

**PaTHs 4 Bethlehem  
Meeting Summary  
May 25, 2010  
Town Hall Auditorium**

Present: Ann Benware, Steve Downs, Scott Lewendon, Dan Lewis, Mark Lewis, Kathy McCarthy, Henry Peyrebrune, Julie Sasso, John Schoenberg, Caleb Wistar  
Town of Bethlehem Staff: Rob Leslie, Erik Deyoe, Jason Gallo

**Comments on April Meeting Summary**

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

**Bike Expo, Saturday May 8, 10am -1pm Recap/Reschedule**

Jason expressed his disappointment in cancelling the May 8, 2010 Bike Expo event due to inclement weather, and thanked those members who were going to volunteer at the event. He stated the event will be held in the Fall 2010 and a date, and backup date will soon be announced.

**Conduct Pathway Evaluation Criteria Exercise**

***Benefits Evaluation***

Rob stated that the purpose of this exercise is to test the draft pathway criteria (benefits component), to better understand how Town staff will use the evaluation criteria. Town staff developed six sample pathway investment projects that may be desirable in the Town. Sample projects are as follows:

- A. Delmar Place – Kenwood Avenue to Douglas Road (pedestrian improvements only)
- B. Delaware Avenue – Bennett Terrace to Elm Avenue (pedestrian improvements along south side)
- C. Blessing Road – NYS Rte. 85 to Krumkill Road (bicycle and pedestrian improvements)
- D. Elm Avenue/Elm Avenue East – University Street to Jericho Road (bicycle improvements)  
-Hague Boulevard to Jericho Road (pedestrian improvements)
- E. Adams Street – Kenwood Avenue Municipal Parking Lot to Hudson Avenue (bicycle and pedestrian improvements)
- F. River Road (NYS Rte. 144) – Simmons Road (Moh He Con Nuk Nature Preserve) to Lyons Road (Henry Hudson Park)

The projects were described through a project narrative that provided information regarding the sample project conducive to the benefits evaluation. Committee members were separated into three groups with facilitation by Rob, Erik, and Jason, and assigned the task of applying the information provided in the project narrative to the criteria listed in the Benefits Evaluation Table. Each group was assigned three (of the six) project narratives to complete the evaluation criteria, and as such each group had a duplicate project.

Groups, facilitators and sample projects were assigned as follows:

<b>Facilitator</b>	Rob	Erik	Jason
<b>Committee Members</b>	Julie S.	Anne B.	Kathy M.
	Steve D.	John S.	Dan L.
	Henry P.	Caleb W.	Scott L.
			Mark L.
<b>Projects</b>	<b>A,B,C</b>	<b>C,D,E</b>	<b>E,F,A</b>

Members in each group were also provided with a Bethlehem Roadway Functional Classification Map, Draft Bicycle and Pedestrian Priority Network Map, and Pathway Prioritization Matrix for benefit and cost scoring.

The scoring results of the evaluation were as follows:

<b>Project</b>	<b>Rob's Group Score</b>	<b>Erik's Group Score</b>	<b>Jason's Group Score</b>
Delmar Place	73.5	–	73.5
Delaware Avenue	71.5	–	–
Blessing Road	62.0	61.0	–
Elm Avenue/Elm Avenue East	–	48.0	–
Adams Street	–	78.5	77.5
River Road	–	–	44.0

### **Cost Evaluation**

In addition to the project description, each narrative included an estimated cost (prepared by the Town Engineering Division) for the entire project. Each project benefit and cost was then applied to the Pathway Prioritization Scoring Matrix (provided below).

<b>Scoring Matrix</b>		<b>Benefit Score</b>				
		<b>=&gt; 80</b>	<b>65 - 79</b>	<b>50 - 64</b>	<b>35 - 49</b>	<b>&lt; 35</b>
<b>Town Share Cost</b>		<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>F</b>
<b>Cost &lt; \$100k</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B+</b>	<b>C+</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>D</b>
<b>\$100k &lt;= Cost &lt; \$400k</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C+</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>F</b>
<b>\$400k &lt;= Cost &lt; \$700k</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>B+</b>	<b>B-</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>F</b>
<b>\$700k &lt;= Cost &lt; \$1M</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>B+</b>	<b>C+</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>F</b>
<b>Cost &gt;= \$1M</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C+</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>F</b>

### **Final Scoring Results**

The final results of the exercise based on the scoring matrix were as follows:

<b>Project</b>	<b>Benefit</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Final Score</b>	<b>Tier</b>
Delmar Place	B	B	B	1
Delaware Avenue	B	B	B	1
Blessing Road	C	F	D	2
Elm Avenue/Elm Avenue East	D	F	F	3
Adams Street	B	B	B	1
River Road	D	C	D	2

Based on the final score, projects were grouped in to tiers (Tier 1 – 3 ). It is envisioned that if the Town was to realistically evaluate these 6 projects, the Delmar Place, Delaware Avenue, and Adams Street projects would be the first to be implemented, based on their status as Tier 1 projects.

Committee comments regarding the evaluation criteria and table were as follows:

- Based on the benefits scoring difference of no greater than one point amongst the duplicate projects, the benefits evaluation and procedure is clearly defined.
- Delmar Place would not receive evaluation since it is not located on the Bicycle and Pedestrian Priority Network. This may be an error in the evaluation process. Possible solution is to revisit

the network map with a closer eye for pedestrian routes along local roads that are not located on principal arterial or collector roadways.

- Give consideration to projects that are within ¼ mile of roadways located on the priority network. These projects could continue through the evaluation process (i.e. Delmar Place).
- Criteria evaluation is a useful tool, but should not be the final decision maker in determining project prioritization. It should be used to assist Town decision makers.
- Members were surprised that Delaware Avenue was ranked in the Tier 1 group, and stated that as long as the evaluation criteria (benefits and cost scores) are not the only factors involved in the decision making for pathway investment, then the process outlined is a good one. In this example, members felt the Delaware Avenue project would not be implemented since a sidewalk already exists along the northern side of the road.
- Provide clarification for when two roads are in the project area (for example, local and principal arterial roadway). How would the evaluator score the project based on the roadway volume criteria? Possible solutions included selecting the roadway functional classification based on the dominant classification found in the project area.
- Are project intersection terminations counted as an intersection crossing? The benefits evaluation does not include intersection terminations as intersection crossings, since most projects will begin and end at an intersection. Only intersections within the project boundaries are to be counted.
- Projects should include pedestrian and bicycle treatments through the intersection, not end at an intersection.
- Consider reviewing operating vehicle speed instead of posted speed limit. Possible solution is to review operating vehicle speed data from NYSDOT and/or County data sources in the event that the evaluator senses roadway operating speed is higher than the posted speed limit. This would be similar to the review of roadway AADT volume for roadway functional classification.
- Provide clarification for the evaluator regarding pedestrian and bicycle accommodations built to (or not to) design standards.
- Consider reviewing the network map with a closer look towards travel routes for pedestrians (and more specifically for students).
- Consider including commuters as a “potential user” group.
- Consider utilizing a town share cost per liner foot or mile instead of total town share project cost.
- Town share project cost is a fair way to incorporate costs into the project evaluation process.

**Public Comment:**

No public comments were provided.

**Adjourned at 8:30 PM.**