1.0 New Business

1.1 New Visions Update
   1.1.1 New Visions Overview
   1.1.2 Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee Tasks
   1.1.3 Timeline

1.2 Follow up from Previous Meeting:
   1.2.1 Bike Ped Set-Aside Solicitation Update
   1.2.2 Comments submitted to NYSDOT re: HDM & CS Checklist

1.3 NYSDOT Programs Update
   1.3.1 Safe Routes to School Update
   1.3.2 Transportation Enhancements Program
   1.3.3 Transportation Alternatives Program Update

1.4 Capital Coexist
   1.4.1 Walk to School Day
   1.4.2 NYS Comptroller Employee Development Week

1.5 Linkage Updates
   1.5.1 City of Watervliet Bicycle Master Plan
   1.5.2 East Greenbush Site Design Standards
   1.5.3 Schodack Town Center Plan & Zoning Recommendations
   1.5.4 Saratoga Springs Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Public Transit Master Plan

1.6 Local Program Updates

2.0 Upcoming Meetings
Meetings Open to the Public:
NEXT CDTC BIKE & PED TASK FORCE MEETING: December 10, 2013 9:00 AM
Guidance for New Visions Subcommittees

Each subcommittee is different and has its own list of tasks. Each subcommittee should be working toward developing an Interim Working Paper that should be completed by June 2014. It will be subject to Planning Committee approval. Based on these Interim Working Papers, the staff will develop materials for public meetings and public comment.

The Interim Working Papers should include:

- Taking stock of New Visions accomplishments
- Overview of existing issues and needs assessment in the subcommittee topic area
- Updated priority network for some subcommittees if applicable. Summarize how the existing priority network is used in TIP project evaluations (is more structure/framework needed?) Address/describe what projects on the priority network should be accomplishing.
- Development of performance measures and targets applicable to the subcommittee with initial results. The performance measures may simply include performance measures already used in the plan, with some modifications if necessary. They should be feasible for developing in the near term. In some cases, new performance measures may be worthwhile. The CDTC New Visions STEP Model can be used to develop and forecast measures and many cases (with assistance from Chris and Sree). In developing targets, consideration should be given to developing realistic targets as well as aspirational targets.
- Initial recommendations for the updated Plan related to funding or policy can be included. In developing recommendations, bold and ambitious concepts should be considered, along with consideration of the viability for Planning Committee approval. Recommendations for further study can be included. These could involve further study during the next phase of the update (between June 2014 and December 2014) or further study after the update is completed.
- The Interim Working Paper should consider issues in the context of asking for public input during the second phase of the Plan Update (from June to December 2014). Identify key issues that should be presented to the public; issues for which public feedback is needed.

CDTC staff will be doing most of the work in developing the Working Papers. A general scope of work can be discussed with each subcommittee, keeping in mind the limitations of staff resources over the next eight months.

New Visions 2035 already addresses all of the planning factors and most of the new requirements for long range plans in MAP 21. The New Visions 2040 planning effort therefore can build off of the existing plan and should be seen as an opportunity to improve the plan where needed, recognizing that the existing plan represents regional consensus and is consistent with other recent regional planning efforts such as the regional sustainability plan (Cleaner/Greener plan) and the regional economic development council plan.

The principles, strategies and actions in the New Visions 2035 plan should be reviewed by staff and task forces/subcommittees and proposed updates to language, identification of “what’s missing” as well as ways to be more bold, all in the context of what we can afford, should be pursued as appropriate.
October 22, 2013

Ms. Nancy Alexander
NYSDOT Landscape Architecture Bureau
50 Wolf Road
Albany, NY 12205

Dear Ms. Alexander,

CDTC staff has reviewed the proposed revisions to the HIGHWAY DESIGN MANUAL REVISION NO. XX - CHAPTER 17 BICYCLE FACILITY DESIGN AND CHAPTER 18 - PEDESTRIAN FACILITY DESIGN - COMPLETE STREETS PLANNING CHECKLIST and appreciates the opportunity to comment on these items. Our comments are attached in a separate Word document.

