.</p> <p>The draft study is not completed yet and will be posted when complete.</p> <p>Comment noted regarding roundabouts.</p>

2

Roundabouts are extremely dangerous for pedestrians, and they do not afford a break in traffic flow allowing for side street traffic to enter New Scotland Avenue. Upgrading/installing traffic signal detection and coordination at the existing signals would be a safer alternative to costly and unneeded roundabouts.

Single-lane roundabouts are safer for pedestrians through a combination of factors:

- Reducing the crossing distances where the pedestrian is exposed to live traffic
- Reducing the associated time to cross live traffic
- Reducing vehicle travel speeds
- Reducing the number of conflict points between pedestrians and vehicles and limiting the direction of the conflicts to one.

Vehicles are required by law to yield to pedestrians within a crosswalk, regardless of the intersection type. At a traffic signal with pedestrian activated buttons, a pedestrian crossing on a walk signal is not completely shielded from traffic. At a traffic signal, a vehicle could conflict with a pedestrian in a crosswalk in the following ways:

- Running a red light
- By turning left at the signal or turning right-on-red into the pedestrian (both turn movements require a vehicle yield to a pedestrian in a crosswalk).

FHWA has documented roundabouts as a proven safety counter measure with a 78% reduction in all types of injury accidents as compared to signalized intersections. The FHWA Desktop Reference for Crash Reduction Factors cites an 89% reduction in pedestrian crashes. The Insurance institute of highway safety (IIHS): (<http://www.iihs.org/iihs/topics/t/roundabouts/qanda#roundabouts>) notes “Studies in Europe indicate that, on average, converting conventional intersections to roundabouts can reduce pedestrian crashes by about 75 percent. Single-lane roundabouts, in particular, have been reported to involve lower pedestrian crash rates than comparable intersections with traffic signals.

Crossing at multi-lane roundabouts can be more difficult and the benefits of two-lane roundabouts have been less clear. Walking Info.org - <http://www.walkinginfo.org/faqs/answer.cfm?id=3454> notes “Multi-lane roundabouts present some challenges to pedestrians, thus reducing the safety effects that roundabouts provide”. One study found that motorists failed to yield to pedestrians 2-3 times more at multi-lane roundabouts than at single-lane roundabouts. A recent IIHS study (2019) found that crash rates at two-lane roundabouts fall over time as drivers gain familiarity with them. The NYS DOT requires a roundabout at least be considered as part of any major intersection capacity improvement project.

The roundabouts considered on New Scotland Avenue are single-lane or a hybrid-configuration, not multi-lane like those found on Route 85. Pedestrian activated flashing beacons or raised crosswalks may be considered as a means to improve the pedestrian crossings should roundabouts be progressed. Additional education and engineering will be needed if roundabouts are progressed in the area.

The traffic signals on New Scotland Avenue currently have vehicle detection and pedestrian push buttons.

E. Fred Perkins

Comment #	Comment	Response
1	I've not attended any of the meetings pertaining to development of the St. Peter's corridor but do have concerns about the traffic: pedestrian, automobile, bus and bicycle. I live on Hackett. Recently moved from Woodlawn and the volume of traffic is high when workers are heading to St. Peter's and other employers both in the morning and in the evening. I am of course more concerned with traffic on New Scotland Ave with the proposal to build new apartments.	Comments noted. Traffic from the proposed apartments was accounted for in the alternatives analysis.
<b>F. Crystal Heshmat</b>		
1	I heard through the neighbors that a completely invalid "survey" is being used to force changes to the neighborhood. Even my remedial math students know better. So: when will you conduct a valid survey?	Public input was sought and considered in various forms. Opportunities have been and are being provided for public input including public meetings (2) with open house times and Question and Answer sessions, comment forms, group exercises, and the project website. An actual survey was not distributed. A "What is most Important to you" activity was conducted at the first public meeting to help guide the development of alternatives, and a group feedback activity was conducted at the second public meeting. The meeting summaries can be found on the project website. <a href="https://hospitalareastudy.weebly.com/documents">https://hospitalareastudy.weebly.com/documents</a> . A third public meeting is also scheduled for October 7, 2019.  All input is being considered as part of this traffic planning study.
2	Here's a simple comment: NO ROUNDABOUTS. If you must have roundabouts to handle increased traffic from apartments and other expansion, then NO APARTMENTS AND OTHER EXPANSION. It's that simple. Just say no.	Comment noted.
<b>G. Christine Kleinegger</b>		
1	There absolutely must be more public meetings and other methods to inform the New Scotland Ave. corridor residents about potential plans to alter traffic patterns. Very few people know that roundabouts have been considered for this dense residential neighborhood. The needs of Albany residents, pedestrians, and bikers need to be considered in any plan, certainly more than the suburban commuters who don't pay taxes, but use our roads.	The needs of Albany residents, pedestrians, and bikers are being considered in this planning study. As part of this study, there have been two public meetings where residents have had an opportunity to provide input. Further, this study documents all of the input received and considered through the project website and emails.
<b>H. Julie O'Connor</b>		

Comment #	Comment	Response
1	Put the materials from most recent meeting up on the web and make deadline for comments no less than 2 weeks from the date they go up on web.	Materials are on the website. See response to comment A1. A four week comment period was provided.
<b>I. Eileen Cusick</b>		
1	Please hold another traffic study meeting, and be sure that its time, place and whereabouts are known to everyone in the neighborhood. Please use all means of communication possible. (Phone, email, flyer, or an ad in the newspaper, or all of the above.) Thank you.	The public meetings were advertised through a City of Albany press release. A third public meeting is scheduled for October 7, 2019 to present the results of the draft report.
<b>J. Catina Mavodones</b>		
1	Unfortunately, for whatever reasons, your meetings have not been well publicized. You definitely need to hold additional meetings since this project affects many in the community. Also, you need to delineate the funding for this project since CHIPs funding is not available.	See response to comment I1.  This is a planning study intended to identify transportation problems and potential solutions in the study area. Funding sources will be identified as part of this study.
2	My belief was Albany was invested in walkability and smart growth. This project shows, once again, that this is not a priority for the traffic engineers. For a speaker to suggest that pedestrians judge the spacing of traffic gaps to cross a street is beyond ludicrous and points out the major problems of this plan.	The City of Albany is dedicated to Complete Streets which includes balancing the needs of users of all ages and abilities, including pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, and motorists.  Motorists must yield to pedestrians at marked crosswalks. Pedestrians should still watch traffic and use good judgement when crossing the street. Roundabouts have been proven to improve pedestrian and vehicular safety when implemented in other cities across the United States and in other countries. See response to comment D2 for additional resources and information. However, the City understands that what works for one place may not work for others. Engaging in dialog and soliciting opinions on improvements through public workshops and project websites is essential towards developing a workable solution.
<b>K. Maura McNulty</b>		
1	It's becoming clear that many, many people in the neighborhood were not aware that the meeting on New Scotland traffic was taking place. Lots of excellent questions have arisen since. Please hold another community meeting so that more neighborhood stakeholders can be involved.	See response to comment I1.
2	Please advise as to when the next community meeting is and what the next steps are in this process, so that we in the neighborhoods can continue to be involved on the process. Thanks!	See response to comment G1 and I1
3	We are wondering what the next stage in this process is. The community meeting this week was very informative, and it has seeded many other excellent questions among neighborhood stakeholders. Could you let me know where we go from here? Thanks.	See response to comment G1 and I1

