

**TOWN OF DRYDEN**  
**SPECIAL TOWN BOARD MEETING**  
**August 2, 2018**

Present: Supervisor Jason Leifer, Cl Daniel Lamb, Cl Linda Lavine,  
 Cl Kathrin Servoss, Cl Alice Green

The Town Board met to discuss alternatives for the Freese Road bridge and narrow down the number of options to move forward with. They had a very productive discussion about the 13 alternatives for the Freese Road Bridge, making some very important decisions to questions that Ben had provided.

From notes provided by Cl Servoss:

Future Maintenance Costs - Is the Town willing to consider additional future maintenance costs for certain elements that would not be maintained by the County?

- Traffic Signals - 4 out of 5 board members agreed to consider the options with traffic signals, though we would prefer not to have them.
- Pedestrian Bridge adjacent to Vehicular Bridge - The Board unanimously agreed to consider those options that would require the town to maintain a separate pedestrian bridge, either newly built or the existing truss bridge.
- Truss as a Facade - 2 Yes, 1 No, 2 would rather use the existing truss as a pedestrian bridge, but would consider the truss as a facade.

Funding - Martha Robertson (Tompkins County Legislature) confirmed that the County is committed to funding the required 5% local share for the project. The question was whether the Town was willing to pay any costs above and beyond that 5%. The Board unanimously agreed that the Town could provide funding not to exceed \$150,000 (the approximate cost of the 5% local match) in addition to the County funding. This decision eliminated alt. 10 & 12 due to estimated costs.

Traffic Signals - The Board agreed to consider the options that require traffic signals (the single lane options).

During the discussion, the following additional eliminations were made:

Alt. 1 - Null (obvious reasons)

Alt. 2 - Due to width of the bridge

Alt. 4 - This option would ultimately end up being a replacement, which is Alt. 11

Alt. 13 - The extent of ROW acquisition that would be needed is too extreme

The Board agreed that Alt. 7, 9 and 11 should definitely be on the list of possibilities. They will review and prioritize the remaining alternatives (3, 5, 6, and 8) individually at next week's board meeting with the intent is to eliminate three more alternatives.

The Board would like some additional information on the estimated future maintenance costs according the what elements the costs are for. (For example, Alt. 6 is a single lane, requiring a traffic signal, and has the truss as a facade. How much of the \$90k/10 years listed in the Future Maintenance Cost column is estimated for the signal and how much is for the truss?)

Alt. 8, 9, and 11 list 5' shoulders for pedestrian accommodations. The Board is concerned about pedestrian safety and would like these alternatives modified slightly so that a pedestrian

walkway is separated from the vehicular lanes by a barrier or guide railing of some sort. Cl Servoss suggested those alternatives consist of two 10' travel lanes, 2' shoulders on both sides of the travel lanes, then a 5-6' walkway with a barrier between the shoulder and the walkway (total of 30'). The engineer will be asked whether that is possible and what additional costs would be associated with this change.