

**PaTHs 4 Bethlehem
Meeting Summary
March 24, 2009
Town Hall Room 101**

Present: Steve Downs, Mark Jordan, Sue Kambrich, Scott Lewendon, Mark Lewis, Kathy McCarty, Mrs. Peyrebrune, Julie Sasso, John Schonberg
Town of Bethlehem Staff: Jason Gallo, Rob Leslie

Guest: Supervisor, Jack Cunningham

Introductions:

Jason G. opened the meeting with an ice breaker at 6:35PM. Mrs. Peyrebrune wanted it to be known for the record that she was there in lieu of her husband, Henry P., and that he is looking forward to being part of this committee as he was in the past with the Bethlehem Citizens for Pedestrian Safety committee.

Current Status of Pathways in Town:

Jack Cunningham presented a power point presentation of the various existing pathways in Town and distributed a hand out which outlined the current status of sidewalk projects and anticipated budget. During presentation of various pathways Steve D. indicated some issues relating to pathway use arise when the user is not clear about who the pathway is actually intended for (type of user) example: bike sign on Wemple Rd. Sue K. had a question regarding the budgeted amount of the projects and the cost of asphalt vs. concrete, which being cheaper. Several replied that asphalt is cheaper

Committee Mission & Goals:

Jason G. outlined the Committee mission & goals. Emphasis was made about the 2005 Comprehensive Plan and how this living document, which represents the vision for the future of the Town, assisted in establishing the mission and goals of the Committee.

Committee Tasks:

Rob L. outlined the committee tasks and emphasized that these tasks will be best achieved after a few committee meetings in which we establish some background/education information regarding pedestrians and bicyclists.

Past / Current Planning Initiatives:

Rob L. reviewed past and current planning initiatives including the Bethlehem Citizens for Pedestrian Safety Committee and the Citizens Advisory Committee on Conservation (CACC). Rob L. explained how the CACC helped to identify resident needs through a series of public planning workshops that explored several topics including connectivity within the town. He also mentioned that a recommendation from CACC's open space planning work is for the development of a Pathways Committee. Kathy M. brought up the idea about re-introducing the Walking Day event as a possible fundraiser, several people thought it was a good idea as an

educational tool. Rob L. also stressed the importance for the committee as a whole to be sensitive to private property as we move forward.

Meeting Schedule:

The future meeting schedule was discussed by Jason G. and set for the fourth Tuesday of every month with a start time of 6:30 PM to be held in Town Hall Room 101. Next Meeting, Tuesday, April 28 at 6:30 PM in Room 101. Mark L. noted that some Tuesdays may be hard for him to attend.

Next Steps:

Rob L. briefly discussed the CDTC Bicycle and Pedestrian Priority Network and how we could use CDTCs criteria as a model for the Committee's work. It was suggested that a representative from CDTC attend a future Committee meeting to discuss the development of CDTCs Bicycle and Pedestrian Priority Network. Scott L. offered to share a presentation on Sharrows, a new roadway treatment for bicycles that is expected to be included in an update to NYSDOTs Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD).

Scott L. mentioned that at a future meeting the Committee could express ideas for future agenda items. It was also suggested that the Committee members identify where they like to bicycle or walk throughout town. Rob L. stated he could produce a blank map of the Town, and as an exercise the Committee could identify community destinations that may include schools (both public and private), parks, conservation lands, public/community centers, and commercial areas. The intent is that the roadways accessing and connecting the community destinations would be identified as priority routes for pedestrian and bicycle travel. Mark L. identified the use of a population density map as part of background information. Rob L. said he could prepare this map as well.

Other committee comments included: Julie S. noted that our goal should not be to have a pathway on every street. The goal is to consider the primary roadways (arterials and collectors) for pathways. Many agreed. John S. discussed speed bumps vs. sidewalks as a traffic calming measure. Stephen D. discussed using alternative surface materials like crusher run or stone dust especially for multi-use paths. Scott L. commented that crusher run is a good interim surface. Mark L. asked about other types of surfaces relating to stormwater runoff. Scott L. indicated that multi-use paths are now exempt from a full Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). He indicated that multi-use paths no longer require water quality controls; however, a basic SWPPP is required, which only includes an erosion and sedimentation control component.

- Public Comment:**
- Asphalt is preferred vs concrete for runners / walkers.
 - Wemple road to Elm Avenue Town Park should be a priority for pathway investment.
 - Speed bumps may not be an appropriate traffic calming tool in the Northeast due to winter weather (i.e. snow plowing).

Meeting adjourned at 8:00PM