Comment #	Comment	Response
4	<p>I believe I speak for many who live in the impacted neighborhoods and are very much opposed to the traffic circles you are proposing. These are our neighborhoods! We live, walk, and attend school and religious services here. We don't want the area turned into what amounts to a small highway that will be impossible to navigate on foot. We who live here have a tremendous financial and emotional investment in our neighborhoods, and after listening carefully to your proposal at yesterday's meeting, it seems very clear to me that traffic circles would drastically damage our quality of life. If, as a result, we chose to move to more commodious neighborhoods, I suspect we'd find our houses would sell for considerably less than they're worth right now, because who wants to live next to a traffic circle? Not me, and I'm guessing not you, either. Please put me firmly in the opposition column.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
5	<p>It seems pretty clear that the traffic circles would wreck the surrounding neighborhoods. Instead of walkable residential neighborhoods in which people could walk to school and houses of worship, we'd basically have a highway. The initial survey you took asked people to choose their top concern, but cities and the traffic in them are products of interlocking factors. Those who selected "traffic calming," for example, likely had pedestrian safety in mind. I think it would be worth doing a more careful survey, and perhaps a referendum, before spending millions of dollars on a project that will despoil neighborhoods whose residents are deeply committed to making Albany a livable city.</p>	<p>See response to comments D2, F1, and J1</p>
<b>L. Carla Hogan</b>		
1	<p>Where are the comments to the study that are referenced in your email of 3-29-19?</p>	<p>This document is the record of public comments received through 4/22/19.</p>
2	<p>Revert one-ways to two ways by Friebel. No roundabouts – a drastic action to address heavy traffic twice a day will impede pedestrian crossing on New Scotland from S. Manning to Buckingham. I have never seen a [pedestrian crossing at rotary. Maybe St. Peter's should stagger work hours? What about having St. Peter's using a parking and shuttle, that is the best option. Why further destroy our walkability to cater to people driving in and out of our neighborhoods.</p>	<p>Comments noted. See response to comments A3 and D2</p>
<b>M. Elana Stein</b>		

Comment #	Comment	Response
1	I'm concerned about the vast number of Albany residents, particularly residents within the area of the study, did not know about the survey and do not know anything about traffic and building changes being proposed. Can we please have another meeting in which residents and discuss the issues, their priorities, and their suggested solutions? Is there a way to announce these meetings more broadly? Maybe include social media?	See response to comment G1 and I1.
2	I strongly oppose the idea of adding traffic circles as a solution to traffic issues along this section of the city. The city has made significant poor choices in the past altering the character and potential character of the city forever. Empire state plaza which destroyed neighborhoods and caused urban sprawl. Loss of potential Hudson river waterfront to highways. Turning a BEAUTIFUL, WALKABLE, NEIGHBORHOOD into an extension of a highway is another horrible decision that will change the face of Albany forever. It would be detracting from charm and character that Albany residents pay high taxes to enjoy. The circles would cause the fastest mass exodus from Albany this city has seen in a long time. Thank you for your time.	Comment noted.
<b>N. Sue Swartz</b>		
1	As soon as possible can you please forward a copy of the methodology, including question text, sampling methodology, and findings from the survey conducted of neighborhood residents in conjunction with your traffic consultancy? I am a neighborhood homeowner. Thank you.	See response to Comment F1.
2	I walk on New Scotland Ave, Buckingham, and South Manning almost every day. I live in Albany ONLY because it offers sidewalks, unlike the suburbs. I pay very high taxes every year. We have the ability to live any place we want. We will leave Albany the minute my ability to walk in the neighborhood is diminished. This is not a threat, this is reality. It will be criminal if this neighborhood is turned into Route 85. It will be criminal if this neighborhood becomes simply a commuter route; it will gut the neighborhood.	Comment noted.
<b>O. Joel Nudi</b>		
1	At present, and especially at high-volume times, it can be difficult and unsafe to cross New Scotland Avenue at or near the entrance to Maria College. We would like to request a state-of-the-art crosswalk be included as part of the study recommendations to assist pedestrians to cross. Thank you.	The study will support improved pedestrian connections. The details of a new crosswalk at Maria College or other locations will require a specific application and engineering study/review.
<b>P. Mia Morosoff</b>		



Comment #	Comment	Response
1	I strongly object to the construction of roundabouts in the residential New Scotland neighborhood. They would worsen two of the factors mentioned- mobility and accessibility. Roundabouts can be useful on busy highways but I don't want New Scotland Avenue to lose its neighborhood character and become a busy unmanueverable and unwalkable highway.	Comment noted.  See response to comment D2 for some documentation on roundabouts.
2	Putting roundabouts on New Scotland Avenue in the hospital corridor would completely transform the nature of the area. First, I don't see where roundabouts could be constructed without doing away with buildings on the proposed corridors. I do not want New Scotland Avenue to become a highway. I like the walkability of my neighborhood and roundabouts would threaten that feature as well. I do think that some roundabouts in/near Albany work very well, while others are confusing. I do not think they belong in residential neighborhoods, even if book-ended by hospitals.	Although the roundabouts identified in the study would likely have impacts to private property, the preliminary concepts show no impacts to buildings.  See response to comment D2.
<b>Q. Melanie Greenspan</b>		
1	Hi. Restore everything back to the way it was prior to when the BLNA was formed. Four Way Stop at Ormond and Buckingham is fine. Thanks.	Comment noted.
<b>R. Robert Savo</b>		

Comment #	Comment	Response
1	<p>Dear Sir/Madam: I attended the meeting last night @ Mercy Auditorium and listened to the presentation for traffic pattern flow concepts. I am firmly against any type of roundabout and/or traffic circle remedy, despite the proclaimed +25% traffic volume improvement. I am highly skeptical such benefits can be realized, studies such as yours are often presented in a “reality vacuum” which never fully manifests itself until the installed project is opened. A clear insight into the lack of neighborhood understanding was evident when a question was raised as to how a pedestrian navigates a circle – “one must time the gaps” was the response. One must assume All pedestrians are 6’1”, in fine physical condition and have 20/20 vision. What about those who are handicapped and require scooters/wheelchairs and other devices? This is a Hospital Zone (Manning &amp; N. Scotland intersection). The entire study area is also populated with: retirees who go for walks; young families who are pushing the strollers; law, medical and nursing students; visitors to the hospitals. Not just for employees of St. Peter’s Hospital who want to access the parking lots and I-85 as quickly as possible @ 8:00 AM &amp; 3:30 PM each day. I have lived in this neighborhood for 30+ years and know the traffic perils first hand from a driver’s and pedestrian’s perspective. The #1 Rule for both is there are NO Rules of logical driver or pedestrian behavior. The current traffic light system with crosswalk signals are the best protection for the pedestrian. Leaving the entry and merging decisions to the driving public without mechanical control devices (as would be a traffic circle) returns us to displaying our worst driving behaviors. I’d like to see more compelling evidence and examples of successful, “Urban Installation Models”, where they were used, how they were envisioned, what were the upsides and downsides. A simple disclaimer – “studies show severe traffic accident events decline” is probably true, but is really short on specifics and overall outcomes. Other Serious Concerns – Loss of the Neighborhood Integrity; Impact on adjacent homeowners near the proposed circles; how various sized vehicles navigate the circles (tractor trailers, emergency apparatus, CDTA buses); snow removal challenges; responsibility for upkeep and maintenance; downstream traffic implications outside the “study boundaries”.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The City of Albany is dedicated to Complete Streets which includes balancing the needs of all users including pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, and motorists.</p> <p>See response to comments D2 for additional documentation and information about roundabouts in various urban environments.</p> <p>This study strives to develop a context- and neighborhood-sensitive solution. Feedback from the community is important to obtaining that goal.</p>
<b>S. Carol Reid</b>		
1	<p>As a resident of the Buckingham Lake neighborhood, I am opposed to roundabouts in densely populated residential areas with lots of pedestrians.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<b>T. Margaret McDonald</b>		

