

***PaTHs 4 Bethlehem  
Meeting Summary  
September 22, 2009  
Town Hall Room 101***

Present: Mark Jordan, Scott Lewendon, Dan Lewis, Kathy McCarthy, John Schoenberg Anne Benware  
Town of Bethlehem Staff: Jason Gallo, Rob Leslie, Erik Deyoe

**Comments on July Meeting Summary**

No Comments. Rob reviewed the Town Board meeting from August 14, in which the Complete Streets Resolution was officially approved by the Town.

**Update on Draft Committee Schedule**

Jason pointed out that there have been a couple of meetings where we did not follow the topics as originally planned on the schedule, but that this was okay. Some of this was a result of the attention dedicated to the Complete Streets Resolution. We have shifted a bit from the original Draft Committee Schedule but we are on the right track.

**Identify Gaps in the Network**

Rob provided a map of the Town that illustrated the Destinations that were identified through the Destination Identification Exercise during the Committee's May meeting. The map also illustrated the locations of sidewalk facilities, that were collected by the Engineering Departments summer inter. Rob reviewed the map and the Committee identified a few more destinations, including Vista Technology Park, Bethlehem Soccer Club fields, Jericho Drive-in, and zoned areas for future dense development. A question of whether or not neighborhoods should be considered as destinations was also discussed.

Rob next outlined the intent of the gaps exercise, where we would be identifying gaps that may exist in the pedestrian and bicycle network. The identification of gaps and reviewing their characteristics would assist in establishing evaluation criteria. The purpose of the criteria development is to establish an evaluation system that will help the Town when deciding/selecting future pedestrian/bicycle investment projects.

Scott thought it would be important to be cautious about granularity (creating an evaluation system made up of many small parts) of project priorities. He suggested a tiered system or grouping would be better instead of a numeric process.

John felt that it would be important for us to have a name or title for the eventual decision making process or system that is utilized.

We then began to identify corridors of importance. It was felt that these roadways should receive some form of pedestrian and bicycle treatment since they contain and provide access to destinations. A “corridor” is defined as having destinations within. We also identified “linkages”, and defined linkages as having a destination(s) or corridors at its terminus. A question of what we value more, corridor or linkage, was asked and the committee felt that for the most part it would be a corridor. The term “connections” for the Committee’s purposes will be defined as, destination to destination within a corridor. These connections would be the future projects since investing in the entire corridor at one time may be a costly undertaking.

Outlined below is the criteria list developed during the committee’s discussions:

#### Criteria List

1. Project falls within identified corridors
  - a. Principle corridors
    - i. 9W corridor
    - ii. Feura Bush Road
    - iii. Vista to Rail-trail
    - iv. Blessing Road
    - v. Elsmere Ave, Fernbank, Delaware
    - vi. Kenwood
    - vii. NYS Route 144
    - viii. Railtrail
    - ix. Link b/t Elm Ave Park to Five Rivers
    - x. Maple Ave – 9W to 144
    - xi. South Bethlehem to Hollyhock Area
    - xii. Murray Ave
    - xiii. Wemple Road
  - b. Secondary corridors
    - i. Linkages between corridors
2. Continuity – linkages between corridors
3. Housing Density
4. Traffic Volume
5. No. of Destinations

6. Types of Destinations
7. Should corridor connections meander to capture other homes in neighborhood – feeder system
8. Traffic speed
9. Safety or risk exposure – umbrella measure?
10. Accident history – probably little data
11. Commuting potential – for commerce or commuting
12. Recreational potential
13. Ratio – Child Density to Park?
14. Diversity of Land Uses – areas with diverse land uses will generate more trips than all residential
  - a. May generate hot-spots
15. Commercial areas
16. Different criteria – one set to identify corridors; another set to develop individual projects
17. ROW availability
18. Cost
  - a. Opportunistic funded – grants, etc. and incidental installations to NYSDOT projects or development
  - b. Town funds or high-level Town priority
19. Funding/Leverage Opportunity
20. Linkage vs. Corridor
21. Are there current facilities? Is the proposed a redundant facility?
22. Resistance from landowners
23. Other planning recommendations
24. Petitions/public support
25. Equality by area/hamlet

Dan asked a general question about corridors and if there are any other possible non-roadway corridors that we may have missed or those we may not be aware of. Eric identified on the map an abandoned rail line in Selkirk and there was discussion about opportunities that sewer and water line corridors and/or paper streets may provide. Dan thought we should take advantage of any opportunities to legitimize these corridors as pathways.

Rob stated the criteria provided at the meeting would be reviewed for grouping opportunities in order to reduce the twenty-five criteria items into a workable amount. Descriptions of the criteria will also be developed. Rob discussed the possibility of setting up a message board where committee members could discuss topics in

between meetings. The committee felt it was a good idea. A follow up regarding this matter will be made by the next scheduled meeting.

Jason mentioned that the November meeting will either be relocated, moved to a different date or both. A follow up regarding this matter will be determined prior to our next schedule meeting.

### **Public Comment**

| Safety should be a number one priority concerning criteria. For example, there is no safe way from Feura Bush Road to the Town Park.

Adjourn – 8:10pm