**ERIE COUNTY LEGISLATURE**

**PATRICK B. BURKE**
*7th District Legislator*

92 Franklin Street, 4th Floor
Buffalo, New York 14202
**716/858-8878**
**FAX: 716/858-8818**

May 5, 2014

Hon. John J. Mills
Chairman of the Erie County Legislature
92 Franklin Street, Fourth Floor
Buffalo, NY 14202

Chairman Mills,

This year has been very hard on our highway system. The damage that we sustained this winter has once again highlighted not just the deteriorated condition of the County highways, but also the burdensome size of the County highway system as a whole. It has been recognized for many years, since as far back as the Gorski administration, that the County highway system contains many, many miles of local connecting roads and residential streets that should be returned to the municipal level.

I am writing to request that you form a special committee on County Highway Reform in accordance to the Rules of the Legislature to develop recommendations to the Department of Public Works, facilitate the necessary actions to reduce the waste, and develop a rational routing system for the County Highway System. Attached to this letter you will find a list of local roads currently in the County Highway System that were identified by the Department of Public Works in 2005 as potential roads to return to the municipal level. In addition, you will find a copy of the Excel Report created in 1994, twenty years ago this month. It is my hope that we can work together to resolve this costly issue, which has been an ongoing problem in Erie County for decades.

Sincerely,

Patrick Burke

Patrick B. Burke
Erie County Legislator, 7th District

**Website: www.erie.gov/legislature/district07 • E-Mail: Patrick.Burke@erie.gov**

# 2005 Potential Abandonment of County Roads to Various Towns

**Town of Alden**

| Road Number | Road Name | Centerline Miles | AADT | Roadway Classification | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 157 | Home Road | 0.67 | 500 | Local | |
| 267 | Buckwheat | 0.55 | 250 | Local | |
| 348 | Zoeller Road | 0.82 | 700 | Local | |
| | Total | 2.04 | | | |

**Town of Amherst**

| Road Number | Road Name | Centerline Miles | AADT | Roadway Classification | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 557 | Mill Street | 0.65 | | Local | |

**Town of Aurora**

| Road Number | Road Name | Centerline Miles | AADT | Roadway Classification | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 144 | West Falls | 1.89 | 500 | Local | |
| 541 | Boles Road | 1.60 | 360 | Local | |
| 378 | Gypsy Lane | 0.60 | 260 | Local | |
| | Total | 4.09 | | | |

**Town of Boston**

| Road Number | Road Name | Centerline Miles | AADT | Roadway Classification | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 401 | Ward Road | 0.27 | 390 | Local | |
| 439 | Omphalius Road | 2.60 | 830 | Local | |
| 444 | Patchin Road | | | Local | Not County Road |
| 481 | Zenner Road | 0.70 | 300 | Local | |
| | Total | 3.57 | | | |

**Town of Brant**

| Road Number | Road Name | Centerline Miles | AADT | Roadway Classification | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 492 | Hardpan Road | 1.45 | 100 | Local | |
| 546 | Mileblock Road | 4.00 | 300 | Local | |
| | Total | 5.45 | – | | |

**Town of Cheektowaga**

| Road Number | Road Name | Centerline Miles | AADT | Roadway Classification | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 319 | Rowley | 1.40 | 1,600 | Local | |
| 319 | Indian | 0.07 | 3,600 | Local | |
| | Total | 1.47 | | | |

# 2005 Potential Abandonment of County Roads to Various Towns

**Town of Clarence**

| Road Number | Road Name | Centerline Miles | AADT | Roadway Classification | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 280 | Newhouse | 0.90 | 3,900 | Local | |
| 281 | Conner Road | 0.88 | 1,300 | Local | |
| 283 | Heise Road | 1.90 | 1,300 | Local | |
| 285 | Keller Road | 3.95 | 500 | Local | |
| | Total | 7.63 | | | |

**Town of Colden**

| Road Number | Road Name | Centerline Miles | AADT | Roadway Classification | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 398 | Irish Road | 2.35 | 190 | Local | |
| 408 | Crump Road | 2.60 | 460 | Local | |
| 535 | Phillips Road | 1.60 | 170 | Local | |
| | Total | 6.55 | | | |

**Town of Collins**

| Road Number | Road Name | Centerline Miles | AADT | Roadway Classification | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 40 | Collins Center - Zoar Road | 1.35 | 600 | Local | |
| 498 | Quaker Street | 2.25 | 300 | Local | |
| 415 | Woodside | 2.40 | 200 | Local | |
| 450 | Ottenbecker | 0.75 | 200 | Local | |
| 452 | Konert | 1.75 | 400 | Local | |
| 453 | Becker | 3.85 | 150 | Local | |
| 454 | Wilson | 1.60 | 100 | Local | |
| 455 | Scrabble Hill Road | 0.75 | 50 | Local | |
| 456 | DuPont Road | 1.00 | 100 | Local | |
| 508 | Foster Road | 2.30 | 300 | Local | |
| 510 | West Becker Road | 3.05 | 200 | Local | |
| | Total | 21.05 | | | |

# 2005 Potential Abandonment of County Roads to Various Towns

**Town of Concord**

| Road Number | Road Name | Centerline Miles | AADT | Roadway Classification | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 62 | Cattaragus Road | 1.80 | 740 | Local | |
| 181 | Sharp Street | 6.40 | 1,000 | Local | |
| 399 | South Hill | 0.40 | 200 | Local | |
| 415 | Concord Road | 4.75 | 200 | Local | |
| 416 | Adams Road | 1.10 | 100 | Local | |
| 418 | Transit Line Road | 1.10 | 200 | Local | |
| 422 | Grote Road | 2.90 | 230 | Local | |
| 426 | Abbott Hill Road | 1.60 | 330 | Local | |
| 427 | Snyder Road | 1.40 | 100 | Local | |
| 428 | Drake Road | 1.35 | 200 | Local | |
| 433 | Morse Road | 2.35 | 200 | Local | |
| 434 | Wheeler Road | 0.25 | 50 | Local | |
| 435 | Spaudling | 0.40 | 100 | Local | |
| 519 | Fowlerville Road | 0.35 | 180 | Local | |
| 425 | Summit Road | 0.50 | 20 | Local | |
| 414 | Skyview Lane | 0.40 | 20 | Local | |
| | Total | 27.05 | | | |

**Town of Eden**

| Road Number | Road Name | Centerline Miles | AADT | Roadway Classification | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 475 | Bauer Road | 2.25 | 300 | Local | |
| 481 | Zenner Road | 0.78 | 300 | Local | |
| | Total | 3.03 | | | |