Comment #	Comment	Response
1	My name is Margaret McDonald I live at 188 Lenox Ave and I'd like to give my comment, seeing that I didn't know about the meeting tonight, regarding road plans but saw someone's comments on social media. I really do not like the idea of a traffic circle, they may work for some areas but I don't feel they are right for residential areas. It would make me leave this area for good.	Comment noted.
<b>U. Richard Magidson</b>		
1	I'd like to raise a neighborhood traffic-pedestrian issue that did not come up in the public comments but I believe is quite well known to those who drive or walk on Berkshire Blvd, between Daytona and Buckingham Pond. Between Daytona and Davis there are no sidewalks on Berkshire Blvd. but very heavy pedestrian traffic on this narrow two lane street. I drive and walk there myself and have serious concerns about everyone's safety, especially the children of all ages including those in strollers who must come face to face with all the vehicular traffic. We really need sidewalks there!	Comment noted.
<b>V. Bill Ottaway</b>		
1	As a regular bike commuter on New Scotland Ave., I want to make sure that bike safety is taken into consideration. A friend who just purchased a house on Euclid indicated that she was not planning to bike the 4 miles to work because she didn't feel safe.	All three striping alternatives presented for New Scotland Avenue would improve conditions for bicyclists.
<b>W. Lois Gordon</b>		
1	Lighting in front of this building [St. Peter's] needs improvement – if a pedestrian doesn't hit the lights at the crosswalks it can be difficult to see them.	Comment noted.
<b>X. Anonymous</b>		
1	One more idea: SPH provide incentive to employees to carpool or City – Park & Ride, Bicycles, Walk, Public Transportation	Comment noted. See response to comment A3.
<b>Y. Jordan Solano-Reed</b>		
1	Make Rt. 85 full access. Connect to grid. Add real buffered and protected bike lanes-New Scotland. Manning – no one parks on Manning! Improved CDTA access. BRT? Bump outs. Lower speed limits: 20 mph for residential. RRFB crosswalks with streetlights!	Comment noted.

<p>2</p>	<p>Please find attached (Attachment A) a modified version of the road diet recommendation for New Scotland Avenue. As we all heard at the last public meeting, our neighbors in the streets around New Scotland are concerned about the amount of traffic and safety in the area, and want to see facilities for bicycling and safer walking.</p> <p>With this in mind, I'd like to reinforce that AASHTO does not consider sharrows (shared-lanes) to be a form of safe bicycle facility, but simply a reminder to drivers to share the road. Additionally, AASHTO, NACTO, and even the NYS HDM do not recommend 15' travel lanes, which are wider than interstate highway lanes. I would like to recommend that no lane be wider than 12', and ideally most should be 11' along the corridor. Additionally, parking lanes that are not facilitating truck loading or unloading on a daily basis could be reduced to 7' from 8'.</p> <p>In the attachment, I have highlighted two alternatives that could supplement the existing recommendations. The NYS HDM allows for curbside bike lanes to be 4'9" in width and bike lanes away from a curb to be 4' in width. As such, I recommend pursuing a buffered bike lane with 4' 9" bike lanes and 1' 9" striped buffers. I have rendered this on page 2 of the document. This would provide a safer, more delineated bike lane than the recommended 6' lane, and it would help discourage illegal (or accidental) parking.</p> <p>On pages 1 and 3 of the attachment, I provide a different alternative: a cycle track of 4'+5', with a 3' buffer. This buffer could be supplemented with removable flexi-posts to further improve safety (as shown in the NYS Empire State Trail Design Guide). I recommend locating the bicycle track on the southwest side of New Scotland, which has fewer intersections and driveways than the northeast side. Creating a cycle track would fulfill the vision desired by this community: to have a safe dedicated space for bicycling. While buffered bike lanes would help achieve this vision, this opportunity to build a cycle track is a unique and special one. A cycle track would help indicate that Albany is interested in becoming a leader in progressive multi-modal transportation, and is a community that is safe for children and families. A cycle track also facilitates easier plowing in the winter months (wider than a standard plow blade of 7' 6"). Additionally, a cycle track could enable more people to consider alternatives to motor vehicle trips, which would help ease congestion and reduce traffic in our neighborhoods.</p> <p>Please note, while I have opted to render the bicycle lanes and cycle tracks with green paint in the attachment, this green paint is not essential, and is</p>	<p>These options will be documented in the Appendix of the Report. The final dimensions of a striping plan for New Scotland Avenue will be confirmed during design, and with further study.</p>
----------	---	---

Comment #	Comment	Response
	<p>only most highly recommended at intersections and driveways. However, bicycle traffic has a smaller impact on green paint than motor vehicle traffic generally has on striping, and accordingly green bike lane paint generally requires less maintenance. Green hash mark striping at intersections can also be placed to minimize wear-and-tear by placing markings out of the wheel paths of motor vehicles, thus reducing maintenance and increasing markings' lifespan.</p> <p>One final recommendation: I love the idea of the bump-outs (curb extensions) at the intersection with Lenox and Buckingham, and I'd like to recommend adding a bump-out (curb extension) at the intersection of Euclid and New Scotland. T-ing up this intersection could help improve vehicles' line-of-sight, reduce vehicle turning speeds, reduce the blind-spot for southwest-traveling Euclid traffic, and improve pedestrian safety.</p> <p>I hope these recommendations and comments are helpful. Thank you all for your hard work on this study, and please reach out if you have any questions.</p>	
<b>Z. Roxanne Lawrence</b>		
1	My husband and I are for all of the new apartment buildings on New Scotland. The old buildings should be torn down and our area should look more like the new buildings near Albany Medical Center.	Comment noted.
<b>AA. Aaron Corman</b>		
1	Hospital literally turns its back on neighborhood. I live one block from St. Peter's and must walk four to get there. Better timing at Krumkill-too long to wait turning onto New Scotland. More room for bicycles/road diet. Wider sidewalks, especially with all new commercial development (New Scotland Village) Traffic calming on side streets/used as cut through (Winnie St). Need a flashing crosswalk for all the foot traffic from hospital to Subway/Donuts. Even with the flashing lights from hospital to here, somebody still practically ran me over.	Comments noted.
2	Comprehensive look at S. Main – S. Manning traffic lights, cross streets. Need to look at new development proposal numbers, especially at Onderdonk.	The New Scotland Village Apartments are considered in the traffic forecasts for this study. Further review of the New Scotland Village Apartments will occur through the Planning Board and site plan review process.
3	Limit number of driveways exiting Maria College. Currently 3-4 driveways oppose each other and cause conflict	Development at Maria College will undergo a site plan review through the Planning Board.
4	Reduce/properly stripe New Scotland Ave. From Buckingham to S. Manning. Bike lane-East Lane-Turn Lane-West Lane-Bike Lane for calming purposes would be ideal.	Comment noted.
5	Calming, realignment, and no parking at bend/intersection with Euclid Avenue. Width of Euclid crosswalk is long.	Comment noted.

