

**RECORD OF MEETING
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ISSUES TASK FORCE**

DATE/TIME/PLACE: Friday, February 25, 1994, 9:00 AM - 11:00 PM, CDTC Offices

IN ATTENDANCE: John DiMura (NYS Thruway Authority), Emily H. Goodman (private citizen), Karin Lang (CDRPC), Jerry Mueller (Green City Transportation Council), Don Odell (Albany County Planning Department), Don Robertson (NYSDOT - Region 1), Paul Russell (Town of Colonie), Bert Schou (CDTA), Zimri Smith (Saratoga County Heritage Trail Committee), Steve Allocco (CDTC)

DISCUSSION SUMMARY

Summary of Conference Results: The bicycle/pedestrian-related results of the December New Visions conference were reviewed. There was considerable support from conference participants for the Task Force's continued efforts at developing a plan which truly "changes the rules" regarding investment in bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. Conference participants deliberated on five issues in this area:

- * bicycle and pedestrian *infrastructure needs*
- * *destination treatments* which would increase bicycle use
- * actions to enhance *intermodal connections* from foot or bike (particularly to buses, but also to trains and planes)
- * *maintenance practices* which would allow for safer bicycle and pedestrian travel
- * promoting *public education and awareness* of the needs of and opportunities for bicycle and pedestrian travel

There was strong support for continued Task Force work on all but the last of these issues; regarding education, many conference participants felt CDTC is not the most appropriate body to conduct these efforts.

The conference findings point to four desirable products for the Task Force to develop:

1. A set of standards for bicycle and pedestrian treatment based on area, roadway and traffic characteristics (e.g., urban or rural area, traffic speeds and volumes). Ideally, all infrastructure projects pursued in the Capital District would have "add-on" components providing the appropriate accommodations prescribed by these standards.
2. A set of "pilot corridor" projects, to be pursued under future Transportation Improvement Programs as separate items rather than as "add-ons," which would illustrate the merits of investing in bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.
3. A discussion of maintenance practices which, if adopted by highway and public works agencies, would enhance the safety and comfort of bicycle and pedestrian travel.
4. A designated regional bike network, including destination treatments (such as racks or lockers) and intermodal connections, which would increase opportunities to cycle for some or all of a trip.

Beyond this list, Bert Schou volunteered to develop some bicycle/pedestrian-friendly design guidelines for local planning boards to apply to the site plan review process. This would accomplish part of the education effort needed in the Capital District -- making local governments and planners aware of the infrastructure needs of bicycle and pedestrian travel at the site level.

Proposed Work Program/Schedule for Phase Two: The draft document mailed/faxed on February 22 was discussed. There were some problems with the document's clarity; a revised version will be sent out prior to the next meeting. Particular items on the document prompted the following observations:

- * *Bicycle and Pedestrian Treatment Standards:* It was suggested that if the State's forthcoming Highway Design Manual incorporates the Federal Highway Administration's table(s) on bicycle treatments (attached), it would be adequate and expedient to simply set forth *these* standards for the Capital District rather than develop parallel standards of our own. If the Task Force takes this route, it will need to ascertain from localities that *they* will be able to adhere to these standards as well, for while a good share of the "average" Capital District trip is on State roads, most of these trips eventually use the local system as well, and failure to have these standards applied across all jurisdictions will result in gaps in the system of bicycle facilities.

It was noted that the Task Force should be able to at least in principle agree to adopt the NYSDOT/FHWA standards at the March meeting. For example, the group could take the attached FHWA standards and stipulate that "if the NYSDOT document does not significantly alter these standards, we will use them in the Long-Range Plan as well." As such, the activity which had been scheduled for April would move up to March, May would move up to April, and March (with exception of Work Program approval) would move to May (see draft revised work program for further details).

- * *Designated Bike Network:* The group spent some time discussing how to properly develop this network. The work of the Saratoga County Heritage Trail Committee was discussed as a model for how to define the function and placement of the network: the Committee studied where people need to travel to and from (trip origins and destinations), how they *currently* make these trips and how they would under *ideal* conditions (that is, if adequate bicycle facilities were available). Also, the Committee worked to identify public lands which could be secured and improved for trail use; the Task Force could perform a similar effort if it determines that new facilities would have to be developed in order to bridge gaps in a completely "on-street" network.

To establish this network, the group will need to spend some time defining what the network's role(s) is (are). How extensive the network is will be a function of whether it is seen as providing a few safer alternatives or, conversely, as providing levels of "coverage" and access comparable to those of the existing roadway system for automobiles.

Having representatives of all four counties participate in network development will also be important, ideally ensuring that local travel patterns and important local access points (the latter such as to major worksites, parks, shopping and educational centers) are reflected. Special efforts will be made to bring residents and/or planning professionals from Rensselaer and Schenectady County into the process, as these two counties have not been represented at Task Force meetings to date.

- * *Pilot Corridor Projects:* The Task Force initially discussed the notion that in order to get the sort of *visibility* needed to make Capital District residents and government officials realize the merits of these modes of travel, there should be one pilot project developed for each county. After the meeting, one member brought up the possibility of having *two* pilot projects in each county -- one in an urban setting, one rural. The Task Force will have to decide whether it can flesh out this many projects in the time available (possibly by having members from each county work on proposals for their own areas).

While discussions during the course of the meeting tended to involuntarily center on bicycle travel, it was suggested during a comment on pedestrian-friendly design elements such as the median islands on State Street in downtown Albany that *one or more of the pilot projects should be more explicitly pedestrian oriented.*

- * Maintenance Guidelines: There was little discussion of this element of the Task Force's eventual recommendations during the meeting. It was noted that ideas for these guidelines will probably come up in the process of developing the previous three products; thus, it seems that this element is best placed as the last to be pursued during Phase Two.

POSSIBLE TECHNICAL WORK IN SUPPORT OF PHASE TWO

Discussions during this and previous Task Force meetings, as well as the draft work program, suggested a number of staff tasks which would give the Task Force the technical foundation it needs to develop its recommendations. *In addition to collecting examples of bicycle and pedestrian plans from other cities and regions* (an effort which is currently underway), the following are among the tasks which may be undertaken in anticipation of Task Force working sessions on the various elements of the recommendation set.

Task Supported: Bicycle/Pedestrian Accommodation Standards

1. Preparation of a listing of "local applications" of the FHWA (and/or NYSDOT) tables of desired bicycle treatments by roadway traffic volume, operating speed and other characteristics. For example, application of these standards might imply a statement such as "the desirable treatment for average cyclists on Balltown Road in Niskayuna is a six foot wide shoulder."
2. Evaluation of major intersections in the Capital District to determine where actions such as restricting right turns on red or providing separate pedestrian signal phases would be most beneficial.