**Town of Elma**

| Road Number | Road Name | Centerline Miles | AADT | Roadway Classification | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 172 | Hemstreet | 1.12 | 680 | Local | |
| 325 | Main Street | 0.22 | 3,000 | Local | |
| 327 | N. Blossom Road | 1.50 | 1,600 | Local | |
| 333 | Hall Road | 2.50 | 560 | Local | |
| 334 | Creek Road | 1.50 | 590 | Local | |
| | Total | 6.84 | | | |

**Town of Evans**

| Road Number | Road Name | Centerline Miles | AADT | Roadway Classification | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 492 | Hardpan Road | 1.16 | 300 | Local | |

**Town of Grand Island**

| Road Number | Road Name | Centerline Miles | AADT | Roadway Classification | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 309 | Huth | 1.08 | 3,100 | Local | |

# 2005 Potential Abandonment of County Roads to Various Towns

**Town of Hamburg**

| Road Number | Road Name | Centerline Miles | AADT | Roadway Classification | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 466 | Heitz | 1.20 | 600 | Local | |

**Town of Holland**

| Road Number | Road Name | Centerline Miles | AADT | Roadway Classification | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 393 | Saunders Hill Road | 3.00 | 170 | Local | |
| 395 | East Holland Road | 3.10 | 400 | Local | |
| 530 | Church Street | 1.20 | 110 | Local | |
| 537 | North Protection | 0.40 | 160 | Local | |
| | Total | 7.70 | | | |

**Town of Lancaster**

| Road Number | Road Name | Centerline Miles | AADT | Roadway Classification | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 105 | Nichter Road | 0.80 | 1,100 | Local | |

add Lake Ave

**Town of Marilla**

| Road Number | Road Name | Centerline Miles | AADT | Roadway Classification | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 16 | East Avenue | 0.90 | 430 | Local | |
| 402 | Liberia | 2.80 | 1,620 | Local | |
| | Total | 3.70 | | | |

**Town of Newstead**

| Road Number | Road Name | Centerline Miles | AADT | Roadway Classification | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 254 | Greenbush Road | 0.55 | 400 | Local | |
| 255 | Swift Mills | 1.50 | 300 | Local | |
| 256 | Meahl Road | 2.30 | 400 | Local | |
| 257 | Fletcher Road | 2.20 | 200 | Local | |
| 262 | Hake Road | 1.15 | 850 | Local | |
| 264 | Dorsch Road | 1.70 | 270 | Local | |
| 265 | Steiner Road | 1.90 | 230 | Local | |
| 266 | Nice Road | 2.10 | 150 | Local | |
| | Total | 13.40 | | | |

**Town of North Collins**

| Road Number | Road Name | Centerline Miles | AADT | Roadway Classification | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 493 | School Street | 3.05 | 400 | Local | |
| 499 | Stearns Road | 0.75 | 50 | Local | |
| 502 | Main Street - Lawtons Road | 0.25 | 300 | Local | |
| 496 | Angling Road | 0.90 | 200 | Local | |
| | Total | 4.95 | | | |

# 2005 Potential Abandonment of County Roads to Various Towns

**Town of Orchard Park**

| Road Number | Road Name | Centerline Miles | AADT | Roadway Classification | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 463 | Duerr Road | 1.10 | 1,200 | Local | |
| 401 | Ward | 0.55 | 390 | Local | |
| | Total | 1.65 | | | |

**Town of Sardinia**

| Road Number | Road Name | Centerline Miles | AADT | Roadway Classification | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 403 | Miller Avenue | 2.55 | 230 | Local | |
| 406 | Matteson Corners Road | 3.85 | 40 | Local | |
| 407 | Pratham Road | 5.30 | 800 | Local | |
| | Total | 11.70 | | | |

**Town of Wales**

| Road Number | Road Name | Centerline Miles | AADT | Roadway Classification | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 388 | Fish Hill Road | 1.70 | 110 | Local | |
| 389 | Maple Hill Road | 1.60 | 140 | Local | |
| | Total | 3.30 | | | |

TOTAL 140.36 ℄ MILES

# *Excel Committee*
# *Final Report and Recommendations*
# *May 1994*

TO: Dennis T. Gorski, Erie County Executive

FROM: Excel Committee

DATE: April 28, 1994

RE: **FINAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

---

Erie County's roads and bridges are in rough shape. No one can argue that. Erie County's roads have been neglected for decades, no one can argue that fact either.

Erie County by far has the most roads to care for of any county in the state. Over the years, the system was turned into a disjointed, hodgepodge where the county is responsible for such things as dead end roads or a single block of a town road. Much of the situation dates back to the old Board of Supervisor days, where politics, and not reason, determined which roads became a county responsibility.

With a road having a typical lifespan of 20 years, some county roads date back to the 1930's and should have been replaced 40 years ago. Some bridges with a lifespan of 50 years, date back to the 1920's.

Compounding the problem is the increasing and crushing burden of state mandated programs on the county budget. In 1994, mandated programs comprise 73% of the budget. Because of that, money which should be used to fix roads and bridges is instead being eaten up to pay for mandated programs like medicaid.

Like the national debt, the county's roads problem has been worsening for decades, and like the debt, it is going to take strong medicine and a long time to cure. There are no quick fixes or easy answers.

We feel strongly that over a 15 year period, a dedicated source of funding, paid for by those who use the roads, combined with an increased commitment from the government, will go a long way in addressing a critical problem which has reached crisis proportions.

## Task

The increase in State mandated contributions to various social welfare programs has grown in a disproportionate amount to the income derived from the traditional sources of revenue for the County of Erie. In order to meet these State mandated expenditures and still provide a viable tax environment for the residents and business community within the County, the funding for the various non-mandated services as a proportion of the total County budget has been steadily reduced.

This gradual erosion of financial resources available has been particularly critical to the County Division of Highways where the resultant severe loss in purchasing power for construction materials has left them no option other than the "deferred maintenance" of many of the roads and bridges within the County highway system. While "deferred maintenance" can provide a temporary solution during periods of financial crisis, sooner or later the roads must be properly repaired. Unfortunately, the erosion of funding to repair/maintain the County's roads and bridges has continued, in many cases, beyond the 15 to 20 year life expectancy of normal roadway pavements. As a result, the condition of the County highway system has deteriorated to the point where a crisis condition exists.

New York State has developed a condition rating for highway pavement based upon a scale of 1 to 10 with 10 being "like new" condition and 1 so poor that need for closure to all traffic is indicated. Presently 888 miles or 76% of the roads owned and maintained by Erie County bear a condition rating of "6" or below and are in need of serious repair. Several are rated as low as 1 or 2.