Comment #	Comment	Response
6	New Scotland, Lenox, Buckingham intersection is LONG in the New Scotland direction and the light/pedestrian signal is not properly timed. The pedestrian signal turns to walk when cars are still flying through the intersection. (Rework intersection)	The study recommends curb extensions at this intersection, which will include a signal timing evaluation.
7	Cars parked at Euclid on New Scotland cause sudden lane changes and accidents.	Comment noted.
8	Parking on New Scotland between Krumkill and Buckingham also causes lane changes and accidents.	Comment noted.
9	Divert some traffic to Whitehall? Come into St. Peters on Whitehall – S. Manning – to parking.	This happens already.
10	I like the stop sign at Freibel and think it has been somewhat effective. Should there be better enforcement, probably? Camera?	Comment noted.
11	One way crossing from Bender to Buckingham are odd. Maybe only a short term solution.	Comment noted.
12	Congestion from Halsey to Krumkill in AM.	Comment noted.
13	Commitment to complete streets, reduce city speed limit to 25 mph (unless otherwise noted). Traffic calming on side streets – painted flowers on street at intersection, speed humps, painted illusionary speed humps (like in Iceland). More traffic enforcement (I have been asking for this on Winnie St.) Bigger bump outs at Manning/New Scotland for safer pedestrian connectivity. Maybe permit parking right near hospital (within 3 blocks). Roundabouts – we have blind (her name is Ronnie) and old people around here. NO, not in the city.	The City is committed to complete streets. A reduction in speed limit below 30 mph is not recommended for the City of Albany as part of this study. Enforcement of existing speed limits is supported. Pavement markings must comply with the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD).
<b>BB. Jan McEneny</b>		
1	Traffic calming on New Scotland – 3 lanes with bike lanes. No street parking. No roundabout at Manning/New Scotland. Too confusing, not enough room. Backups at CVS. Yes roundabout at Buckingham/Euclid/New Scotland but cars exiting colonial, Holmesdale, Milner will never get out.	Comment noted.
2	Replace one way sign on Friebel to 1 way the other way. Keep one way on Tampa as it is. No raised islands on Friebel or Tampa.	Comment noted.
3	Increased need for police to monitor speeding and stop signs and driveways. Suggest that St. Peter’s develop shuttle parking at the old Picotte Building out New Scotland – incentives to staff to use shuttle.	Comment noted. See response to comment A3.
<b>CC. Judy Doesschate</b>		
1	Prefer turning lane and bike lanes. No parking on New Scotland. Yes-make onramp to Rte 85 clear its 2 lanes. Cement islands are dangerous. You need on ramp to 85 near cemetery. You could prevent cross traffic by allowing people to go over Buckingham. Fewer people would go down Buckingham to get to on ramp if you moved on ramp to near cemetery.	Comments noted.

Comment #	Comment	Response
<b>DD. Gail Pawlowski</b>		
1	I am absolutely against any roundabouts being added to my neighborhood! They cause more accidents, are difficult for pedestrians and cyclists to navigate. And it will ruin the look and feel of the neighborhood. And 3 in a row will only make it more difficult for residents to get in and out of the driveways.	See response to comment D2.  Increased accident rates do not typically occur with single lane roundabouts. While two lane roundabouts do have a history of increased accident numbers after construction, a recent IIHS study (2019) found that crashes at two-lane roundabouts fall over time as drivers gain familiarity with them. Roundabouts also result in less severe accidents by nearly eliminating the high angle, high speed (T-Bone) collisions that can occur at traditional intersections.
<b>EE. Elana Stein</b>		
1	Please do not add roundabouts!! You will change the neighborhood character of the city and make the city feel like a highway. A roundabout on Krumkill would be right in my backyard and would not help at all with the traffic coming off Krumkill onto New Scotland Ave. Albany is a city of neighborhoods, please keep that feeling to our city!	Comment noted.
<b>FF. Barbara Aronson</b>		
1	Friebel Drive 2 way again. No roundabout. Krumkill one way and Buckingham one way	Comments noted.
<b>GG. Maureen Boll</b>		
1	If you don't open Friebel to 2 way at least open Tampa in opposite direction with no left. This will help with the land lock situation for the two streets. Make a circle.	Comment noted.
2	Put a stop sign on Millner to cause breaks on Buckingham so people living on that street can actually get out.	A stop sign was previously installed on Millner and resulted in vehicles queues extending on Buckingham Drive to New Scotland Avenue.
3	Hospital parking with shuttle to keep traffic out of area = the old Blue Cross Building works.	See response to comment A3.
4	Roundabout move traffic faster – why would we want that.	Roundabouts increase vehicle capacity while reducing vehicle speeds. While vehicles traveling through a signalized intersection may travel at speeds of 30 mph or higher, design of roundabouts forces vehicles to slow down to 10-15 mph.
5	Did you make sure all residents got survey my mailing to all effected homes?	See response to comment F1.
6	Make Krumkill one way and Buckingham one-way opposite direction with all side streets 2-way.	Comment noted.
<b>HH. Steve Dominick</b>		

Comment #	Comment	Response
1	It is very difficult to exit Holmesdale because the traffic from New Scotland is non-stop. So in a roundabout the traffic would not pause at a red light to give us an opportunity to exit or enter from another direction.	There can be some gaps created on the downstream side of roundabouts depending on the flows at the roundabout.
<b>II. Terry Waltz</b>		
1	Why-specifically based on what monitoring and data- is the option to restore two-way travel on Friebel not included in this presentation? Much time was spent rejecting other options with data-but this option was simple ignored. The results of Meeting #1 should mean something.	Comments received at the first public meeting indicated a desire to examine traffic circulation in the Buckingham Neighborhood. Restoring Friebel to two-way travel is an alternative under consideration.
<b>JJ. Bob Martin</b>		
1	The roundabout proposal would negatively impact the ability of enter and exit to the properties near the rotaries.	There can be some gaps created on the downstream side of roundabouts depending on the flows at the roundabout.
2	Westbound traffic (Albany Med – St. Peter’s) floor it immediately past the New Scotland/S. Manning intersection.	Comment noted. Alternatives considered would calm traffic in this area.
3	Can’t we have even side or alternate side parking on New Scotland between S. Manning and Buckingham?	Parking alternatives are considered in this area.
<b>KK. Mark Harris</b>		
1	I like roundabouts but if there was one on Buckingham and New Scotland, when the traffic backs up on Buckingham it would block the flow of the roundabout.	Should a roundabout be pursued, further analysis would be conducted during design to ensure adequate operations.
<b>LL. Melanie Greenspan</b>		
1	Make Friebel 2-way-no restriction on turning on or off the street. No flashing lights and no neon green pedestrian signs. The neighborhood is nice and natural. Not interested in pedestrian safety changes. Never see people strolling around Buckingham. Roundabout does not allow breaks in the traffic for people to get in and out of side streets.	Comments noted.
<b>MM. Ira Lobel</b>		
1	Go back to the 2-way on Friebel and Tampa. It makes everyone a little disturbed by traffic. It spreads the traffic throughout the area. Now you have made it worse for Ormond, Friebel and Tampa. Not much you can do about traffic unless you close both hospitals and the colleges. Bike lanes and /or parking on New Scotland may slow traffic down, but not much. It is a long term problem that will not go away. Simply go back the way it was and use cops to slow traffic. Add couple speed bumps where necessary.	Comment noted.
<b>NN. Craig R. Waltz Jr.</b>		