Task Supported: Designated Bike Network

1. Preparation of a map of low-volume streets with potential for safest designation as parts of bike routes.
2. Preparation of maps of travel patterns -- city-to-city, intra-city and city-to-suburb -- particularly indicating where the shortest vehicle trips are. This would aid estimation of where *latent* demand for bicycle/pedestrian travel is greatest.
3. Preparation of maps of streets with *higher* traffic volumes might bring out indications of stretches of roadway for which development of alternate routes are most critical.

Task Supported: Pilot Corridor Projects

1. Preparation of a map of travel patterns like #2 in the last section, but emphasizing the emergence of *corridors* with consistently higher numbers of shorter trips with greatest potential for conversion to bicycle/foot travel.

Task Supported: Maintenance Practices

1. Preparation/ mailing of letter to highway and public works agencies asking for information on current sweeping/plowing/rehabilitation practices, frequencies. Letter would emphasize that the group is looking to see how these agencies' *current* resource and staffing levels could better accommodate cyclists and pedestrians, rather than indicating that recommendations on *reallocations or expansions* of their resources for this purpose are being developed.

Task Force members should feel free to raise suggestions of other desirable technical efforts.

ACTION ITEMS

- * CDTC to prepare clarified version of Work Program/Schedule with suggested task sequence changes. Revised version to be mailed out well in advance of next meeting; estimated mailing date **March 9**.
- * Don Robertson (NYSDOT) to look into status of NYSDOT Highway Design Manual; to provide copy to CDTC for mailing in advance of next meeting *if possible*.
- * **Next Task Force meeting: Tuesday, March 22, 5:30 - 7:30 PM, Colonie Community Center, 1653 Central Avenue (across from Lake Electronics).** Tentatively set for Room 21; whether or not the room assignment changes, signs will be placed at the main entrance and along the way to the proper room.
 - Meeting agenda to include:
 - * Agreement on Phase Two work program/schedule
 - * Discussion of/agreement on FHWA/NYSDOT bicycle treatment standards; accept if possible.
 - * Discussion of possible *pedestrian* treatment standards
 - * Begin discussion of designated bike network

**RECORD OF MEETING
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ISSUES TASK FORCE**

DATE/TIME/PLACE: Tuesday, March 22, 1994, 5:30 - 7:30 PM, Colonie Community Center

IN ATTENDANCE: Brad Birge (CDRPC), Helene Brecker (Saratoga County Heritage Trail Committee), John DiMura (NYS Thruway Authority), Emily H. Goodman (private citizen), Jerry Mueller (Green City Transportation Council), Don Odell (Albany County Planning Department), Don Robertson (NYSDOT - Region 1), Bert Schou (CDTA), Zimri Smith (Saratoga County Heritage Trail Committee), Steve Allocco (CDTC)

DISCUSSION SUMMARY

(Note: Materials distributed at the meeting are attached for those members who did not attend.)

Work Program: The time frame for Phase Two of the New Visions effort has been extended, allowing the group more time for product development. At present, the Task Force should aim to have its recommendation package ready for a December conference.

Along with modification of the part of the work program dealing with treatment standards, as discussed in more detail in the next section, the group concurred with extension of the Phase Two schedule through not meeting in April or September. The resulting Work Program, with other changes related to meeting developments detailed below, is attached.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Treatment Standards: At the February 25 meeting, it was proposed that accepting the Federal Highway Administration's suggested standards for bicycle treatments would save the group some work, particularly if NYSDOT was to incorporate these standards into its updated Highway Design Manual. However, given uncertainty regarding when the update will be completed, coupled with concerns raised regarding the desirability of stringent (and, often, costly) standards, the group decided on an alternative approach to setting forth directions for bicycle and pedestrian treatments.

It was noted that while uniform treatments across the Capital District would be desirable, individual localities vary widely in what improvements they can afford. Thus, if local governments in particular are to look to this group's products for direction on "what is needed and how it should be designed," it is important to develop *guidelines*, rather than *standards*, which reflect the varied capabilities of Capital District municipalities and thus *encourage*, rather than *discourage*, provision of bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The group decided that preparing two items would meet the aims of giving decisionmakers a general *understanding* of the issues faced by cyclists and pedestrians and providing a reference for how to *address* these issues. These items are as follow:

- * ***Policy Statement:*** For the group's consideration, the concept of a Policy Statement was set forth and a sample was prepared to help them envision how the concerns they have brought up in meetings to date could be presented in a listing of bicycle/pedestrian-related goals or issues for planners to address. The sample presents a "shopping list" of considerations; a fleshed-out version of this list could be a useful tool not only to CDTC, but also as a guide for municipalities preparing to undertake local projects outside the CDTC capital programming process.

There was some discussion during the meeting of the idea of seeing Committee approval of a Policy Statement along the lines of the handout in the short term. There is a conflict with the goals of the New Visions effort in trying to do this. As discussed on pages 89-92 of CDTC's 1993 Regional Transportation Plan Report (distributed at the meeting), the latest statement of official CDTC policy includes a commitment to enhancing the environment for bicycle and pedestrian travel. In short, what the conceptual policy statement looks for is already in place, save for a formal review procedure. Setting forth a "goal statement" as part of the group's recommendations for the long-range plan would be a useful tool in pursuing this commitment. Looking to change formal processes prior to the end of this multidisciplinary effort, however, could go outside the New Visions plan -- the Task Forces need to work together during Phase Three to determine what (if any) changes to procedures are best for all the Task Force issue areas and goals. In

addition, one of the key features of the New Visions effort is "respect for the existing CDTC structure;" one group's bulldozing through a change in the way CDTC makes decisions would violate this notion and be unfair to other groups adhering to this principle. The Task Force would be best advised to limit its proposals of any changes in the way business is done to the final recommendation package to be worked with by all Task Forces during Phase Three.

- * Design Guidelines: To date, Task Force members have received several documents presenting official standards, advisory guidelines and case studies from which a set of directions for providing bicycle and pedestrian accommodations could be culled. The group decided that this would be a desirable alternative to simply adopting the FHWA treatment tables and hoping they are what NYSDOT eventually goes with for the updated Design Manual. Keeping the result termed *guidelines* rather than *standards* would also avoid conflicts with other agencies' procedures, and giving this product a more advisory presence would avoid "scaring off" localities which might otherwise feel the regional standards imply too high a cost to even try to carry out locally. The group identified the FHWA bicycle treatment matrices mailed out on March 2 and the excerpts from the FHWA case study paper entitled *Measures to Overcome Impediments to Bicycling and Walking* as the best sources from which to draw, tailoring these references' particulars to the Capital District as they see fit. It was noted that providing a number of "real world" examples of where these guidelines could be applied would be helpful, in illustrating for localities where to look for opportunities to better accommodate cyclists and pedestrians.