The Excel Committee has been assigned the task of examining the County highway system, the operation of County Highway Division, and the present and proposed sources of funding in an effort to set forth viable recommendations to remedy to this situation. The following report contains a consensus of the conclusions and recommendations drawn by this committee.

## County Highway System

The present County highway system consists of approximately 1200 miles of highway. The highway milage owned and maintained by Erie county is far and away the largest number of miles of any county in New York State. It is more than 300 miles greater than the second place County and almost double of that in third place! The historic reason for the disproportionate number of highway miles which are owned and maintained by Erie County is blurred in actions which took place when the County was under the direction of a Board of Supervisors. Review of a map showing the highways presently owned and maintained by Erie County reveal many roads which simply never should have been designated as County roads in the first place. Examples include dead ends, low volume, residential streets, and adjacent, parallel roads. To remedy this situation and restore to the County a highway system which truly reflects the needs of the County as a whole, rather than the possible whim of some predecessor Town Supervisor, we make the following recommendations.

a. Establish a rational "County Road System". This system would include only those roads which serve the transportation needs of the County as a whole rather than the residents within a single street or small neighborhood. As such, the "County Road System" would define a grid type system of major connectors crossing the county and linking with the established State system of roads. Members of the Committee have carefully studied the existing county roads and recommend those roads shown in red on exhibit "A" be designated as "On System" roads with respect to the "County Road System". The roads shown in blue on Exhibit "B" would be designated as "Off System" roads.

b. To best utilize the limited financial resources available to the Erie County Department of Public Works it is recommended that first priority for repair, maintenance and upgrading be given to those roads defined as "On System" roads. Roads not defined as "On System" roads would receive repair and maintenance.

c. Provide the capital required to repair/upgrade designated "Off System" roads on a one time only basis should the local government entity desire to take back the road.

d. Establish a system of standard roadbed construction configurations based upon roadway use and traffic counts. Exhibit "C" contains roadway configurations A thru D. The County would repair/upgrade existing "Off System" roads to the appropriate standard based upon the following criteria:

| AADT | Road Class |
|---|---|
| Greater than 5000 | A |
| 1000 - 5000 | B |
| 500 - 1000 | C |
| 0 -500 | D |

e. For each "Off System" road, a budget would be established by the County Highway Division to repair/upgrade the road to the appropriate standard. Upon application for turnback, the local Town/Village could submit a request for direct funding from the County based upon the cost which the Town/Village establishes as appropriate assuming the work is done by their forces and/or outside contractors hired by the Town/Village. If the requested funds are within the established budget for that road, a one time only grant for the amount requested will be given directly to the Town/Village along with clear title to the road. If the request for funds exceeds the budget established for that road, then the County would repair/upgrade the road using its own forces and/or outside contractors and then turn the road back to the Town/Village.

NOTE: Exhibits A, B, and C are not included but are available at the Erie County DPW for review.

## The Highway Division

The Highway Division presently has approximately 350 employees. Based upon comparisons with other highway departments this appears to be approximately comparable on an employee per mile basis. It is not the goal of the committee to micro-manage the Division, but we are concerned that these people are utilized in the most efficient manner and to the fullest benefit of the County. Therefore, we are setting forth the following recommendations.

a. Create an accurate highway management system for the County. Put it in place and stick to it.

b. Prioritize a construction/maintenance schedule based upon real need (not political considerations).

c. Adopt standardized road building specifications which match actual road utilization. Insist upon adoption of compatible specifications among all town/village entities within County. (See item 1.d. above)

d. A need exists to assign someone who can to cure ROW problems. This will facilitate the turnback program and ease current jurisdictional problems with towns, utilities, etc.

e. Create a "Best Practices Advisory Panel" for long term oversight of the Erie County Highway Fund. It is recommended that the Erie County Highway Fund be guided by additional experts and advisors to maximize the efficient use of these funds, through a public/private sector group of interested and qualified persons. This group would be made up of one representative each from the County Highway Division, highway construction industry, highway consulting engineering profession, a county legislator, and a union representing the staff within the Highway Division. The emphasis of the advisory oversight would be on innovations and best practices in the use of the funds that will need to be stretched to accomplish the major highway improvement task at hand. This advisory group will be asked to assist in enhancing highway crew productivity, prioritizing new construction, recommending work process improvement, and the use of new materials and technologies in the repair, rebuilding, and maintenance of county highways.

## Funding

As stated above, a need exists to reverse the effects of many years of "deferred maintenance." In order to achieve this goal, revenue must be made available to fund the massive rebuilding program which is required to restore the county road/bridge system to an efficiently maintainable condition. The funding options available to achieve this goal are summarized in the "Funding Options" chart shown on the next page.

Of course, the past exercise of Option #1 (Do Nothing) is what created the problem in the first place.

The Committee studied the ramifications of Options 2 through 4. Each offer the advantage of not having to generate new revenues. However, as can be seen from the chart, each also carries disadvantages which could result in no remedy to the problem or simply shunts the problem to another area.

After thorough consideration, it is the consensus of the Committee that Option #5 provided the only positive solution to the problem. However, before the Committee would recommend any new source of revenue several basic tenets had to be met.

a. Any new (or increased) source(s) of revenue must be structured to provide for the least financial impact upon the taxpayers of Erie County.

b. Any new (or increased) source(s) of revenue must be coupled with a restoration (or partial restoration) of the percentage of funds derived from traditional General Fund and Capital Fund sources.

c. Any new (or increased) source(s) of revenue must be fully available for the 1995 construction season and of sufficient magnitude to provide a significant step in remedying the problem.

d. Absolute safeguards must be provided against any reduction in the General Fund and Capital Fund contribution to highway/bridge funds which would offset any proposed new (or increased) source(s) of revenue.

e. The Executive branch must release all funds budgeted for highway/bridge construction/maintenance in time for summer construction (early spring).

# FUNDING OPTIONS

| Option | Advantages | Disadvantages |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Do Nothing. | No new Revenues are needed. | Roads will continue to deteriorate. |
| 2. Wait until Federal and State Mandates are decreased making additional local revenue available for Highway use. | No new Revenues are needed. | It is possible that mandates will not be substantially decreased in the near future. Roads will continue to deteriorate until then. |
| 3. Use "contingency" funds in Erie County's Budget such as vacant positions etc. for Highway purposes. | No new Revenues are needed. | These "contingency" funds have been used to cover unforseen costs. If these funds are used for Highway purposes, it could drive the County into a deficit at the end of the year. |
| 4. Take funds from other non-mandated services such as parks, cultural, etc. | No new Revenues are needed. | This will further increase the already severe fiscal handicap that these other services are operating under. It might altogether eliminate the other services. |
| 5. Establish a new revenue source dedicated to Highway use. | County roads can be brought up to an acceptable level. | New fee is established. |



04-04-91 / REV 04/15/91

OPTIONS.DWG

f. Creation of an oversight committee as described in paragraph 2.e. to maximize the efficient use of these funds.

g. Any State funding to Erie County which has been traditionally earmarked for highway/bridge improvements must not be traded for funding of other projects.