Comment #	Comment	Response
1	The option to simply re-open traffic on Friebel Ave. to two-way traffic with the four-way stop at Buckingham should absolutely be an option for voting. It is the most cost efficient, achieves traffic calming and improves traffic control It eliminates the high-risk congestion which negatively impacts the ability of emergency vehicles to flow through that area. The options you did present are both inefficient, costly, and would not achieve any positive impact on the congestion problems caused by making Friebel one-way.	Comment noted. This option is being considered.
<b>OO. Matt Barendse</b>		
1	Roundabouts – YES! For peds and drivers. Definitely at Lenox, maybe at S. Manning, won't fit at Krumkill.	The preliminary concept shown indicates that a roundabout at the New Scotland Avenue/Krumkill Road intersection will fit with property impacts, but not building impacts.
2	Remove the bullnose on the end of Buckingham and allow true 2-way traffic. If speed is a concern consider speed tables.	This condition has been in place for decades. The concern is the removing the bullnose and making Buckingham Drive a true 2-way between Route 85 and New Scotland Avenue would negatively impact the neighborhood.
3	Stripe New Scotland as 3 lane abut use a grass median where side streets end.	Comment noted.
4	If no roundabout at S. Manning, make CVS parking entry/exit on Manning only. (Allow u-turns on Manning).	Comment noted.
<b>PP. Rosemary Johnson</b>		
1	A crosswalk is needed on New Scotland – halfway between Lenox/Buckingham and Manning. 25 mph speed limit unless otherwise noted. Pay more attention to pedestrians.	See response to comments O1 and AA13.
<b>QQ. Bernadette McSparron</b>		
1	I agree that we need a 4-way stop at the intersection of Friebel & Buckingham. This was not the intersection that backed up Buckingham- it was the short-lived 4 way stop more in the center of Buckingham. (Cannot remember which intersection.)	Comment noted.
2	I am skeptical of roundabouts at S. Manning & New Scotland. We all walk in our neighborhood – the safety of this intersection is of utmost importance.	See response to Comment D2.
3	Employees should shuttle employees into City. Employees should be encourage to use public transportation, walking, biking, and at very least carpooling.	See response to Comment A3.
<b>RR. Greg</b>		

Comment #	Comment	Response
1	The root of the issue is that too many people are driving cars. The city employers and developer need to work together to better manage demand and parking. A few ideas: Bonuses for employees carpooling, charging for parking by the day (see downtown Seattle employers), encouraging CDTA universal access arrangements for employers and developers.	See response to Comment A3.
<b>SS. Dianne Hornas</b>		
1	I don't feel this rotary 2 way is a good idea, causing a lot of problems. Traffic has to be solved and studied a lot more even putting in these new apartments is even going to put traffic in more jeopardy and hazardous for neighbors crossing. The 180 plus 90 units is way too much for New Scotland Ave to handle. Need to size it down, this is too horrific for a great neighborhood to endure. The shuttle buses for both hospitals would help at least a little. We need to reduce speed all over.	Comments noted. See response to comments A3 and AA1.
<b>TT. B. Brown</b>		
1	I do not feel the roundabouts are a solution for the city. Roundabouts do not support pedestrian or bikers. They work best for the most aggressive drivers. How will roundabouts support ambulances that need to come through those area safely and quickly? I think Friebel should go back to being a four way stop. To get to the park at Buckingham Pond I am forced to Buckingham Drive to get there. I used to go across Friebel. Off-site parking for hospitals with a shuttle bus.	See response to Comment D2.  Under the vehicle and traffic law, motorists must yield to emergency vehicles at a roundabout, just as they would at a traffic signal.  See response to Comment A3.
<b>UU. Holly Montgomery</b>		
1	More traffic speed enforcement on many streets, actual police presence, not just speed blink lights, improve striping, improve turning lanes at critical points like the CVS left turn going into town, hospital staggered times of shift changes or offsite parking with hospital shuttles in.	Comments noted.
<b>VV. Jeanne Rocke</b>		
1	Putting Friebel back to two way with 4-way stop sign. Also putting Tampa Ave. back to two-way traffic with a 3-way stop sign. The way it is now people do not come to a full stop at Friebel and stop on the gas so we cannot get out of Tampa to make the left turn toward New Scotland Ave. or alternate the one ways on Friebel and Tampa. St. Peter's, Albany Med, Pharmacy College and Maria College run shuttles from the Blue Cross Blue Shield parking lots.	Comment noted.  See response to comment A3.
<b>WW. Gregory Coons</b>		

Comment #	Comment	Response
1	<p>Roundabouts are far safer to me. I run and bike the neighborhood regularly, crossing at S. Manning and New Scotland is extremely dangerous due to traffic potentially coming in several directions. Prior to the roundabouts on Fuller Rd, I never used to ride my bike out to Colonie using Fuller due to the intersections of Fuller/Washington. Now with roundabout, I only have worry about one lane in one direction, at a time. It is a simple action every time. Please install roundabouts, the traffic moves much more efficiently and does not back up. Thank you.</p>	Comment noted.
2	<p>I am in support of the traffic circles. I find they are more efficient , and far safer than the current intersections. Whether I am walking , running, riding or driving, I am much more confident in traffic coming from one direction.</p> <p>I would also recommend a fourth circle at Whitehall. Residents on Crescent can utilize it, instead of making a dangerous left turn out of their street. I would also like to see the circle at S Manning be moved over towards the empty field. This would create space for parking for the residents along New Scotland.</p> <p>I would also like to see quality landscaping at the circles, along with LED pedestrian crossing signs. These items will make the circles usable, and blend into the neighborhood.</p> <p>I am also in support of dedicated cycling lanes, not sharrows. This will support alternative commuting solutions.</p>	Comment noted. Should the City pursue roundabouts in the future, further analysis, design and public involvement will be included.
<b>XX. Felton McLoughlin</b>		
1	<p>I vote for 2 lanes on New Scotland and ideally with bike lanes if the bike lanes do not prevent alternate side of the street parking. If they do, make the bike lanes to allow the homeowners on New Scotland to have parking on street in front of their houses.</p>	Comment noted.
<b>YY. Karina Ricker</b>		
1	<p>I think rotaries will take away our neighborhood. Don't like the options for lanes changes on N.S. Just need to fix the lack of lane lines from Manning to Buckingham. Shocked that pedestrian safety was not top of the list at this meeting (did not attend 1<sup>st</sup> meeting). We cannot curtail traffic on Buckingham or Krumkill. We need to slow it down. (Rotaries will do the opposite). Learned at my last driver safety class that pedestrians have the legal right of way at each intersection. We need bright cross walks at each intersection. Speed bumps (or fake ones- didn't know they existed!) 25 mph traffic enforcement, thank you.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>See response to comments J2 and AA13.</p>
<b>ZZ. Steven Cooper</b>		