It was decided that a subcommittee consisting of Brad Birge, John DiMura, Emily Goodman and Bert Schou would meet to develop working drafts of the Policy Statement (bearing in mind the concerns noted earlier) and the Design Guidelines. A working goal should be to have documents ready for distribution well in advance of the May meeting of the full group, such that (a) approval of these documents can be reached and (b) they will provide the necessary guidance to the remainder of the Task Force's efforts. As this material comes together, it will be passed on to CDTC for duplication and mailing; in addition, if other Task Force members wish to offer some direction to this effort, their comments can be made through CDTC or by directly contacting subcommittee members. A listing of phone numbers of Task Force members was requested; this list is attached.

Core System Performance Measures: A draft listing of core performance measures was distributed for members to review in anticipation of a brief discussion at the May meeting. The rationale for having these measures is that the range of issues and possible actions being discussed by the Task Forces requires that we go beyond the traditional measures used to evaluate transportation projects -- namely traffic delay, operating speeds and air pollution. Clearly, actions which would increase cycling or walking for transportation purposes would be of real benefit, but few would provide for improvements in these three measures on a scale which would "compete" with those of traditional highway projects. (Note: later in the meeting, the draft New York State Energy Plan was briefly discussed, and it was observed that cycling and walking as potential means of reducing energy consumption were almost completely ignored. This small scale of "aggregate benefits" may be part of the reason why; numerous studies have, however, concluded that these projects tend to have far higher benefit/cost ratios than traditional highway projects, due to the comparatively small costs of most bicycle or pedestrian accommodations.)

The core measures listing reflects a need to develop a socially and environmentally responsible transportation system, furthering the goals of improving access, mobility, safety and environmental quality. Members should review this list with an eye towards whether any modifications or expansions are required in order to fairly evaluate not just bicycle and pedestrian-related actions, but those which other Task Forces will be proposing.

ACTION ITEMS

- * Subcommittee to meet to prepare Policy Statement (or whatever the alternative term may be; "Goal Statement" is one possibility) and Design Guidelines.
- * **Next Task Force meeting: Tuesday, May 17, 5:30 - 7:30 PM, Colonie Community Center, 1653 Central Avenue (across from Lake Electronics).**

Meeting agenda to include:

- * Brief discussion of performance measures
- * Discussion of Policy Statement and Design Guidelines; acceptance if possible

- * Initial discussions of designated bike network

Capital District

second revision March 24, 1994

Transportation Committee

BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ISSUES TASK FORCE DRAFT PHASE TWO WORK PROGRAM AND SCHEDULE

Phase Two Products

- * a set of design guidelines for bicycle and pedestrian treatment
- * a set of pilot corridor projects
- * a discussion of desirable roadway/sidewalk maintenance practices
- * a designated regional bike network, including destination treatments and intermodal connections

Schedule of Task Force Meetings/Product Development Timeline

(Staff work indicated by italics)

February

~~Discuss December conference results
Implications for Phase Two goals/work program/schedule
"Preliminary approval" of Phase Two work program/schedule~~ NOT REACHED

March

~~Discussion/approval of revised Phase Two work program/schedule
Discuss FHWA or NYSDOT bicycle treatment standards; accept if possible
IN LIGHT OF REVISED PLAN; SEE MAY TASKS
Development of pedestrian treatment standards (start from FHWA materials on
impediments to walking and improvement strategies)
REVISIED PLAN; SEE MAY TASKS
Begin development of designated bike network (time permitting)
DEFERRED TO MAY
WITH REVISED PLAN~~

April - NO MEETING (Subcommittee work on Policy Statement and Design Guidelines)

May

Brief discussion of performance measures to be applied to all task forces'
recommendations
Discussion/Acceptance of Policy Statement and Design Guidelines
*Staff work to establish "typical costs, benefits" of treatments suggested by design
guidelines between this meeting and June meeting (will use these measures in*

developing and evaluating designated bike network and pilot projects).
Initial discussion/development of designated bike network

June

Brief review of "typical costs/benefits" developed by staff for bicycle/pedestrian treatment guidelines discussed in May
Continued discussion of designated bike network; acceptance if possible. If acceptance not reached, necessary guidance should be provided to staff for any technical work to be completed so as to have network prepared for acceptance at beginning of July meeting.
Start discussion/development of pilot corridor projects (time permitting)
Staff work to establish estimated costs, benefits of designated bike network between this meeting and July meeting

July

Start or continue development of pilot corridor projects; accept series if possible*. If acceptance not reached, group should follow same steps as indicated in June schedule for designated bike network, to allow for staff completion and group acceptance at August meeting.
Staff work to establish costs and benefits of project(s) between this meeting and August meeting
Staff work between this meeting and August meeting to solicit information from Public Works, Highway agencies on current roadway/sidewalk maintenance practices (to be presented at that meeting)

August

Acceptance (if necessary) of pilot corridor projects
Develop recommendations on road/sidewalk maintenance practices which will make bicycle/pedestrian travel safer (this could largely be an expansion of some of the points in the subcommittee's Policy Statement)
Staff work between this meeting and October meeting to prepare Task Force recommendation package

September - NO MEETING, but will plan on late August or early September transmittal of draft recommendation package to members for review.

October

Acceptance of recommendation package

*

To get maximum "visibility" for bicycle and pedestrian accommodations, it has been proposed that there be one urban and one rural project in each county. As an alternative, a four-county project could be considered.

Bicycle/Pedestrian Issues Task Force Members w/Phone Numbers Currently on File

<u>Name (Affiliation)</u>	<u>Phone(s)</u> <u>v=voice/fx=fax</u>
Brad Birge (Capital District Regional Planning Committee)	393 - 1715 (v) 393 - 6081 (fx)
Helene Brecker (Saratoga County Heritage Trail Committee)	
Denise Cashmere (Schenectady County Planning Department)	386 - 2225 (v) 382 - 0194 (fx)
John DiMura (New York State Thruway Authority)	436 - 3034 (v) 436 - 2899 (fx)
Emily H. Goodman (Private citizen/NYS Bd of Equaliz. & Assessment)	474 - 8821 (v)
Jerry Mueller (Green City Transportation Committee)	
Tom Nattell (Albany Peace and Energy Council)	438 - 6314 (v)
Don Odell (Albany County Planning Department)	447 - 5660 (v) 447 - 5662 (fx)
Jeff Olson (NYS Department of Transportation - Central Office)	457 - 3125 (v) 457 - 7960 (fx)
Don Robertson (NYS Department of Transportation - Region 1)	474 - 6215 (v) 474 - 9853 (fx)
Paul Russell (Town of Colonie Environmental Conservation)	783 - 2839 (v)
Joann Ryan (City of Albany Planning Department)	434 - 5190 (v) 434 - 5098 (fx)
David Schmidt (City of Schenectady Planning Department)	382 - 5049 (v) 382 - 1050 (fx)
Bert Schou (Capital District Transportation Authority)	482 - 4199 (v) 482 - 9039 (fx)

Zim Smith 587 - 9499 (v)
(Saratoga County Heritage Trail Committee)

Maggie Vinciguerra/Ken Grudens 473 - 3835 (v)
(Hudson River Valley Greenway Communities Council) 426 - 0330 (fx)

Note: Includes people who primarily wished to be kept apprised of the Task Force's work rather than actively participate.