To this end, the Committee has worked in close consort with Legislator Swanick and representatives of County Executive Gorski and the County Law Department to develop the draft law which is set forth as part of our recommendations. This draft law achieves the goals as stated above.

a. The Committee examined various possible sources of increased and/or new revenue, from increasing the property tax, to a gasoline tax, and the Committee selected imposing an annual fee of $5 per vehicle under 3500 lb. (cars) and $10 per vehicle over 3500 lb. (trucks and busses) as the least intrusive. Rather imposing a tax which bears no relationship to value derived, the proposed source of revenue is truly a users fee in which those entities which cause the greatest deterioration to the highway system and derive the greatest benefit pay the most.

This innovative source of revenue has already been successfully enacted by 6 other counties including Westchester and Schoharie Counties. Using present registration data it is expected this fee will produce approximately $3 million per year in new funds to be expended for highway renovations.

Additionally, the appropriate enabling legislation has already been passed in Albany making it possible for Erie County to begin to derive revenue almost immediately after enactment by the County. This will avoid losing yet another critical construction season, further exacerbating the already critical condition of our county road system. Several of the other counties have already begun their rebuilding program using this revenue source.

b. Augmenting the registration fee, the draft law provides for an increase in the in the county highway division capital program of approximately $2 million per year such that the net increase in highway division revenues above the 1993-94 "base" years is guaranteed to be $5 million for each of the 15 years the fee is proposed to be enacted. This capital program increase to be derived from the traditional fund sources. First priority will be given to the

use of unexpended budget line items for this portion of the funds. Every effort shall be made to provide these funds without raising taxes.

Yet further augmenting the proposed registration fee, is a provision whereby up to $500 thousand in any year which the county declares a budget surplus in excess of $3 million shall be directed toward the next annual county highway division capital budget with a cap of $1 million during the 15 year life of the proposed law.

These provisions,in effect, reverse the erosion of percentage of highway division funds which have been lost from traditional fund sources.

c. For each of the 15 years which the new fee is in effect, the net increase in revenue available to the Highway Division will be $5 million per year. The "15 Year Highway Program" chart shown on the next page, contains a comparison of highway milage and bridge projects with could be completed during this 15 year period with and without this additional funding. As one can see, using normally accepted per mile costs for various repairs, it is projected that for a 15 year "catch-up' program (including improving those roads identified in the "turnback' program), will provide for the repair of approximately 741 mi. of the 888 mi. of roads currently in listed as seriously deficient.

Of course, other roads and bridges will fall into disrepair during this period, but this "first step" will reverse the tide. Thus, through savings using new innovative technology such as micro-paving, and further financial augmentation through other possible additional sources of revenue such as future budget surpluses (as discussed above), unspent contingency funds, and revenues which may be freed up due to decreased Federal and State mandates (as discussed in the "Funding Options" chart), making it possible for the county highway system to be restored to a "normally maintained" condition.

d. The draft law contains absolute safeguards whereby the new and increased sources of funding are only made available if the average expenditure from county sources other than the funds provided by this law during the previous two years is maintained

# 15 YEAR HIGHWAY PROGRAM

## with and without Additional Funds

Total Miles of Deficient Roads = 888

| | Stone & Oil | Overlay | County Capital Road & Bridge Reconstruction | ISTEA Road & Bridge Reconstruction | County Town Road Giveback | Total Miles of Roads & # of Bridges | Total $ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Normal Yearly Program | $0<br>0 miles Rd. | $3,100,000<br>14 miles Rd. | $7,000,000<br>2 miles Rd.<br>3 Bridges | $3,000,000<br>1.3 miles Rd.<br>2 Bridges | $0<br>---<br>0 | 17.3 miles Rd.<br>5 Bridges | $13.1 M |
| Additional Annual Funds Program<br>(Reg. Fee + Add'l Co. Capital = 5m) | $1,000,000<br>100 miles Rd. | $3,000,000<br>13.5 miles Rd. | --- | --- | $1,000,000<br>5 miles Rd. | 118.5 miles Rd. | $5 M |
| Total Annual w/Add'l Funds | $1,000,000<br>100 miles Rd. | $6,100,000<br>27.5 miles Rd. | $7,000,000<br>2 miles Rd.<br>3 Bridges | $3,000,000<br>1.3 miles Rd.<br>2 Bridges | $1,000,000<br>5 miles Rd. | 135.8 miles Rd.<br>5 Bridges | $18.1 M |
| Total 15 Year Prog. w/out Add'l Funds * | 0<br>0 | $46,500,000<br>172 miles Rd. | $105,000,000<br>25 miles Rd.<br>39 Bridges | $45,000,000<br>16 miles Rd.<br>26 Bridges | $0<br>0 | 213 miles Rd.<br>65 Bridges | $196.5 M |
| Total 15 Year Prog. w/ Add'l Funds * | $15,000,000<br>300 miles Rd. | $91,500,000<br>338 miles Rd. | $105,000,000<br>25 miles Rd.<br>39 Bridges | $45,000,000<br>16 miles Rd.<br>26 Bridges | $15,000,000<br>62 miles Rd. | 741 miles Rd.<br>65 Bridges | $271.5 M |

* - No. of Miles of Road and No. of Bridges have been reduced for inflation using a factor of 0.82 (i = 3%, n = 15, S Factor = $\frac{1 + 0.64}{2}$ )

03-07-94 / REV. 03-18-94

9

Comm. 10E-16
Page 17 of 31

e. The draft law contains language which provides for the timely release of funds required for the summer construction season.

f. The proposed law contains provision for the creation of a "Best Practices Advisory Panel"

g. While not included in the proposed law, the Committee most strongly recommends that there be no county government initiated redirection of State funds traditionally earmarked for highway/bridge projects to other projects.

## Concluding Remarks

The above described recommendations should be viewed as a "Total System" whereby one provision augments the other. Enactment of the increased revenue sources without taking steps to streamline the existing unwieldy county system of roads through the "Turnback" program will eventually lead to the return of a crisis condition when these "town oriented" roads once again need maintenance.