We are encouraged to see questions in the checklist, the checklist notes, and proposed text encouraging project designers to reach out to municipalities and MPOs for more information on planned improvements and input on existing and needed infrastructure. Communication and coordination between NYSDOT and local and regional entities typically results in better projects. NYSDOT should be commended for inclusion of these features.

However, we strongly feel project designers should be required to conduct such outreach during project scoping and throughout the project development process. Toward that end it is important that each NYSDOT Region has trained and supported staffing resources, specifically the Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator, to assist with this outreach and provide knowledge on best practices related to complete streets design and implementation.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on this important approach to ensure New York State's roadways are designed to consider and balance the needs of all users.

Sincerely,

David P. Jukins
Deputy Director
Chapter 17 & 18 HDM Revisions and Complete Streets Checklist Comments

NYSAMPO BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN WORKING GROUP:

Under 18.3 Policy

First sentence that is italicized “NYSDOT must make...” all the language of this federal policy and design guidance should be spelled out.

Under 18-5 Pedestrian Facility Design: Information for the Checklist may be obtained through the use of methods such as:

Included should be information found in municipal Comprehensive/Master Plans, Corridor Plans, Scenic Byway Plans, Regional MPO plans – including Bicycle priority routes, NYS Bicycle Routes, and municipal bicycle/pedestrian or Complete Streets plans.

The Notes section of the Complete Streets checklist should define what “Major Bridge Rehabilitation” includes...such as superstructure replacement, deck replacement etc.

Also somewhere within either the Chapter 18 or checklist itself, guidance should be provided for how to deal with bridge rehabilitations or bridge replacement projects where pedestrian and or bicycle accommodations may be warranted but the infrastructure/roadway approaches (outside of the identified project area) do not provide complete streets infrastructure whether this be sidewalks or especially shoulders that are at least 4 feet in width. This is important since NYSDOT is programming so many bridge projects – many in rural areas that may be along scenic byways, NYS bicycle routes or MPO bicycle priority routes – where the approaches don’t have adequate shoulder width. On bridge projects, NYSDOT generally tries to provide consistent facilities with those on the approaches.

- Susan Olsen, Region 1

There are far too many instances of words like “may” and “should” in these chapters that make the statements that follow not worth the paper they are printed on. If you really want to see this stuff get done as a way of doing business, don’t be wishy-washy and define a clear process with “shall”.

- Roger Weld, Region 11

A few things that I question upon quick review of the changes to Chapter 17 and 18:

1. On Page 18-5 it mentions generally “local governments, planning organizations”... yet in item no. 1 of the checklist it mentions “community’s comprehensive plan”. Should there be some clarification on this since a county’s
comprehensive plan may support what a local municipality’s does not? Or vice versa.

2. Item No. 2/No. 3: is this only related to those proposed by the state? I have recently become aware of a number of facilities or potential facilities in Orange County that that the Region may not be wholly aware of. Also the Region may not know about all private development projects in the area. Should this be reviewed by local Planning Departments/MPO’s as well and not just rely on the Regions Bike/Ped Coordinator? E.g. there may be development that are not accessing State Routes and therefore, may not be on the Regions radar.

- Chad Wade, OCTC

Firstly, I think the Complete Streets Planning Checklist is a great start to further advance multi-modal trip choices and safety to make communities around our state more livable. In addition, creating infrastructure for non-motorized transportation and lowering automobile speeds by changing road conditions can improve economic conditions for both business owners and residents. To that end, the Complete Streets Planning Checklist serves as a helpful tool for fostering implementation and in turn strengthening economic development efforts around the state.