Comment #	Comment	Response
1	I like the idea for three lanes for New Scotland. I believe it should be extended all the way to Buckingham. I love what you did on Madison. One additional thought-Cars going into Albany sometimes try to turn left into the CVS parking lot. This brings the intersection to a standstill. This should be prevented.	Comment noted.
<b>AAA. Barbara Brenner</b>		
1	Agree that Friebel returning to a 2 way street, with all-way stop at Buckingham Drive, must be considered as part of the overall solution.	Comment noted.
2	Reduce the speed limit on Buckingham and Krumkill.	See response to Comment AA13.
3	Traffic must be calmed with pedestrian considerations in mind.	Comment noted.
<b>BBB. Tim O' Sullivan</b>		
1	Roundabout do not belong in our residential area. Roundabouts keep constant flow of traffic. Such a flow will be a Danger to pedestrians and will make it impossible for cars to get out of the side streets onto Buckingham. Pedestrians cannot cross at roundabouts. Buckingham is "down flow" from the proposed roundabout. This will only hurt us more. We are taxpayers and should not be used as entrance ramp for commuters. NO ROUNDABOUTS!	See response to Comment D2.
<b>CCC. Louis-Jack Pozner</b>		
1	Why not have St. Peter's and AMCH stagger hours to reduce traffic flow?	See response to Comment A3.
<b>DDD. Suzanne Waltz</b>		
1	4-way stops at Friebel and Buckingham. This was no problem when this was a 4-way stop. This was "a favor" to certain political people (well-connected). Put this back! It's worse on Buckingham. PS Spend a lot of time on Western because of the WCA. Trust me "traffic calming "does not work.	Comment noted.
<b>EEE. Anonymous</b>		
1	Cannot cross street from traffic coming off Hackett around curve by Adams Apts. Need a stop sign on corner of Hackett and Whitehall on Hackett. Terrible from 3:45 pm to 6 pm. Get killed trying to cross traffic.	Comment noted.
<b>FFF. Lori Lasch</b>		
1	Yes make Friebel 2 way again. The City of Albany needs to decide if they want to identify as a walkable city or a city that caters to commutes and traffic. Our neighborhood votes walkable! Speed bumps on Buckingham will slow traffic.	The City is committed to Complete Streets, which includes balancing the needs of all users including commuters and walkable neighborhoods.
<b>GGG. Janet Dwyer Stitzman</b>		

Comment #	Comment	Response
1	<p>Roundabouts are inappropriate for this mostly residential stretch of New Scotland. Their very nature and presence will depress home values and discourage pedestrians. The estimate of \$20 million expenses would be better spent establishing park and ride lots outside of the city proper with buses or shuttles providing transportation. Either could be controlled by uber-lyft apps.</p> <p>I believe the intersections of Buckingham and 85 would be improved with a dedicated right turn ramp/lane.</p> <p>Restriping of New Scotland Avenue must include a left turn lane and should accommodate some parking and bicycle traffic Parking could be by permit for residents and repair vehicles (home repair). Also side streets should have alternate or limited time parking.</p> <p>Tampa and Friebel should be two-way with turn restriction signs at either end.</p> <p>The intersection of Lenox and Buckingham and New Scotland would be safer if curbing is extended into the turns as indicated to change the driving space and lane angles.</p>	<p>Comments noted. See response to Comments A3, D2,and AA13.</p>
<b>HHH. Sam Shipherd</b>		
1	<p>Thanks for soliciting feedback from users. As a pedestrian, cyclist, and motorist, I would like consideration for a dedicated bike lane. I do not want traffic circles as these are appropriate where you have pedestrians and cyclists. Great care and consideration should be given to the fact that there are many children in the neighborhood who could walk or bike to school but don't because of the cars. If traffic were calmed and there were bike lanes, more people would use their cars less. Thank you. -Sam</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<b>III. Barbara Nazarewicz</b>		
1	<p>Thank you so much for working on this area of the City. My husband bikes to AMC daily and I bike in the area occasionally, so we are particularly excited to see possible changes in the transportation modes accommodation along New Scotland.</p> <p>Our comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We would greatly appreciate dedicated bicycle lanes (not shared lanes) and traffic calming.</li> <li>2. We are not in favor of 2-lane or hybrid traffic circles.</li> <li>3. We like the "bump out" idea for the intersection of Lenox/Buckingham/New Scotland to reduce the speed of cars as they leave New Scotland and access Buckingham on route to Rt 85.</li> </ol>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<b>JJJ. Ellen Jabbur</b>		

Comment #	Comment	Response
1	I DO NOT SEE THE NEED FOR THE KRUMKILL ROUND-ABOUT .BUCKINGHAM COULD WORK .ALSO THERE IS NO STREET SIGN AT THE NEW SCOTLAND -BUCKINGHAM INTERSECTION	Currently the New Scotland Avenue/Krumkill Road intersection operates near or at capacity with motorists experiencing long delays during the peak hours. A roundabout at this intersection would increase capacity, reduce delays and address some of the concerns expressed during this study.
<b>KKK. William Myers</b>		
1	<p>Comment. The roundabouts I am most familiar with are those along Route 85 in Slingerlands and the one at the intersection of Krumkill and Schoolhouse roads. I am also familiar with roundabouts in other states. Universally, those with which I am familiar are in exclusively commercial areas or in open space areas.</p> <p>The proposed roundabout at New Scotland Avenue and Krumkill Road appears to be an unwelcome departure from those I cite. As a resident/owner of one of the four units in the Buckingham Mews segment known as Krumkill Court East, I question the wisdom of placing a roundabout in the middle of residential properties on both New Scotland and Krumkill Court East. Exiting our properties with the existing traffic light system can be challenging, but is do able. I am not at all sure that the proposed roundabout would permit reasonable egress without a light to stop traffic entering and leaving Krumkill.</p>	Comment noted.
<b>LLL. Laurie Gottheim</b>		
1	<p>The first thing that needs to happen in the Buckingham neighborhood is returning Friebel and Tampa to two-way streets. This will alleviate the problem of there being only one way into and one way out of the neighborhood. I have found that most of the city's concerns involve making things easier for commuters, completely ignoring the people who actually live in the neighborhood and are trying to leave their homes or return to them. Reassigning these street as two way will give residents options.</p>	<p>The City is committed to Complete Streets, which includes balancing the needs of all users. The Study's project objectives are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Determine best overall roadway system for all users to, from and through the area, while minimizing the negative effects of traffic in neighborhoods.</li> <li>• Involve the public and stakeholders in the study so that all project stakeholders understand the trade-offs and support development of the plan.</li> </ul>
<b>MMM. Ann McCullen Hess</b>		