Similarly, enactment of the streamlining practices recommended for the County Highway Division, including and most importantly, the "Best Practices Advisory Panel" will serve to assure that the roads/bridges will be repaired using sound highway system management practices.

The goal of the Committee was to produce recommendations which will remedy the present crisis condition of the county highway system. It took many years of "deferred maintenance" to create this problem and one cannot assume that any remedy will cure it overnight. Given the magnitude and cost of the problem, coupled with the already overburdened condition the taxpayers in Erie County, one must work within the realm of the possible, and provide innovative solutions with the greatest value for the least financial impact. The proposed county road system streamlining, proposed County Highway Division streamlining linked with the proposed new/increased funding sources represent what we believe to be a significant "first step" in reversing the long standing tide of deterioration within the county highway system.

However, we do not purport that the recommendations contained herein will do the whole job. More savings must be realized through the initiation of modern technology within the County Highway Department planning and construction practices. This task will, in large measure, lie with the "Best Practices Advisory Panel". Also, yet additional funds, as presently not identified, will have to be made available in the future to complete the job. Of course, this task will lie with both the Legislative and Executive branches of the county government through judicious allocation of the financial resources available.

Respectfully Submitted;

| | Voted |
|---|---|
| Ralph Abate, Chm. | yea |
| Joyce Baldi | yea |
| Marilynn Calhoun | yea |
| Herbert Darling | yea |
| Richard Garman | nay |
| Gary Hill | yea |
| John Orlando | yea |
| Henry E. Senefelder, Jr. | (Resigned due to health reasons) |
| Richard Smith | yea |
| Charles M. Swanick | yea |

# EXCEL DEDICATED FUNDING PROPOSAL

$3 M Registration Fee plus $2 M additional County Funds

* Dedicated Funding Source guarantees $75 M extra funds for Highway use over a 15 year period.

* Dedicated Highway Funding cannot be used to replace or reduce current County contributions to the Road Fund.

* Regardless of economic conditions, future Administrations and Legislatures must maintain level of County contribution to the Road Fund in order to avoid Dedicated Funding becoming null and void.

# 15 YEAR HIGHWAY PROGRAM

## with and without Additional Funds

Total Miles of Deficient Roads = 888

| | Stone & Oil | Overlay | County Capital Road & Bridge Reconstruction | ISTEA Road & Bridge Reconstruction | County Town Road Giveback | Total Miles of Roads & # of Bridges | Total $ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Normal Yearly Program | $0<br>0 miles Rd. | $3,100,000<br>14 miles Rd. | $7,000,000<br>2 miles Rd.<br>3 Bridges | $3,000,000<br>1.3 miles Rd.<br>2 Bridges | $0<br>---<br>0 | 17.3 miles Rd.<br>5 Bridges | $13.1 M |
| Additional Annual Funds Program<br>(Reg. Fee + Add'l Co. Capital = 5m) | $1,000,000<br>100 miles Rd. | $3,000,000<br>13.5 miles Rd. | --- | --- | $1,000,000<br>5 miles Rd. | 118.5 miles Rd. | $5 M |
| Total Annual w/Add'l Funds | $1,000,000<br>100 miles Rd. | $6,100,000<br>27.5 miles Rd. | $7,000,000<br>2 miles Rd.<br>3 Bridges | $3,000,000<br>1.3 miles Rd.<br>2 Bridges | $1,000,000<br>5 miles Rd. | 135.8 miles Rd.<br>5 Bridges | $18.1 M |
| Total 15 Year Prog. w/out Add'l Funds * | 0<br>0 | $46,500,000<br>172 miles Rd. | $105,000,000<br>25 miles Rd.<br>39 Bridges | $45,000,000<br>16 miles Rd.<br>26 Bridges | $0<br>0 | 213 miles Rd.<br>65 Bridges | $196.5 M |
| Total 15 Year Prog. w/ Add'l Funds * | $15,000,000<br>300 miles Rd. | $91,500,000<br>338 miles Rd. | $105,000,000<br>25 miles Rd.<br>39 Bridges | $45,000,000<br>16 miles Rd.<br>26 Bridges | $15,000,000<br>62 miles Rd. | 741 miles Rd.<br>65 Bridges | $271.5 M |

* - No. of Miles of Road and No. of Bridges have been reduced for inflation using a factor of 0.82 (i = 3%, n = 15, 5 factor = $\frac{1 + 0.64}{2}$ )

# FUNDING OPTIONS

| Option | Advantages | Disadvantages |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Do Nothing. | No new Revenues are needed. | Roads will continue to deteriorate. |
| 2. Wait until Federal and State Mandates are decreased making additional local revenue available for Highway use. | No new Revenues are needed. | It is possible that mandates will not be substantially decreased in the near future. Roads will continue to deteriorate until then. |
| 3. Use "contingency" funds in Erie County's Budget such as vacant positions etc. for Highway purposes. | No new Revenues are needed. | These "contingency" funds have been used to cover unforseen costs. If these funds are used for Highway purposes, it could drive the County into a deficit at the end of the year. |
| 4. Take funds from other non-mandated services such as parks, cultural, etc. | No new Revenues are needed. | This will further increase the already severe fiscal handicap that these other services are operating under. It might altogether eliminate the other services. |
| 5. Establish a new revenue source dedicated to Highway use. | County roads can be brought up to an acceptable level. | New fee is established. |

**Loffredo, John**

**From:** Sickler, Charles
**Sent:** Friday, June 02, 2006 2:40 PM
**To:** Hartman, James
**Cc:** Loffredo, John; Scibor, Wayne; Juncewicz, Annette; Dimmig, Carl
**Subject:** Road / Bridges / Culverts condition history

Jim, as a follow up to your question this morning and the 5/25/06 memo to you from the Commissioner I have found the following. In 2001 Maria Lehman (Commissioner) identified, in her report for the Co. Exec. to the House Subcommittee on Highway and Transit transportation needs, that Erie Co. would need $ 600 million to bring our roads, bridges and culverts up to good condition. In the period from 2001 to 2005 between our capital, CHIPS, Federal Aid, Transfer Tax and Tobacco funding we spent according to our records, spent $ 153 million. The Tobacco funds that are included in this amount accounts for approx. $ 35 to $ 40 million. This is just my quick run through on the numbers if you need more we would try to do additional research on Monday for you.
Charlie

# Erie County Department of Public Works
**Commissioner**

# MEMORANDUM

**To:** Joel A. Giambra, County Executive

**From:** John C. Loffredo, P.E., Commissioner of Public Works

**Date:** May 25, 2006

**Subject:** Roads/Bridges/Culverts Condition History

---

This memorandum is in response to your recent question regarding the history on the condition of our roads, bridges, and culverts in Erie County. You had asked that I look back over the recent history and provide you with a condition history report

Erie County roads are surveyed, inventoried and assessed as to condition every two years. This assessment is performed by the Greater Buffalo-Niagara Regional Transportation Council (GBNRTC). The pavement condition survey is based on visual scoring procedures developed and used by the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT). The surface condition rating reflects the extent of scaling, cracking, patching, raveling and faulting of the pavement. The ratings of these measures are made on a one to ten scale where one represents the poorest roadway condition and ten the best roadway condition.