However, my concern is that this checklist only applies to new projects or projects beyond maintenance which is noted in the small print at the bottom under the notes section. With the funding realities we are faced with, going forward most projects will fall under the category of maintenance and new construction will be in the minority. To not have Chapter 18 and the checklist apply in some fashion to the majority of future projects significantly impedes the real implementation of complete streets in the State of New York.

According to fine print at the bottom of the Complete Streets Planning Checklist, all maintenance projects are to follow the Resurfacing Safety Assessment Form in Chapter 7 of the Highway Manual. This form only mentions “occasional bicyclists” under the Shoulder Resurfacing element on page two and has two sentences at the very bottom of the checklist which address pedestrian and bicyclists.

If this is the only form or checklist that is to be followed for all maintenance projects, at the very least elements for the Complete Streets Checklist should be incorporated so that opportunities during resurfacing, restoration and rehabilitation projects are not lost to make the most out of our existing transportation system. For example, much can be accomplished with paint in resurfacing projects as demonstrated by the City of Buffalo which has added over 20 miles of bike lanes in the last two years. Such efforts have helped to propel the city to earn a Bronze level designation for a bicycle friendly city this week by the League of American Bicyclists in Washington, DC.
In addition, the incorporation of basic green infrastructure opportunities may also be missed in future maintenance projects as the Drainage element on the assessment form in Chapter 7 does not mention any elements of landscaping and other efforts to reduce stormwater runoff (this is called out in item #20 on the Complete Streets Checklist). Having more complete streets elements for consideration in maintenance projects is needed if we want to make our communities more livable and attractive for future economic development.

I understand the Resurfacing Safety Assessment Form in Chapter 7 was revised in June 2013, but I think it would be important to consider additional changes to this checklist while comments are being solicited for Complete Streets Planning Checklist.

If making the Complete Streets Planning Checklist apply to all projects or revising the Resurfacing Safety Assessment Form to incorporate more Complete Streets principles is problematic given the way the Complete Streets Law is written, then perhaps New York State Department of Transportation could consider incorporating language into the project eligibility requirements to ensure that all projects seeking Transportation Alternative funding include complete street components.

- Kelly Dixon, GBNRTC

Chapter 17:

- 17.4.1 - If this chapter is being updated anyway, it would be good to incorporate Shared Lane Markings.
- 17.4.1 - Also, it would be good to incorporate guidance from the new AASHTO guide.
- 17.4.6 - I suggest noting that wide curb lanes may increase travel speeds-- that should be considered.
- 17.4.8 - Per the latest AASHTO guide, Bicycle Routes are not considered a facility, but wayfinding.

Chapter 18:

- 18.5 - I missed this list of projects-- it would be helpful to make it more obvious in the text that these are the project types that the CS checklist applies to. Also, it would be clearer in bullet form.
- Also, section 18.5.1 below refers to projects that require mitigation (such as lane widening). Should those project types also be listed here?
- Page 18-4 last paragraph -
  o or- project scoping report and design approval document?
  o Local ‘plans change’ (not ‘planning changes’)
• Page 18-5 - This implies that the B/P Coord is responsible for all CS checklists. Should the project designer be in charge instead, and be required to coordinate with the BP Coord?
• Page 18-22 implies that the Project Developer or Project Designer completes the checklist. Clarify.
• Exhibit 18-1 – Complete Streets Checklist
  o “Comment/Action” - this is an awfully small space! i think it should be larger so there is room for meaningful comments.
  o #2 – Add ‘or other bicycle facility’.
  o All the questions are framed so that 'Yes' would mean there is a potential issue or area for improvement. It makes sense to have all the questions framed consistently, but the way it is done, the questions are a little awkward. If possible, it would be better if they were turned around the other way (eg, is xxx adequate)-- that way, any 'no' answer would point to a need for improvements.
  o I suggest re-wording #11 and #13 to "would medians or pedestrian refuge islands [mid-block crossings] improve pedestrian safety and convenience?" rather than are they needed.
  o Question 18: this question should be clarified/re-worded. Parking adequacy part could be cut. Potential conflicts between on-street parking and bicycle lanes is the real concern.
  o Question 26: 12,000 ADT is a very low threshold for a road diet. There are successful examples with over 20,000 ADT. I suggest raising it to at least 18,000 ADT.
  o Page 18-11 - This is an extremely out-dated LOS model for pedestrians. It should be removed and replaced with more up to date metrics.
  