**RECORD OF MEETING
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ISSUES TASK FORCE**

DATE/TIME/PLACE: Tuesday, May 17, 1994, 5:30 - 7:30 PM, Colonie Community Center

IN ATTENDANCE: Brad Birge (CDRPC), Helene Brecker (Saratoga County Heritage Trail Committee), Emily H. Goodman (private citizen), Jerry Mueller (Green City Transportation Council), Katrina Neugebauer (Troy Architectural Program), Don Odell (Albany County Planning Department), Don Robertson (NYSDOT - Region 1), Bert Schou (CDTA), Russell Ziembra (Rensselaer County Environmental Action), Steve Allocco (CDTC)

DISCUSSION SUMMARY

Note: All meeting handouts referred to in this report are attached for members who did not attend the meeting.

Design Guidelines: The design guidelines subcommittee has prepared a nuts-and-bolts listing of ways to make communities more bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly. Brad Birge distributed this listing for review; Task Force members are invited to get back to Brad with comments or suggestions on the document by Friday, June 3 (voice 393-1715; fax 393-6081). Meeting participants commented favorably on the format and content of the listing, which through its "in order of increasing cost" structure drives home the message that better accommodation of cyclists and pedestrians does not necessarily mean spending major amounts of money.

Subsequent to the meeting, CDTC staff explored the prospects for sending this document out in the near future as an "FYI" item to local municipalities and other interested parties. It appears that this is possible if the document first gets Planning Committee approval. It was proposed that the Task Force plan on approving the document at its June meeting; arrangements can be made to present the document to the Planning Committee for consideration afterward.

Deferral of More Specific Design Guidelines: Given continued delays in completion of the Highway Design Manual update, and the extension of the Phase Two timetable, spending any great amount of time on developing recommended roadway/off-road treatments at this point could prove to be a waste of time other than as an intellectual exercise. Thus, this work will be deferred to after September.

Additional Recommendations: Discussions raised the possibility of offering a few additional recommendations beyond the four main products (desirable bicycle/pedestrian treatments, pilot project(s), maintenance practices and designated bicycle network) the group was charged with developing after the first conference. For example, there was some discussion of the idea of a regional clearinghouse/point person to address the bicycle- and pedestrian-related elements of all major capital highway projects and site developments in the region. (*As this would likely amount to a full-time job by itself, the implication is for creation of such a position rather than adding it to someone's current duties.*) Along this line, members interested in setting forth recommendations going beyond the Task Force's "product mandate" are encouraged to develop these ideas and prepare concise summaries of them for consideration by other members. CDTC staff will look into the possible avenues through which the Task Force could introduce these recommendations.

Core Performance Measures: The draft core performance measures document distributed previously was revisited. As noted during the discussion, the purpose of having these core measures is to provide a fair basis for understanding the merits of projects which would produce different types of benefits.

Performance measures will not "make or break" projects at the New Visions conferences or in Planning Committee discussions -- rather, they will be for informational purposes. For example, when an HOV project is compared to a bike project or a transit project, the measures will indicate how the projects would provide benefits in different areas (e.g., emissions reductions or single-occupant vehicles removed from the highway system) without setting "minimums" such as "if the project would not save X vehicle hours of delay per year, it drops from contention".

The most important use of the performance measures could be *within* Task Force discussions, where Task Forces may make use of the performance measures as *internal checks* to see how the projects they are considering match up to their own objectives. For example, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Issues Task Force might use the performance measures to compare competing pilot project candidates to determine which ones are most worth advancing through the New Visions process.

The group discussed a few possible additions to the core measures list. Safety and environmental impacts were the main areas of discussion. It was decided that members would take some time on their own to think about possible additions to the list and pass these on to CDTC for distribution prior to the next meeting; Friday, June 3 will be the deadline for these submissions. The group should plan on approving any additional measures at the June meeting, for as the designated bicycle network and pilot projects are approved during the summer, these measures will be needed to produce some objective measures of benefits.

Designated Bicycle Network: Discussion of the designated bicycle network concept began. As noted, there are two main reasons to identify a network of this sort:

1. This sort of *priority treatment network* (the term being used across Task Forces in the New Visions effort) will influence strategies for infrastructure maintenance and renewal. For example, cyclists tend to be more sensitive to the physical conditions of road surfaces than cars are. Thus, being a "priority treatment" facility could translate to a policy that a road be swept more frequently than non-priority roads, or that it not be allowed to deteriorate as greatly as non-priority roads before being rehabilitated.
2. Going beyond rehabilitation (reconstruction of a roadway based on physical deterioration), a policy could be developed to advance *Transportation Improvement Program* (TIP) projects to reconstruct priority facilities to FHWA Group A cyclist design guidelines even before true rehabilitation needs set in. There could conceivably be one or more projects added during each TIP update which would consist solely of shoulder widenings or bike lane development.

Copies of CDTC's 1976 *Regional Bicycle Transportation Plan* system map were distributed. This plan, developed through extensive public participation and considerable staff time (in an era when there was funding for such activity), identifies a network of arterial, collector and touring facilities which could if properly improved accommodate both transportation and recreational bicycle travel. It was suggested that the 1976 map, while dated, could provide a good starting point for the group's identification of a priority network. The group examined the maps and determined that looking at a "clean slate" rather than starting from the 1976 map might prevent any biasing of how they consider bicycle travel needs and possible priority routes. It was decided that at the June meeting, the group would start from unmarked maps and develop a priority network. Plots indicating peak hour traffic volumes and major activity centers (particularly employment centers, schools, shopping and recreational areas) will be provided for reference during this exercise.

OTHER ISSUES

Don Odell, Jeff Olson and Maggie Vinciguerra represented the Bicycle/Pedestrian Task Force at a meeting with CP Rail and Conrail officials at CDTC on May 18. Also representing the bicycle/pedestrian community was Ivan Vamos, who is the consultant for the Greenway Conservancy for the Hudson River Valley. The purpose of the meeting was to establish a dialogue between the railroads and bicycle/pedestrian advocates regarding possible rail-to-trail conversions or the sharing of railroad rights-of-way for both railroad and trail uses. A summary of this meeting will be sent out when available; in the meantime, the key points for the Bicycle and Pedestrian Issues Task Force to bear in mind from this meeting are the following:

1. Contrary to what may be the popular perception, the railroad industry has "turned the corner" from the depths of the recession; some rail companies are even exploring the potential to *restore* some long-inactive trackage to use. As such it should not be expected that there *are* or *will be* great amounts of abandoned right of way (ROW) available for conversion to trails in the Capital District. In short, "what is out there now" *is* the network, and the Task Force should not count on other abandonments in developing its pilot projects or a designated bicycle network.