The road scoring by the GBNRTC began in 2001 and is done every two years. Prior to 2001, we performed our own road scoring, but we have limited data. Erie County has a total of 1,180 centerline miles of roadway that we own and maintain.

A road with a score of 5 or less is considered to be in poor condition. The number of miles of road considered poor by year is noted below:

| YEAR | POOR CONDITION RATING | PERCENT OF TOTAL |
|---|---|---|
| 1994 | 480.0 miles | 40.7% |
| 2000 | 391.8 miles | 33.2% |
| 2005 | 219.5 miles | 18.6% |

Our bridges, which are structures greater than 20' in length, are inspected by the NYSDOT. We have a total of 277 of these bridges throughout the County. The bridges are inspected and rated every two years unless they have a condition rating less than three, posted for load or have an active structural flag, then they are inspected every year. The rating system for bridges is on a scale of one to seven, with one being a totally deteriorated or failed condition and seven being a new condition. A bridge with a condition rating of less than 4 is considered to have serious deterioration or not functioning as originally designed. Numerous elements of the bridge, including abutments, pedestals, bearings, wingwalls, approach items, sidewalks, railings, piers, superstructure and substructure items are evaluated and rated to arrive at an overall condition rating of a bridge.

The number of bridges considered to have serious deterioration or not functioning as designed by year, is noted below:

| YEAR | SERIOUS DETERIORATION CONDITION RATING <4 | PERCENT OF TOTAL |
|---|---|---|
| 1994 | 67 bridges | 24.2% |
| 2000 | 46 bridges | 16.6% |
| 2005 | 32 bridges | 11.6% |

Our culverts, which are structures less than 20' but greater than 5' in length, are inspected by our forces or our engineering consultants. We have a total of 437 culverts throughout the County. Culverts being of a much less complex nature, significantly smaller investment and generally representing less of safety hazard then bridges, are inspected on a less frequent basis. The inspection and evaluation of culverts follows procedures and guidelines established by the Federal Highway Administration and the NYSDOT in their Culvert Inspection Manuals. The rating system for scoring culverts is the same as for bridges with a one being totally deteriorated or failed condition and seven being a new condition. A culvert with a condition rating of less than 4 is considered to have serious deterioration or not functioning as originally designed. Numerous elements of the culverts, including approach roadway, waterways, end treatments/appurtenances, shape and type of culvert (metal, cast in place concrete, precast concrete, masonry) are evaluated and rated to arrive at an overall condition rating of a culvert.

The number of culverts considered to have serious deterioration or not functioning as designed by year, is noted below:

| YEAR | SERIOUS DETERIORATION CONDITION RATING <4 | PERCENT OF TOTAL CULVERTS |
|---|---|---|
| 1994 | 70 | 16.0% |
| 2002 | 68 | 15.5% |
| 2004 | 13 | 3.0% |

In summary, it is evident that we have made demonstrable progress in addressing and improving our infrastructure in recent years, but we still have serious needs which is why it is imperative that these efforts and funds continue into the future.

Please advise if you have any further questions or if we can be of any further assistance.

JCL/CAS:bjl
cc: Gerard J. Sentz, P.E.
Charles A. Sickler, P.E.
Wayne S. Scibor, P.E.
Carl P. Dimmig, P.E.
FILE: 2006-giambra-history-memo

Excell Committee Sept 16, 1993

PROPOSED "OFF SYSTEM" ROADS

(ELLIGABLE FOR TAKE-OVER BY TOWNS/VILLAGES)