  - Emily Dozier, PDCTC

The list of information sources on page 18-5 should be expanded to include adopted planning documents, such as Comprehensive Plans, downtown plans, etc.

It would be helpful to add a column on the checklist to explicitly identify the source of information used to answer the question. It shouldn't create any more work for the reviewer, since they are theoretically seeking input from the sources listed on page 18-5. Many of the questions are somewhat subjective, and citing the specific plan, meeting, or statistic used to justify a "yes" or "no" would help to justify why these boxes were checked. This would also help to clarify in cases where there are conflicting priorities.

  - Kate Mance, AGFTC

Maintenance projects should incorporate Chapter 17, 18, and the checklist in some manner. Most projects will be of this nature and opportunities for low cost pedestrian and bicycle improvements, primarily through pavement markings and signage, are lost using the proposed process. Where there is evidence of current pedestrian, bicycle, or
public transportation; latent demand for these modes; and safety issues, necessary low cost changes need to be made when the maintenance work is being done. Doing so would more effectively work to accomplish complete streets, and would seem to be the most efficient use of limited funds.

Complete Streets Checklist:

#22 – Reword: “Are there gaps in the bike/ped connections needed between bus stops, transit stations, depots/terminals and existing or planned generators?”
- Scott Reigle, BMTS

BMTS PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

- 18.5.1: Second Paragraph, Second Sentence: Along with reference to the users listed, I found that other Complete Streets policies include the following users in addition to those users listed in 18.5.1: all users of a corridor, including motorists, freight providers, emergency responders and occupants of adjacent land uses, persons of all abilities, promoting safe operation for all users. (See Seattle Complete Streets.)
- 18.5.1: Add reference to the priorities, such as: Highest priority is safety and Second priority is mobility.
- 18.5.1: Add statement that the Complete Streets should incorporate community values and qualities, including environment, scenic, aesthetic, historic and natural resources, as well as safety and mobility.
- 18.5.1: Add (?): Complete Streets solutions shall be developed to fit within the context of the community?
- 18.5.1: Add (?): Complete Streets projects shall make use of the latest and best design standards?
- Exhibit 18-1: Add Existing Conditions block and include check offs for:
  - Classifications: traffic classification, transit classification, route classification and street type
  - sidewalk and crosswalk conditions
  - bus stops within a given radius
  - parking restrictions at crosswalks and intersections
- Exhibit 18-1: Add Exemptions block listing the allowed exemptions to incorporating Complete Streets – clearly spell out the exemptions in Exhibit 18-1 which can be checked off if applicable.
- Exhibit 18-1: Add separate block for Existing Plans that should be considered in the Complete Streets, such as the following:
  - local comprehensive plans
  - Susquehanna Heritage Area Management Plan Amendment (Heritage Area Plan that references historic and scenic corridors linking the local communities through Broome County and Tioga County and includes Action
Items supporting the development of trails connecting the local communities

- local transportation plans
- Stormwater Plans
- Landscaping Plans and Urban Forestry Plans
- Green Infrastructure Design
- Climate Change Plans
- Other Plans

- **Exhibit 18-1: Adequacy of Existing Infrastructure:** Add check offs for opportunity to combine driveways, consolidate bus stops

- **Exhibit 18-1: Need for Infrastructure:** Add check offs for mid-block crossings and lighting conditions / opportunities.

- **Exhibit 18-1: Add Primary Design Features** block or matrix (See Seattle Complete Streets Checklist)

- Lora Zier, Broome County Planning / BMTS Pedestrian & Bicycle Advisory Committee