2. Furthering the point raised above with regard to conversion, lines which were historically abandoned (particularly in the 1970s, as Conrail was formed) were minor lines carrying very small amounts of traffic. In the Capital District, most rail lines are either mainlines or critical connections, such that even if the rail industry *was* in a period of scaling back, there probably would not be many local candidates for abandonment.
3. Conrail's policy on shared use of ROWs was representative of that of the industry: shared use (e.g., a rail line and a bicycle/pedestrian trail both within the ROW) is *not* permitted along active lines. Liability is a major concern in the industry; CP Rail posts its property and prosecutes trespassers (typically cross-country skiers, snowmobilers) caught on its lines.
4. An example was provided of an approach which has been used elsewhere to get around the "shared ROW" issue: where the ROW is unusually wide, there are no foreseeable track additions within the ROW and the railroad's ROW width could be reduced and still allow for adequate separation of activities, *splitting* the ROW (e.g., by selling off part of it to a state, locality or other group) has made land available for trail use. This facilitates trail development while relieving the railroad of liability and tax concerns. This approach to trail development would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

UPDATE ON PHASE TWO TIMETABLE

With a number of Task Forces looking at extended work efforts and/or the need to coordinate their work with non-New Visions activities (for example, the Expressway Management Task Force's development of a strategic plan for an Intelligent Vehicle-Highway System (IVHS) for the Capital District has to dovetail with NYSDOT's effort at developing similar plans across the State), the next conference has been moved back to May of 1995. As noted on Page 1, this will allow the Bicycle and Pedestrian Issues Task Force to revisit the issue of design guidelines later this year. For the moment, it is proposed that the group still try to adhere to the revised Work Program distributed in the March 24 mailing, save for "sliding" the timetable one month such that the May activities be pursued in June, the June in July, and so forth.

ACTION ITEMS

- * CDTC to prepare copies of 1994-99 TIP project listings by county for next meeting. Task Force members will be able to examine these listings to get a better understanding of how bicycle and pedestrian accommodations can be included in capital projects which have already been placed on the TIP. *Note: in total, a couple of sets of these listings will be brought to the next meeting.*
- * CDTC to prepare suitable "blank" maps for Task Force to use in identifying Designated Bicycle Network facilities. Plots of PM peak hour traffic volumes will also be prepared to help members identify suitable lower-volume facilities to designated as "preferable alternatives" to busy, high-speed arterials.
- * Task Force members to review draft document, "Making Your Community More Bicycle- and Pedestrian-Friendly," and get comments/suggestions to Brad Birge (v:393-1715; fx:393-6081) by **Friday, June 3.**
- * Task Force members to review "Core Performance Measures" document and get comments/suggestions to CDTC (v:458-2161; fx:459-2155) by **Friday, June 3.** CDTC will send out list with any additions for member consideration, along with "Bicycle/Pedestrian-Friendly" document by June 10. Any suggestions for additional measures should be measurable at the regional level, e.g., "centerline miles of roadway meeting FHWA Group A design standards in the Capital District." "Specific location" measures, such as "safe walking distance from office building X to bus stop Y," would be difficult to apply in this sort of exercise, and would probably require a lot of "judgment calls" not just with regard to bicycle/pedestrian accommodations, but in various other fields.

Measures should be quantifiable rather than simple yes/no items. The idea is to give some indication of the *magnitude* of benefits attendant to a project, rather than simply indicating that they make bicycle/foot travel easier.

- * **Next Task Force meeting: Thursday, June 23, 5:30 - 7:30 PM, Colonic Community Center, 1653 Central Avenue (across from Lake Electronics).** Room assignment to be announced in future mailing.

Meeting agenda to include:

- * Approval of content of "Making Your Community More Bicycle- and Pedestrian-Friendly"
- * Approval of Core Performance Measures document (with any additions)
- * Begin development of Designated Bicycle Network

**RECORD OF MEETING
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ISSUES TASK FORCE**

DATE/TIME/PLACE: Thursday, June 23, 1994, 5:30 - 7:30 PM, Colonie Community Center

IN ATTENDANCE: Brad Birge (CDRPC), John DiMura (NYS Thruway Authority), Emily H. Goodman (citizen member), Jerry Mueller (Green City Transportation Council), Don Odell (Albany County Planning Department), Don Robertson (NYSDOT - Region 1), Zim Smith (Saratoga County Heritage Trail Committee), Ivan Vamos (Hudson River Valley Greenway Communities Council), Russell Ziemba (Rensselaer County Environmental Action), Steve Allocco (CDTC)

DISCUSSION SUMMARY

Note: All meeting handouts referred to in this report are attached for those who did not attend.

Bike/Rail Meeting: The minutes of the May 18 meeting between bicycle advocates and railroad representatives were distributed. As summarized in the "Other Issues" section of the May 17 Task Force meeting minutes, the purpose of the meeting was to "clear the air" as to ^(a)the directions in which bicycle advocates may be looking with regard to possible rail-to-trail conversions and ^(b)the rail industry's perspective on such conversions and on the notion of shared rights-of-way (within which both rail and trail activity would take place). *See handout for details.*

Status of "Making Your Community More Bicycle- and Pedestrian-Friendly": Brad has received some comments on the draft; there is a little more time for input on additional changes, with the aim of group acceptance of the document at the July meeting. The document can be distributed by CDTC as an informational reference, with "for more information, call Steve Allocco at CDTC" at the end to give readers a place to turn for examples of where and how the ideas indicated have already been pursued.

The document should be approved by the CDTC Planning Committee before it gets mailed out as a "CDTC document;" if the Task Force decides it is comfortable with the draft at the July meeting, there is adequate time to mail it to Planning Committee members for them to review prior to their August meeting.

Performance Measures: A listing of possible additional performance measures was distributed and discussed. Taking into consideration the issues of both ^(a)whether some items are truly measurable and ^(b)suitability for making the group's case, the group decided that measures 3 through 7 on the handout should be developed for use in its evaluations and, perhaps, for overall evaluation of future regional transportation plans and the "state of the region" regarding bicycle- and pedestrian-friendliness. Discussions of the environmental, economic and social impacts of bicycle and pedestrian travel noted that somewhere in the New Visions process, the point should be raised that these modes of travel provide for a number of benefits which while not easily quantified are both important and largely unique to human-powered travel.

Planning and Investment Principles: Part of what the New Visions process is requesting of the Task Forces is that they articulate some basic principles for better incorporating consideration of their subject areas into the transportation planning and investment processes. CDTC staff prepared a list of six principles for member discussion, drawing from past meetings and the "Making Your Community More..." document, in an attempt to capture the group's basic ideas. Task Force discussion resulted in the revised list attached.

Designated Bicycle Network: The Task Force began development of the Designated Bicycle Network (DBN) by considering two handouts: one entitled "Possible Significance/Benefits of Priority Bicycle Network Status," which answers the question of why this network is being developed; and one listing some "Suggested Destinations," which might represent the "dots" to connect via the network. These and other items raised during this work follow, grouped by issue.