Comment #	Comment	Response
1	<p>The Hospital Area Traffic Study did not take Ambulances, Polices Cars and Fire Trucks into consideration. I find it hard to believe safety was not there first priority.</p> <p>The safest way to get to the hospital from Rt85 would be to go straight down Buckingham Drive. The one way sign needs to be taken down. It makes as much sense as having a one way sign at Krumkill &amp; New Scotland. ( That would never go up)</p> <p>The speed needs to change to 25 the cars coming off Rt. 85 are still going 40 if we are lucky.</p> <p>On Washington Ave by the campus the city speed limit went from 40 to 30 and when you go 30 there the cars are passing you, it is the same on Bender/ Krumkill they want to go over the 30 and 15 speed limits. The curve by the cemetery does get them to slow down a little but not much. The traffic going down Buckingham would also help the Streets of Crescent Drive, Home Ave. and Berncliff. The traffic on New Scotland would be spaced out more so they could get out of there streets. They would only have the traffic from the 2 gas stations to contend with.</p> <p>It is difficult to cross Bender to Buckingham because of right on red the traffic does not slow down for pedestrians. Also on Krumkill &amp; New Scotland is hard for pedestrians to cross there as well due to right on red. If a traffic light is put on Buckingham and Friebe that would slow the cars down. The cars on the side streets could then get out.</p> <p>The stretch of New Scotland by Albany Med has 3 or 4 lights in that short strip. So one could go on Buckingham.</p> <p>If speed bumps are hard for the snow plows I think the roundabouts would be worse for them to plow. I can not see roundabouts in on a city street.</p> <p>New Scotland should go on a road diet just like Madison Ave did.</p> <p>The people who work at the hospitals St. Peter's, Albany Med. and the VA should be bused to work or take public transportation.</p> <p>NYS Employees who work at the Empire State Plaza are told to take the city bus or use a shuttle. I see the shuttle bus for Albany med going around the various buildings they have on Hackett BLVD.</p> <p>To get parking at ESP you have to be on a list for years. The old Blue Cross/Blue Shield building could be used for this since it is right off Rt. 85 it should not disrupt pedestrians living in the development by there.</p> <p>The 3 hospitals could split the expense and use the building for back office departments such as payroll billing etc.</p> <p>The City of Cohoes has some of the same problems with traffic by 787 going thru the city they have just now started making it a blvd to help the pedestrians and have the traffic slowed down.</p>	<p>Mobility for all users is being considered including ambulances, polices cars and fire trucks.</p> <p>See response to Comments A3, AA13, OO2, TT1.</p> <p>The concern is that making Buckingham and Krumkill one-way pairs between Route 85 and New Scotland Avenue would negatively impact the neighborhood.</p>

Comment #	Comment	Response
	<p>It shows people back in the 60's when these roads were put in did not think that this much traffic would happen but it has...</p> <p>The other thought I had is to have Buckingham one way from Rt 85 and Krumkill Rd one way from New Scotland to Rt 85, that way the 2 sides streets would not get the traffic trying to take a left since it would not be allowed. the 2 streets could have bike lanes and also enough room if an emergency vehicle did need to go on ether road there would be room for vehicles to pull over to let them by. It would also be easier for the pedestrians.</p> <p>I am sorry I was not able to get this to the traffic study group it said they are not taking any more comments. I did not hear the deadline to get back to them.</p>	
2	<p>Thank you again for doing this ! I think we have some good ideas from our neighbors.</p> <p>The bottom line for is to see the one way on Buckingham come down permanently .</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>See response to Comments OO2</p>
<b>NNN. Christine Zoltan</b>		
1	<p>I live on Marion Ave. This street is obviously used as a route to the hospital during rush hours. My number one concern is the outrageous speeding that occurs on Marion Ave. during the rush hour time periods. I am an early riser and observe each morning cars travelling close to 50 mph down Marion Ave to cut over to New Scotland. There are children in this neighborhood and school buses transporting children through here. I will be reporting this to law enforcement as well, but I thought it might be relevant to your traffic study. Thank you.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<b>OOO. Anonymous</b>		
1	<p>I live on Brookline Ave near Cortland. The city speed limit of 30 mph is too high for residential streets with parking on both sides and driveways every 20-30 feet. Please look at Boulder Colorado as an example of safer and better practices in residential areas such as speed limits of 20 mph, use of stop signs, not traffic lights, at intersections and creation of dead ends to deter commuters from cutting through neighborhoods.</p>	<p>See response to Comment AA13.</p>
<b>PPP. Linda Hunt</b>		



Comment #	Comment	Response
1	<p>I request that any consideration of roundabouts give high priority to the needs of numerous blind persons who utilize services and businesses in the hospital corridor. Various technical considerations impact the successful and safe use of roundabouts by blind persons and other pedestrians, including youth and elderly persons. Please reach out to persons who are blind, through appropriate and reasonable accommodations for our input. Most importantly, please do not begin construction on any roundabouts until there is a clear understanding of the problems they pose to blind persons and a specific plan presented with input considered from the blind and visually impaired community that complies with the ADA and other applicable laws, and which does not diminish our rights and opportunities to safe, effective and independent travel.</p>	<p>See response to Comment J2. Users of all abilities including sight impaired, will be considered in any design.</p>
<p>QQQ. Dan Sleasman</p>		

Comment #	Comment	Response
1	<p>Pedestrian safety and traffic calming are NOT the same thing please incorporate pedestrian safety engineering design and improvements along Buckingham Drive and New Scotland Ave. There have been vehicles on sidewalks and front lawns and near misses with pedestrians in this area many times. This is a busy pedestrian area residents are walking to and from bus stops, churches and parks every day all day long in this area. Buckingham Drive is classified as an arterial roadway because of its usage even though it is a narrow residential street not designed for this usage. The stop sign at Buckingham / Friebel / Ormond needs to stay. Additional crosswalks at each intersection on Buckingham with ample permanent easy to see signage need to be installed with maybe the most visible signs right at the first intersection on Buckingham at Holmes Dale. The crosswalk currently at Milner is dangerous as crossing from the pond side is directly behind a large old tree it should be moved to the far side of the intersection closer to 85 to avoid this. Simply put there are too many cars going too fast it is a recipe for a vehicle/pedestrian collision.</p> <p>As we noted during the last 3 meetings Buckingham Drive is not designed to be an arterial roadway and with the connection to the Route 85 interchange at the end of Buckingham this is the MAIN cause to the multitude of safety and quality of life problems here. I did not see or hear about anything at the last meeting that truly attempts to address this and you will be hearing about that at the next public meeting.</p> <p>Can you please as part of this study provide the residents here with a what if "Buckingham Drive is made local traffic only". Can Krumkill handle all the in and out at the 85 interchange? If not what can be done to expand Krumkill including the City purchasing residential property and vacant property on either side to widen and handle all the in and out? This might be a pie in the sky idea but certainly much less than a new interchange someplace else that you correctly state is impractical for a variety of reasons. Buckingham being the connection to 85 is a huge problem. The critical problem. It created the cut through issues and the need for the one ways. It creates the backups and the traffic and pedestrian safety issues. It has also ruined the neighborhood by creating a highway on ramp directly through it. This problem will only continue to worsen in the future with additional growth planned for the area.</p>	<p>Pedestrian safety recommendations are being incorporated into the study including treatments at existing crossings that are consistent with the NYSDOT Pedestrian Safety Action Plan. This includes pedestrian enhancements along Buckingham Drive.</p> <p>Restricting Buckingham Drive to local traffic only was one of four major alternatives presented at the second public meeting. The concept would impact property along Krumkill, and negatively affect access for residents along Bender, and is not considered practical at this time. The study is focusing on what can be done along existing facilities to improve safety and mobility for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists.</p>
<b>RRR. George Jenkins</b>		