| TOWN ROAD | ROAD SEGMENT | AADT | LENGTH (MILES) |
|---|---|---|---|
| WALES | | | |
| SCHANG RD | RT 78 TO COUNTY LINE | 90 | 3.10 |
| MAPLE HILL RD | FISH HILL TO WARNER HILL RD | 130 | 1.60 |
| FISH HILL RD | MAPLE HILL TO EAST CREEK | 110 | 1.70 |
| | | | 6.40 |
| MARILLA | | | |
| EASTWOOD RD | 354 TO EAST BLOOD | 400 | 2.20 |
| CAYUGA CREEEK | TOWN LINE TO 354 | 410 | 1.00 |
| EAST AVE | TWO ROD TO FOUR ROD | 820 | 0.90 |
| WILLISTON | TWO ROD RD TO COUNTY LINE | 550 | 3.55 |
| HEMSTREET | TOWN LINE TO PORTERVILLE | 820 | 0.40 |
| | | | 8.05 |
| ELMA | | | |
| STOLLE | 354 TO CREEK RD | 820 | 2.55 |
| CREEK RD | STOLLE TO JAMISON | 590 | 1.50 |
| HEMSTREET | JAMISON TO TOWN LNE | 820 | 1.00 |
| N BLOSSOM | BULLIS TO SENECA CREEK | 1590 | 1.15 |
| WINSPEAR | BULLIS TO CLINTON(354) | 420 | 1.50 |
| POUND | BULLIS TO SENECA | 1140 | 1.25 |
| AURORA ST | TOWN LINE TO CLINTON(354) | 3310 | 0.40 |
| NORTH DAVIS RD | SENECA TO TOWN LINE | 650 | 2.75 |
| | | | 12.10 |
| LANCASTER | | | |
| PENORA | LOSSON TO BROADWAY | 5500 | 1.40 |
| AURORA ST | COMO PARK BLVD TO TOWN LINE | 4190 | 1.90 |
| LAKE | WILLIAM TO VILLAGE LINE | 1640 | 0.30 |
| NICHTER | PAVEMENT TO CEMETARY | 1020 | 0.80 |
| CENTRAL | WALDEN TO CONRAIL TRACKS | 13400 | 0.20 |
| | | | 4.60 |
| AURORA | | | |
| GYPSY LANE | KNOX TO 20A | 240 | 0.60 |
| GROVER | FALLS TO JEWITT-HOLMWOOD | 300 | 4.35 |
| WEST FALLS | FALLS TO MILL | 1470 | 1.90 |
| FALLS | RT 240 TO BOISES RD | 540 | 3.25 |
| BOISES RD | FALLS TO EMERY (ADD TO COLDEN) | 360 | 1.60 |
| EMERY RD | BOISES TO CENTER ST | 750 | 0.75 |
| NORTH DAVIS RD | TOWN LINE TO WILLARDSHIRE | 650 | 0.25 |
| | | | 12.70 |
| ORCHARD PARK | | | |
| SCHERRF | RT 240 TO WARD | 600 | 2.70 |
| WARD | SCHREFF TO COLE RD | 390 | 0.50 |
| DUERR | ARMOR-DULLES TO THORN | 1230 | 1.10 |
| THORN | DUERR TO RT 277 | 1988 | 0.70 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| TAYLOR | RT 20 TO RT 277 | 1360 | 2.00 |
| | | | 7.00 |
| WEST SENECA | | | |
| INDIAN CHURCH | CITY LINE TO MINERAL SPRINGS | 8100 | 2.34 |
| EAST AND WEST | RT 277 TO LEYDECKER | 5900 | 3.27 |
| LEYDECKER | EAST AND WEST TO RT 20 | 2500 | 0.62 |
| | | | 6.23 |
| CHEEKTOWAGA | | | |
| ROWLEY | INDIAN TO BORDEN | 2080 | 1.40 |
| INDIAN | ROWLEY TO COMO PARK | 3560 | 0.07 |
| BENNETT | RT 277 TO COMO PARK | 7800 | 0.75 |
| GEORGE URBAN | RT 33 TO RT 78 | 2600 | 4.88 |
| AERO | SUGG TO RT 78 | 6340 | 1.10 |
| | | | 8.20 |
| TONAWNDA | | | |
| CREEKSIDE | TONA CITY LINE TO RT 62 | UNK | 1.70 |
| ELLICOTT CK RD | TONA CITY LINE TO RT 62 | 6700 | 1.84 |
| COLVIN | TONA CITY LINE TO ELLICOTT CK | 7500 | 0.77 |
| ENSMINGER | TWO MILE CK TO MILITARY(265) | 8500 | 1.03 |
| TWO MILE CREEK | KENMORE TO TONA CITY LINE | 5100 | 1.59 |
| SAWYER AVE | KENMORE TO RIVER RD | 2300 | 1.01 |
| | | | 7.94 |
| AMHERST | | | |
| N. ELLICOT CK | RT 62 TO SWEET HOME | UNK | 1.20 |
| CASEY RD | DODGE RD TO RT 78 | 3800 | 2.08 |
| DODGE RD | NEW RD TO RT 78 | 960 | 1.50 |
| DODGE RD | SWEET HOME TO HEIM | 6000 | 3.14 |
| NORTH FOREST | DODGE TO HEIM | 6500 | 2.16 |
| MILL STREET | VIL. LINE TO SHERIDAN | 5300 | 0.65 |
| | | | 10.73 |
| CLARENCE | | | |
| THOMPSON | RT 5 TO CLARENCE CENTER RD | 1780 | 3.05 |
| HEISE | CLARENCE CENTER TO LAPP | 240 | 1.90 |
| WOLCOTT RD | RT 78 TO GOODRICH | 880 | 3.00 |
| RAILROAD | GOODRICH TO CLARENCE CENTER | 470 | 0.35 |
| NEWHOUSE | ROLL TO CLARENCE CENTER | 630 | 0.90 |
| ROLL RD | RT 78 TO GOODRICH | 1560 | 3.00 |
| SCHURR | STAGE TO RT 5 | UNK | 0.60 |
| HARRIS HILL | GREINER TO ROLL | 1610 | 0.80 |
| KELLER | GOODRICH TO TOWN LINE | 180 | 2.55 |
| | | | 16.15 |
| NEWSTEAD | | | |
| FLETCHER | RAPIDS TO TONA. CREEK | 230 | 2.20 |
| GREENBUSH | RAPIDS TO SWIFT MILLS | 230 | 0.55 |
| SWIFT MILLS | GREENBRUSH TO CEDAR | 200 | 1.50 |
| MEAHL RD | SAND HILL TO HAKE | 350 | 2.30 |
| CARNEY | HAKE TO SCOTLAND | 540 | 1.85 |
| DORSCH | NEWSTEAD TO CRITTENDEN-MURRAY | 220 | 1.70 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| STEINER | NEWSTEAD TO CRITTENDEN-MURRAY | 225 | 1.90 |
| NICE | NORTH MILLGOVE TO NEWSTEAD | 170 | 2.10 |
| KELLER | UTLEY TO TOWN LINE | 200 | 0.80 |
| UTLEY (TAKES) | KELLER TO CLARENCE(EC to take) | --- | --- |
| BUCKWHEAT | TOWN LINE TO NEWSTEAD | 260 | 1.75 |
| STAGE (TAKES) | N. MILLGROVE TO TOWNLINE | 860 | --- |
| | | | 16.65 |
| **ALDEN** | | | |
| BUCKWHEAT | TOWN LINE TO NORTH MILLGROVE | 480 | 0.55 |
| ZOELLER | WALDEN(130) TO RT 33 | 240 | 0.80 |
| HOME | WALDEN(130) TO RT 33 | 650 | 0.65 |
| WENDE | WALDEN(130) TO RT 33 | 670 | 0.60 |
| | | | 2.60 |
| **GRAND ISLAND** | | | |
| BUSH | WEST RIVER PKWY. TO BASELINE | 660 | 0.75 |
| HUTH RD | BASELINE TO STONEY POINT | UNK | 1.08 |
| | | | 1.83 |
| **HAMBURG** | | | |
| VERSAILLES | NORTH CREEK TO LAKEVIEW | 470 | 0.55 |
| VERSAILLES | LAKEVIEW TO PLEASANT | 460 | 1.70 |
| BEETOW | RT 62 TOMCKINLEW PKWY | 800 | 0.61 |
| BAYVIEW | SEE BEETOW | ---- | ---- |
| OLD MILESTRIP | MCKINLEY TO ABBOTT | UNK | ---- |
| ELECTRIC | (BLASDELL) | 3700 | 0.55 |
| LEGION | CAMP TOSOUTH PARK | 7200 | 0.60 |
| HELTZ | LAKEVIEW RD TO PLEASANT | 560 | 1.20 |
| NORTH CREEK | LAKEVIEW RD TO LAKESHORE | 570 | 5.20 |
| | | | 10.41 |
| **TOWN OF EVANS** | | | |
| DENNIS | BENNETT RD TO NEW PVMT | 900 | 1.00 |
| SWEETLAND | NEW PVMT TO LAKESHORE | 520 | 0.90 |
| SWEETLAND | RT 5 TO NEW PVMT | 500 | 0.20 |
| GOWANS | VERSAILLES PLNK TO DELAMETER | 330 | 2.65 |
| HARDPAN | S. MAIN ST TO CAIN RD | 240 | 1.50 |
| LAKE | ANGOLA V.LINE TO S.MAIN | 3680 | 0.50 |
| LAKE | V. LINE TO LAKESHORE | 2620 | 1.50 |
| | | | 8.25 |
| **BRANT** | | | |
| HARDPAN | BRANT FARNHAM TO CAIN | 130 | 1.45 |
| LOTUS | RT 5 TO LAKESHORE | 440 | 1.40 |
| | | 260 | 3.00 |
| | | | 5.85 |
| **NORTH COLLINS** | | | |
| SCHOOL | V. LINE TO JENNINGS RD. | 350 | 3.05 |
| ANGLING | SHIRLEY RD TO KETCHUM RD | 170 | 0.90 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| STEARNS | QUAKER RD TO KETCHUM | 50 | 0.75 |
| MARSHFIELD | RT 62 TO RT 75 | 200 | 4.65 |
| SENECA RD | RESERVATION TO RT 62 | 250 | 0.70 |
| MAIN ST | SENECA RD TO RT 62 | 340 | 1.60 |
| KETCHUM | TOWNLINE TO SCHOOL ST | 280 | 3.70 |
| | | | 15.35 |
| COLLINS | | | |
| DUPONT | SCRABBLHILL TO BECKER | 120 | 1.00 |
| SCRABBLE HILL | BECKER RD TO DUPONT | 50 | 0.75 |
| WILSON | KONERT TO W. BECKER | 80 | 0.60 |
| KONERT | WILSON TO RT 39 | 260 | 1.75 |
| LONE | GOWANDA ZOAR TO FOSTER | 260 | 1.00 |
| KETCHUM | QUAKER RD TO TOWNLINE | 110 | 0.80 |
| BREWER | RT 39 TO BROWN ST | 280 | 1.05 |
| OTTENBECKER | BROWN ST TO WOODSIDE | UNK | 0.75 |
| | | | 7.70 |
| CONCORD | | | |
| HOFFMAN | HOFFMAN RD TO RT 39 | 410 | 0.75 |
| WHELLER | TREVETT RD TO SPAULDING RD | 50 | 0.25 |
| SPAULDING | WHEELER RD TO CONCORD RD | 130 | 0.40 |
| BELCHER | RT 39 TO CONCORD RD | 260 | 2.25 |
| CONCORD | TREVETT TO BELCHER RD | 120 | 1.50 |
| ADAMS | TRANSITLINE TO BOSTON SPRING | 140 | 1.10 |
| SKYVIEW | TRANSITLINE TO DEAD END | UNK | 0.40 |
| TRANSIT LINE | ADAMS RD TO GENESEE | 160 | 1.10 |
| SUMMIT | GENESEE TO DEAD END | UNK | 0.50 |
| SNYDER | SPR-BOSTON TO SPR-CONCORD RD | 120 | 2.40 |
| DRAKE | GENESEE RD TO SNYDER | 150 | 1.35 |
| TOWNSEND | BOSTON-SPRINGVLE TO GENESEE | 630 | 1.50 |
| ABBOTT HILL | BOSTON-SPRINGVLE TO S. HILL | 180 | 1.60 |
| SOUTH HILL | ABBOTTHILL RD TO TOWNLINE | 150 | 0.40 |
| EMERLING | WAGNER RD TO HILL RD | 280 | 1.20 |
| PFARNER | (SEE BOSTON) | | |
| | | | 16.70 |
| SARDINIA | | | |
| DUTCH TOWN | S. PROTECTION RD TO DEAD END | UNK | 0.20 |
| MILLER | S. PROTECTION TO CURRIER-SAR | 230 | 2.55 |
| PRATHAM | MIDDLE ROAD TO ALLEN | 160 | 3.30 |
| | | | 6.05 |
| HOLLAND | | | |
| CHURCH ST | HUNTER CRK TO VERMONT HILL | 110 | 1.20 |
| SAUNDERS HILL | HUNTER CR TO COUNTY LINE | 110 | 3.00 |
| N. PROTECTION | SAVAGE RD TO RT 16 | 160 | 0.20 |
| | | | 4.40 |
| COLDEN | | | |
| DARIEN | LEWIS TO BOISE RD | 250 | 1.70 |
| HAYES HOLLOW | RT 240 TO FALLS RD | 470 | 5.50 |
| HEATH | RT 240 TO HAYES HOLLOW RD | 730 | 1.55 |
| KNAPP | IRISH ROAD TO RT 240 | 400 | 1.60 |
| IRISH | PARTRIDGE RD TO KNAPP | 190 | 2.35 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| LOWER EAST HILL | RT 240 TO TOWNLINE | 590 | 0.75 |
| | | | 11.75 |