1. *Why Prepare a DBN?*

In short, the DBN is being developed is to establish a long-term bicycle system goal, giving people involved in various areas of transportation (general planning, infrastructure, traffic safety, etc.) a sense of which streets are or can be (with proper accommodations) key bicycle facilities and thus merit some special consideration in their respective areas. Holding these facilities to a higher standard of maintenance or overall physical condition, for example, would reflect the fact that cyclists are more sensitive to pavement condition than cars are; thus, encouraging people to use their bicycles instead of their cars will require extra measures to ensure their safety and comfort.

2. *Destinations*

In reviewing the "Suggested Destinations" listing, the group added a number of individual sites (e.g., Latham Circle Mall) and localities (e.g., Hoosick Falls) along with overall *categories* of places to be considered (e.g, high schools). Not all of these destinations would require that the group identify *direct accesses* to them on the network; rather, for some, the goal would be simply for the network to get bicycles reasonably close to them with levels of safety and comfort exceeding current conditions. The working list of destinations reflecting the group's discussions is attached.

The group began marking the working maps to reflect existing (complete), underway and proposed projects. Particular success was realized in proposing projects for Saratoga County and the Hudson River corridor. It will be difficult to send out any sort of interim map for member review; thus, it is advisable for members to concentrate on developing their own lists or maps of facilities to include in the network. (See "Action Items" for likely areas of emphasis.)

3. *"Designated Bicycle Network" versus "Regional Bicycle Network"*

In considering what to add to the network, group members should bear in mind that proposals for the *designated bicycle network itself* as defined here should be *existing streets*. The parties noted earlier (planning, infrastructure, traffic safety) will be concerned with the identification of streets as important bicycle facilities for the purposes of maintenance and rehabilitation decisions. Off-street facilities should also be indicated, but primarily for the purposes of *defining connections to the rest of the system*. *They should not be expected to become "part of the roadway system" or to receive any special attention beyond that given them by whichever agency is ordinarily responsible for their maintenance*. Perhaps a better way of defining what is on the map is that the on-street facilities will be the designated bicycle network, while the full set of on- and off-street facilities would constitute the *regional bicycle network*.

4. *Consider More Stringent Treatments or Alternate Routes*

Another consideration in continuing development of the network is that in some cases, the *route* desired for a particular travel path may involve streets upon which bicycle travel would be uncomfortable due to high motor vehicle traffic volumes and/or speeds. A more accommodating standard for improvement, such as FHWA's Group B/C Cyclist (less skilled adults, children), might be in order. Alternatively, in the denser urban/suburban areas the group should consider parallel routes carrying less traffic. One example for the major city in each county follows:

<u>City(County)</u>	<u>THIS</u>	<u>instead of THIS</u>
Albany(Albany)	New Scotland Ave	Western Ave
Troy(Rensselaer)	Peoples Ave	Hoosick St
Saratoga Springs(Saratoga)	Excelsior Ave	Routes 9/50
Schenectady(Schenectady)	Front St	Erie Blvd

Some alternate routes may require detours of a mile or more; thus, the notion of alternate routes should be balanced with the need to avoid adding *too much* additional travel distance.

5. The "Minimum Coverage" Principle, and "Special Cases"

One additional point raised on network development was that the group should work towards some "minimum coverage" of the region. This would be necessary because, for example, all the major destinations and popular travel routes may be accounted for but there could still be several hamlets or even fairly large rural areas with no coverage at all. One approach to take in providing for minimum coverage might be to assume a need for a larger-scale "grid" pattern of a few north-south and east-west routes covering an area such as, using the attached map, the towns of Eastern-Southeastern Rensselaer County. As the map illustrates, identifying routes on the basis of likely use or connection of major destinations alone (solid lines) in the seven labelled towns would leave much of Grafton, Poestenkill, Berlin, Nassau and Stephentown without any relatively "local" access. The dotted lines reflect an attempt to provide some additional coverage of these towns; even on these facilities, poor lines of sight, high speeds, poor (on some facilities) pavement conditions and a general lack of motorist awareness of the *possibility* of cyclists on the road suggest that using a traffic volume basis alone for design of bicycle facilities would be woefully inadequate. Some sort of "special case" designation may be in order for such facilities, with design to a *higher* standard (e.g., bike lanes or paved 5' shoulders as *minimums*).

ACTION ITEMS

- * CDTC to investigate possible means of getting additional public input on Designated Bicycle Network.
- * CDTC to determine typical costs of some treatments included in "Making Your Community More Bicycle- and Pedestrian-Friendly" document.
- * Task Force members, if they desire, may forward additional comments/suggestions on "Making Your Community More Bicycle- and Pedestrian-Friendly" ASAP to Brad Birge (v:393-1715; fx:393-6081).
- * Task Force members to continue consideration of possible additions to Designated Bicycle Network. If you cannot attend the next meeting (July 14; see below), please pass on ideas for additions to CDTC (v:458-2161; fx:459-2155).
- * **Next Task Force meeting: Thursday, July 14, 5:30 - 7:30 PM, Colonie Community Center, 1653 Central Avenue (across from Lake Electronics).** Room assignment to be announced in future mailing.

Meeting agenda to include:

- * Continued development of Designated Bicycle Network
- * Initial discussion of Pilot Project(s) (time permitting)

ABSTRACT

DRAFT PLANNING AND INVESTMENT PRINCIPLES

BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ISSUES TASK FORCE

One requirement of the New Visions effort is that the Task Forces articulate some principles for better incorporating their subject areas into the transportation planning and investment processes. The following six principles were culled from group discussions; the list would be sufficient to meet this requirement if the group concurs with it:

1. Cycling and walking should be recognized as equal partners with motor vehicles in the transportation system; project development should facilitate expansion of cycling and walking in the system.
2. Better accommodation of cycling and walking will enhance mobility for those Capital Region residents with the fewest travel choices.
3. Better accommodation of cycling and walking can enhance transit use by making it more accessible.
4. Possible bicycle/pedestrian-related improvements should be considered from the perspective of **developing a system** -- not just based on whether a particular facility is currently used.
5. Barriers to bicycle and pedestrian travel can often be removed quickly and inexpensively.
6. Cyclists and pedestrians are vulnerable to travel surface conditions and motor vehicles; maintenance practices should insulate them from danger.

The overall theme of these principles is as follows:

Encouraging bicycle and pedestrian travel is the most socially, economically and environmentally responsible approach we can take to improving the performance of our transportation system.

**DRAFT PLANNING AND INVESTMENT PRINCIPLES
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ISSUES TASK FORCE**

OVERALL THEME: Encouraging bicycle and pedestrian travel is the most socially, economically and environmentally responsible approach we can take to improving the performance of our transportation system.