Comment #	Comment	Response
1	Albany New Scotland Ave. proposal draws complaints reads the headline; if Ryan Janko Puts in 188 extra apartments there, he will totally destroy your expensive traffic study and room for growth. The entire neighborhood is in an uproar.	See response to Comment AA1.
<b>SSS. Rosemary Sheridan</b>		
1	<p>I am a resident on a street off Buckingham Drive and am responding to the proposals presented at the March 25 meeting, which I attended.</p> <p>I support the New Scotland Ave proposal for 3 lanes (1 a turning lane) with alternate-side of the street parking. I'm not totally clear about the proposal for putting "bumpers" at the New Scotland/Buckingham intersection but, as described at the meeting, it sounds like a possible way of slowing traffic there - as long as it does not inhibit right turns from Buckingham onto New Scotland Ave.</p> <p>However, I think it's a mistake to focus primarily on New Scotland Ave and only secondarily on Buckingham Drive. Quite a bit of the New Scotland Ave problem is because Buckingham Drive is the access to Route 85 - therefore, while New Scotland Ave gets a lot of traffic speeding along it, Buckingham Drive and its side streets bear the brunt of that traffic (both speeding and backed up) on its way to Route 85.</p> <p>I suggest more attention be placed on ways to alleviate the problems along Buckingham Drive. All but 2 of the streets off Buckingham are dead-ends; Buckingham Drive is our only access to the "rest of the world"!</p> <p>I think the proposal to make Tampa and Friebel each one-way in opposite directions is a positive one. However, that is a limited way of addressing the problems along Buckingham Drive.</p> <p>There are other ways to address those problems that would not cost vast investments of money or personnel. One would be "Do Not Block Side Road" signs at every side street along Buckingham - then have police enforcement every day for a couple of weeks after the signs' postings. A couple of speed bumps along Buckingham - with police enforcement for a couple of weeks - might also help. Either or both of these could be done almost immediately without waiting for completion of studies or outside grant money. Either or both of these suggestions would help those of us who cannot get out of our streets or find it difficult to walk and cross safely in our own neighborhood.</p> <p>I also support putting in a crosswalk in front of Maria College.</p>	Comments noted. The study is focused on New Scotland Ave and access to/from NY Route 85, which is where most of the traffic concerns have been expressed.
<b>TTT. Phil Hansen</b>		

Comment #	Comment	Response
1	<p>What's happening with Washington Avenue-Patroon Creek Corridor Study? I went to a meeting last spring and submitted comments twice via weebly. There was a meeting on November 8 that I couldn't attend, but nothing appears to have been posted following the meeting, and I've heard nothing since. Googling is to no avail. No public information appears to be readily accessible.</p>	<p>The Washington Avenue-Patroon Creek Corridor Study is complete. Information can be found at <a href="https://washingtonpatrooncorridor.weebly.com/">https://washingtonpatrooncorridor.weebly.com/</a> and <a href="http://www.cdtcmpo.org">www.cdtcmpo.org</a></p>
<b>UUU. Albany Bicycle Coalition</b>		
1	See Attachment B	Comments noted
<b>VVV. Andrew Neidhardt</b>		
1	<p>Attached please find testimony from Walkable Albany (Attachment C) that we hope will be useful in your study of the St. Peter's Hospital Area.</p>	<p>The complete streets approach of this study is consistent with many of the views of the Walkable Albany Testimony. The striping alternatives evaluated for New Scotland Avenue will slow traffic and make the area more pedestrian and bicycle friendly. The circulation options in the Buckingham area are intended to reduce the negative affects of traffic in neighborhoods.</p>
<b>WWW. Matthew Shore</b>		
1	See Attachment D	<p>Comments noted and suggestions are being considered. The final recommendations in this Traffic Planning study may be different, but the intent is to address traffic mobility concerns and neighborhood quality of life concerns, to the extent possible.</p>
<b>XXX. Pam Lavin</b>		

Comment #	Comment	Response
1	<p>Ann Hess and I were concerned that Bender St. and Krumkill Rd., two of the most heavily trafficked streets in the study area, were under represented at Public Information Meetings #1 and #2. To address this, we reached out to our neighbors and asked them to complete a short questionnaire that focuses on the main proposals that came out of the meetings and are most relevant to our area. I did not mention the Interchange options that were discussed in Meeting #2 in the questionnaire because I believe that they were rejected in Meeting #2 because of cost and space limitations. Copies of the cover letter and questionnaire/Summary of Responses that we sent to our neighbors are attached for your information.</p> <p>We contacted a total of 16 households which includes all of the occupied properties on both streets and excludes a vacant lot on Bender St. and a vacant house on Krumkill Rd. As of 4/20/2019, we received 5 responses from the 16 households. These responses are tabulated on the attached Summary of Responses. A summary of the hand-written comments that we received with them is also included on the attached Summary of Responses. All 5 of the respondents authorized us to share their responses and contact information with you. Therefore, I am copying them on this email and attaching copies of their responses for your reference in case you have questions.</p> <p>Thanks again for the opportunity to comment, and thanks to my neighbors for the time and thought that they put into completing their questionnaires.</p> <p>See Attachment E</p>	<p>Comments noted. The survey results are consistent with input by others regarding concerns about traffic speeds, volume and delays, and the need to protect neighborhoods from the negative effects of traffic.</p>
<b>YYY. Mary Beilby</b>		

Comment #	Comment	Response
1	<p>I attended traffic study meeting 2 and generally agree with the group decisions from the breakout activity. I particularly favor a shuttle bus or “park and ride” for commuters to the hospitals as well as a city-wide 25 mph speed limit. Do the hospitals charge employees a parking fee high enough to prompt them to seek other transportation?</p> <p>However, I find that the responses to questions regarding traffic flow on Friebel (where I live) and Tampa Av. are ambiguous and most participants are not familiar with the area. These questions should be directed to people living in the area alone.</p> <p>We experienced heavy traffic flows on Friebel and were told by a person conducting a traffic count that there were several thousand vehicles traveling on Friebel each work day. When Friebel was two-way, the majority of the north-bound traffic was headed for Rte. 85. We are now inconvenienced by the necessity of using Krumkill to access New Scotland Av and Buckingham to return home.</p> <p>We strenuously oppose returning Friebel Rd. to a two-way unless it includes some measure to prevent commuters from using Friebel as a short-cut to Rte 85. Signs have been pointed out as ineffective. Neither a “right turn only” sign nor an island forcing a right turn would benefit local residents who want to drive up Ormond. An island would narrow the street especially in winter. Enforcement is needed as I regularly experience violations such as the car that tore past my car and another stopped at Ormond and Freeway and ran the stop sign.</p> <p>Friebel is narrow with no curbs or storm sewers; there is a partial sidewalk on one side; and the road is not constructed for heavy traffic. Friebel’s pavement is breaking up and portions are under water after storms or snow-melts. It is badly in need of re-construction.</p> <p>I have not studied the Tampa Av. Situation but consider it very similar to Friebel its suitability to serve as a major traffic carrier.</p> <p>I notice that some neighborhoods have signs that say THIS IS OUR NEIGHBORHOOD, NOT YOUR SHORTCUT. These may or may not be effective.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	<p>Comments noted. See response to Comment AA13 regarding a speed limit reduction. Traffic Demand Management strategies (such as transit incentives) will be discussed in the study.</p>
<b>ZZZ. Phil Rowlands</b>		

Comment #	Comment	Response
1	I agree making Buckingham completely 2 way is the best answer, and you know we'll receive negative feedback from all those that live on that street. In regards to my solution, just last week the 4 acre parcel by the Jewish Community Center on Whitehall was listed for sale. It runs straight from I 87 to Whitehall. Great spot to flow traffic to/from the Hospitals. Just sayin.	Comments noted.
<b>AAAA. Margie Sheehan</b>		
1	When is the next Buckingham/New Scotland Avenue Area Traffic Study public meeting planned for?	The next public meeting is scheduled for October 7, 2019. See response to Comment I1.

N:\Projects\2018\118-084 Albany Hospital Area Traffic Study\documents\118084\_Comment Response\_20190723.docx