

**PaTHs 4 Bethlehem
Meeting Summary
June 22, 2010
Town Hall Auditorium**

Present: Ann Benware, Dan Lewis, Kathy McCarthy, Henry Peyrebrune, Caleb Wistar
Town of Bethlehem Staff: Rob Leslie, Erik Deyoe, Jason Gallo

Comments on May Meeting Summary

No comments on the meeting summary. The May meeting summary will be posted to the Committee website.

General Announcements

Jason announced the new date for the Parks and Recreation Bike Expo Event, Saturday, September 11 (rain date, Sunday 9/12).

It was also announced that John Schonberg will no longer be volunteering on the committee due to job and family related responsibilities.

Address Committee Comments from Pathway Evaluation Criteria Exercise (May 25th meeting)

Rob addressed the following Questions and Comments that were brought up after the Pathway Evaluation Criteria Exercise conducted in May:

Q/C) Give consideration to projects within a ¼ mile of roadways located on the priority network? A) We will revisit the priority Network Map. A ¼ mile radius will end up capturing several local roads, which would not be treated with pedestrian and bicycle accommodations based on their distinction as local road (low vehicle volume/speed roadways can safely and efficiently accommodate bicyclist and pedestrians).

Q/C) Provide clarification when two different road classifications are in the same project area A) New note was added under the safety discussion portion of the Benefits criteria: "If project boundaries incorporate multiple roadway speeds and functional classifications, utilize higher speed and functional classification to apply points".

Q/C) Consider reviewing the operating speeds versus posted speed. A) If the speed data exists (provided by NYSDOT or Albany County). Similar to the review of roadway AADT volume for roadway functional classification. That said the data collected by state or county only captures a portion of the roadway and may not always reflect the operating speed for the entire roadway, only that area which was measured.

Q/C) Provide clarification for the evaluator regarding pedestrian and bicycle accommodations built to (or not) design standards – A) A new note was added to the lack of existing pedestrian & bicycle accommodations directing the evaluator to use ASHTO and NYSDOT guidelines/standards to determine if existing accommodations are built to design standards. The Procedures Guide will provide a list of recourses to determine if accommodations are up to current design standards.

Q/C) Consider using commuters as a "Potential User" group. A) There was no direct way to capture and measure a potential commuter user group.

Q/C) Projects should include pedestrian and bicycle treatments through the intersection, not end at the intersection. A) Project parameters will include / go through intersections and this will be addressed in the procedures guide for the evaluator.

Q/C) Consider utilizing a Town share cost per liner foot or mile instead of total/overall Town share project cost. A) Feura Bush Road as an example, the benefit score resulted in an A and cost was scored at an F, which resulted in overall score B. Larger (distance) projects can still receive a greater score versus smaller projects without using a liner foot cost basis. The Committee agreed to utilize a total/overall Town share project cost.

Q/C) Consider reviewing the network map with a closer look towards travel routes for pedestrians and more specifically for students. A) The committee re-reviewed the map during the June meeting. It is recommended that the network map should be reviewed at minimum on an annual basis. Henry thought that the committee should consider having the schools involved in the process of reviewing the network map when it pertains to students and schools.

Dan feels that closer attention needs to be paid to non-roadway opportunities specifically on public lands. If a network map is approved by the Town Board, for public viewing, we should be open to potential private property owners who may want to include their land as part of a link and be included on the map.

Revisit/Discuss Bicycle and Pedestrian Priority Network Map

The committee looked at the Priority Network Map for any missing roads that are within a mile of the Bethlehem High School and half mile of the Bethlehem Middle School and elementary Schools, which student pedestrians or bicyclists would use for travel. The following streets were added to the network:

- Beacon Rd.
- Bender Ln. (portion)
- Borthwick Ave.
- Brockley Dr
- Clapper Rd.
- Darroch Rd.
- Delmar Pl.
- Elsmere Ave. Ext. (proposed)
- Fernbank Ave.
- Glenmont Rd.
- Hague Blvd.
- Howard Pl.
- Kimmey Dr. (proposed)
- Krumkill Rd. (portion)
- NYS Route 85
- Schoohouse Rd.
- Union Ave.
- Van Dyke Rd.
- Winne Rd.

Next Steps for PaTHs Committee

Henry inquired about setting up a program for rehabbing (maintenance) existing pedestrian and bicycle accommodations. It was suggested, as a first step, that roadways identified on the network map would receive a higher priority for rehab (maintenance) work over others not located on the network. The committee would review the network map on an annual basis. Maintaining existing accommodations should be associated with a larger bicycle and pedestrian program (Engineering component).

Caleb suggested conducting an inventory of funding and grant opportunities that may be available to the Town. We then could bring these opportunities to the table and see what might fit our needs.

Henry asked if this is a standing committee or task driven. If the committee is task driven, the 3'Es concept (Engineering, Education, and Enforcement) would be an ideal direction for the committee to take. We should engage someone from the Town Police Department to be part of the committee.

Within the land use and planning review process conducted by the Town Planning Board, the incorporation of the Pedestrian and Bicycle Priority Network Map should be used as a tool during review to assist in determining the need for bicycle and pedestrian accommodations.

Perhaps different resources or the make-up of staff and volunteers would be required depending on the direction of our next steps. For example, if going in the direction of marketing and education maybe new committee members that specialize in these areas would be appropriate.

For the July Committee meeting Town staff will prepare a draft Accomplishments and Next Steps Memo to the Town Board and a draft Evaluation Process for New Pathway Investment – Procedures/ Users Guide. The Committee should receive the documents a few weeks before the July meeting. The July agenda will consist of the Committee providing their comments on the documents. The August 24, 2010 meeting would be cancelled and the Committee request placement on the August 25 Town Board meeting to present the

Evaluation Process for New Pathway Investment Guide, Bicycle and Pedestrian Priority Network Map, and a recommendation of next steps.

Public Comment:

Public education and outreach is important. It was suggested the Committee hold a public meeting/workshop to present the Evaluation Process for New Pathway Investment Guide and Bicycle and Pedestrian Priority Network Map to receive public feedback/comment.

Committee should remain forward looking with an eye towards potential new development projects. As the Town develops new residential developments and new destinations are created, (i.e. Vista Tech Park). The Priority Network Map should be flexible so as new destinations (i.e. Kendall Square) evolve the network can be adjusted accordingly.

Developer funding source: Research the opportunity of establishing a Town procedure that creates a sidewalk fund to facilitate future construction for bike/pedestrian accommodations, in the instances that accommodations are not immediately needed due to lack of accommodations nearby, or potential lack of use. (Similar to the Town's payment in lieu of Park Land Set-Aside Fund.) The Town of Penfield Sidewalk Policy may serve as an example.

Adjourned at 8:20 PM.