1. Cycling and walking should be recognized as equal partners with motor vehicles in the transportation system; project development should facilitate expansion of cycling and walking in the system. In the Capital District, more people commute to work by bicycle or on foot than by using transit. Aside from sidewalks in the downtown areas and a small number of paths or bike lanes, this is without any direct investment in bicycle or pedestrian infrastructure. Investments in new bicycle and pedestrian facilities will tap the *latent* demand for travel via these modes, encouraging people who would travel these ways "if it was safe" to do so.
2. Better accommodation of cycling and walking will enhance mobility for those Capital Region residents with the fewest travel choices. Many Capital Region residents either choose not to or cannot afford to own a car. Not providing reasonable opportunities for bicycle or pedestrian travel limits their mobility by making them dependent on transit schedules (and coverage), taxis or friends. In addition, bicycle and pedestrian accommodations can eliminate the dependence on cars in suburban areas where subdivision designs and the local street networks combine to effectively require car travel for all trip purposes.
3. Better accommodation of cycling and walking can enhance transit use by making it more accessible. People are willing to travel on foot for a short distance to bus stops. However, this willingness is reduced when the trip to or from the bus stop is uncomfortable. Wide, paved shoulders and/or sidewalks connecting residential areas to bus routes will make bus travel more attractive. Cyclists would be more inclined to bike to bus stops if there were safe shoulders or bike lanes as well as (a) secure bike storage facilities at the stops and/or (b) bike racks on the buses.
4. Possible bicycle/pedestrian-related improvements should be considered from the perspective of developing a system -- not just based on whether a particular facility is currently used. As was observed at the first New Visions conference, "bicyclists (and pedestrians) are not stupid." If they feel that a facility is not comfortable or safe, they will not use it. Still, this facility might be along a potentially well-used bicycle/pedestrian travel route. We should look to remedy the *barriers* to bicycle and pedestrian use along facilities which would combine to form very attractive routes for both local and regional travel.
5. Barriers to bicycle and pedestrian travel can often be removed quickly and inexpensively. Whether by smoothing over a rough shoulder with some blacktop or by retiming a traffic signal to allow pedestrians (and wheelchairs) adequate time to cross a busy intersection, bicycle and pedestrian accommodations are often low cost, particularly when compared to even the simplest roadway project. Both as "add-ons" to existing highway projects and as free-standing efforts, we should be finding ways to quickly remove some of the main barriers to these modes of travel.
6. Cyclists and pedestrians are vulnerable to travel surface conditions and motor vehicles; maintenance practices should insulate them from danger. Bicycle and pedestrian facilities should be maintained to a higher standard than motor vehicle facilities typically are. Broken glass, loose gravel, snow and ice are common hazards; more frequent sweeping, plowing, rehabilitation (repaving) and other practices should be the rule in maintaining the facilities we have and any new facilities developed in the future.

Along with proper maintenance of bicycle and pedestrian facilities, we need to heighten motorist awareness of cyclists and pedestrians. Crosswalks and bike lanes should be clearly signed and marked. Pedestrian phases at busy intersections (and near transit stops) would provide additional protection. Separate bicycle stop lines at intersections would increase visibility along with giving cyclists a chance to "pull away" ahead of turning vehicles.

DESIGNATED BICYCLE NETWORK
SOME SUGGESTED DESTINATIONS FOR CONNECTION/ACCESS IMPROVEMENT

City Downtowns

Major Worksites

Corporate Woods
Corporations Park (Scotia)
Empire State Plaza
Executive Woods
G.E. - KAPL
G.E. - Main
Rensselaer Technology Park
State Farm
State Office Campus
Watervliet Arsenal

Major Shopping Areas

Clifton Country Mall
Colonie Center/Northway Mall
Crossgates Mall
Latham Circle Mall
Rotterdam Square Mall
Saratoga Mall/Wilton Mall
Wolf Road

Schools

Albany Law/Pharm/Med
High Schools
HVCC
RPI
Sage
SCCC
SUNY
Siena
Skidmore
Union

Major Recreational Sites

Cherry Plain State Park
Grafton Lakes State Park
Mohawk-Hudson Bike-Hike Trail
Moreau State Park
Sacandaga Lake
Saratoga Battlefield Park
Saratoga Spa State Park
Thacher State Park
Urban Cultural Parks

Intermodal Facilities

Albany County Airport
Amtrak Stations (Rensselaer, Saratoga Springs, Schenectady)
Greyhound/Trailways Stations (Albany, Schenectady)

Regional Gateways/Trails

Bike Route 5

Hudson River Greenway routes to south (NY 9J, NY 144)
Hudson River Route 4 (to Glens Falls)
NY 9N to Luzerne/Adirondack Park
US 20 to west
US 9/NY 32 to Glens Falls

Major "Barrier" Spots

Airport area
Balltown Road, Route 7 to Glenridge Road, Niskayuna
Fuller Road from Western Avenue to Central Avenue, Albany/Colonie/Guilderland
Krumkill Road from Route 85 to the Krum Kill, in the Russell Road area, and from Font Grove to Johnston Roads, Albany/Bethlehem/New Scotland
Maple Avenue from Freeman's Bridge to Glenridge Roads, Glenville
New Scotland Avenue from the Thruway Bridge to the Normanskill, Albany
Non-limited access facilities where bicycle/pedestrian use is prohibited OR where it is not prohibited but officially discouraged
River crossings (Hudson & Mohawk)
Route 155 from Central Avenue to Western Avenue, Albany/Colonie/Guilderland
Route 50 from Broadway across I-87, Saratoga Springs
Route 7, Colonie/Niskayuna
Western Avenue (Route 20) from Church Road to Fuller Road, Guilderland

Outlying Small Urban or Otherwise Built-Up Areas (Rural "Hubs")

Averill Park/Sand Lake
Ballston Spa
Berlin
Castleton
Corinth
Delanson
Hoosick Falls
Nassau
Petersburgh
Ravena
Rensselaerville
Schaghticoke/Valley Falls
Schuylerville/Victory Mills
South Glens Falls
Stillwater
Voorheesville

**RECORD OF MEETING
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ISSUES TASK FORCE**

DATE/TIME/PLACE: Thursday, July 14, 1994, 5:30 - 7:45 PM, CDTC Offices

IN ATTENDANCE: Emily H. Goodman (citizen member), Jerry Mueller (Green City Transportation Council), Katrina Neugebauer (Troy Architectural Program), Don Odell (Albany County Planning Department), Paul Russell (Town of Colonie), Bert Schou (CDTA), Ivan Vamos (Hudson River Valley Greenway Communities Council), Russell Ziemba (Rensselaer County Environmental Action), Steve Allocco (CDTC)

DISCUSSION SUMMARY

Route 9/Mohawk-Hudson Bike-Hike Trail Interface: Paul Russell reported concerns regarding the transition from Route 9 to the Bike-Hike Trail at Fonda Road in the Town of Colonie. In short, this transition requires cyclists to use the travel lane on Fonda Road and then an active gravel driveway between Fonda Road and the trail. It was noted that this location also provides a connection between the Bike-Hike Trail and the Mustang Drive site expected to shortly become a Postal Service facility -- potentially a major trip destination. Discussions between the Town and NYSDOT are ongoing regarding how to improve this particular location for cyclists, either in the course of the current Route 9 rehabilitation project or afterward; this is also an important "case study" for the Task Force as it illustrates the need to provide for the *full lengths* of cyclists' trips, rather than simply getting them to the general vicinity of a facility and "letting them take it from there." Some of the types of possible actions discussed for this location, including creation of a direct, publicly-owned access from Route 9 or Fonda Road to the trail and signage indicating where the trail goes *from* this access point, would likely have application to a number of transition areas on the draft regional bicycle network; thus, it will be useful to watch for how this matter is resolved.