BOSTON

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| WOHLHEITER | COLE RD TO LOWER EAST HILL | 180 | 0.75 |
| BOSTON CROSS RD | BOSTON STATE TO COLE RD | 540 | 1.15 |
| PFARNER | 219 TO BOSTON STATE RD | 240 | 3.25 |
| BACK CREEK | PFARNER TO ZIMMERMAN RD | 1600 | 4.65 |
| PATCHEN | BOSTON STATE TO BACK CREEK RD | UNK | 0.30 |
| LOWER EAST HILL | BURR TO TOWN LINE | UNK | 3.05 |
| OMPHALIUS | LOWER EAST HILL TO BOSTON ST | 830 | 0.80 |
| OLD LOWER EAST | BURR RD TO COLE RD | 390 | 0.80 |
| (COUNTY TAKES RICE RD) | | --- | --- |
| | | | 14.75 |

EDEN

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| HARDT | E. EDEN TO RT 75 | 540 | 1.65 |
| (COUNTY TAKES N. BOSTON RD.) | | --- | --- |
| BLEY | BAUER TO RT 62 | 400 | 1.17 |
| BAUER | BLEY TO SHADAGEE | 290 | 2.25 |
| HAIG | FEDDICK RD TO E.EDEN RD | 400 | 1.60 |
| E. EDEN | ZENNER RD. TO HAIG RD. | 1350 | 0.50 |
| | | | 7.17 |

Totals: 229.56