"Making Your Community More Bicycle- and Pedestrian-Friendly" Informational Document: The Task Force approved by voice vote the draft document, with the understanding that slight modifications to the text will be made to (1)include the physically challenged in references to parties who would benefit from bicycle or pedestrian accommodations and (2)clarify that particularly in rural areas, on-road accommodations such as shoulders must be designed for safe use by bicyclists *and* pedestrians. Due to time constraints, the document will not be on the August Planning Committee agenda for approval, but it should be on the September agenda.

Designated Bicycle Network: The Task Force continued development of the network. The resulting draft network includes over 1,000 miles of streets and off-street trails, broken out as follows:

<u>County</u>	<u>Mileage</u>
Albany	± 244.05
Rensselaer	± 261.41
Saratoga	± 371.09
Schenectady	± 164.29
TOTAL	± 1,040.84

The network includes approximately 110 miles of existing facilities (primarily the Mohawk-Hudson Bike-Hike Trail and Bike Route 5) and ± 70 miles of planned (with all necessary funding commitments) facilities. Excerpts of the map are attached; a distributable version of the full draft map is under development and should be distributed at the August Task Force meeting if not prior to it. At the August meeting, the Task Force will have to take a hard look at the question of what they want to *do* with the network, both in terms of somehow *prioritizing* the various facilities and in terms of what role they want the network to play in the transportation planning process. With over 1,000 miles of facilities indicated, the network would be unwieldy as a planning tool without some "preference" logic set forth for its use. Task Force members should give some thought to the possible roles of this map in influencing future decisionmaking, and be prepared to share these thoughts at the next meeting.

The Task Force will need to get feedback on the draft network from two groups: the general public, who will be the *users* of the network; and the professional planning/public works/transportation community having *jurisdiction* over the roadways on or near the network. In response to a suggestion raised at the July meeting, CDTC staff has identified a two-part approach to getting this input. First would be a mailing, distributing the map for comment by CDTC's Planning and Policy Committees, its Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee and other interested parties on the mailing list for bicycle and pedestrian issues. Next, two public meetings could be held. The first meeting could come as early as the last quarter of 1994, presenting the map in a "here's what we have to this point -- are we on the right track?" context. The long-term nature of the New Visions process and the need to balance bicycle and pedestrian concerns with those of other Task Forces would be pointed out at this meeting, such that those in attendance would not come away with the mistaken impression that "this is the plan, plain and simple." It may be a good *part* of the plan, but it remains to be seen during Phase 3 how the bicycle and pedestrian concerns and needs balance with those of competing or related issue areas. A second meeting, more towards the end of the New Visions process, would present the network along with the planning and investment principles, pilot project(s) and proposed facility maintenance practices with any changes developed during Phase 3 to illustrate the Capital District's long-term plans for enhancing the bicycle and pedestrian environment.

ACTION ITEMS

- * CDTC staff to complete development of a draft network map for distribution; distribution to come either at or prior to the August meeting.
- * Task Force members to review attached excerpts of network map to get a sense of typical urban and rural "coverage" and develop ideas regarding the following questions:
 - * should identified facilities be prioritized to get down to "key" and "secondary" levels?
 - * examples: commuter versus touring routes, volume-based identification of facilities where treatment is most immediately necessary (e.g., via FHWA standards), "arterials first" policy for improvement
 - * what is the most effective way in which the network can be a planning tool?
 - * some possibilities: developing Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) project candidates *specifically* to provide bicycle-related improvements to facilities on the network; using the network as a "check" on TIP candidates for possible bicycle elements; conducting inventories of existing conditions on the network to develop "area plans" for enhancing the bicycle environment.¹

¹This could be an advisory role, similar to CDTC's current work in local corridor studies. Under these efforts, a number of municipalities have contracted with CDTC for traffic studies of heavily used travel corridors or areas (e.g., the Balltown Road and Route 50 studies, and the Clifton Park townwide study). Municipalities interested in developing local "master plans" for enhancing bicycle and pedestrian travel would be able to enlist CDTC's assistance to perform or in support of these tasks. CDTC would draw from the regional network and other Task Force products in developing these plans.

- * Task Force members also to develop ideas for possible bicycle/pedestrian pilot projects.
 - * some issues/possibilities:
 - * one regionwide project with urban and rural, bicycle and pedestrian components?
 - * as alternative, develop one *very* aggressive yet more localized project (e.g., the downtown Albany to SUNY corridor)?
 - * how to make sure transit/other intermodal access and destination treatments are included?

- * **Next Task Force meeting: Thursday, August 11, 5:30 - 7:30 PM, CDTC offices, 5 Computer Drive West, Colonie.**

Meeting agenda to include:

- * Discussion of the function(s) of the Designated Bicycle Network, including any further prioritization of facilities shown on the map
- * Initial discussion of Pilot Project(s) (time permitting)

**RECORD OF MEETING
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ISSUES TASK FORCE**

DATE/TIME/PLACE: Thursday, August 11, 1994, 5:30 - 7:15 PM, CDTC Offices

IN ATTENDANCE: Emily H. Goodman (citizen member), Jerry Mueller (Green City Transportation Council), Katrina Neugebauer (Troy Architectural Program), Don Odell (Albany County Planning Department), Don Robertson (NYSDOT - Region 1), Ivan Vamos (Hudson River Valley Greenway Communities Council), Russell Ziembra (Rensselaer County Environmental Action), Steve Allocco (CDTC)

DISCUSSION SUMMARY

Regional Bicycle Network: The Task Force reviewed copies of the draft network map (enclosed for those who did not attend the meeting), considering the question of how the network should influence planning and investment decisions. The network presented two basic problems for the group: it arguably designates too many facilities to appear "selective," and without any sort of prioritization, there is a real question of what the group feels the most important facility types or locations are within it.

As the group discussed these issues, what seemed to evolve was a place for the network in the planning process which does not entail the network's having the "rule of law" with regard to the treatment of specific facilities. In this place, the network could serve a number of functions:

1. Identify desirable bicycle travel corridors

The map presents a system for intra- and interregional travel towards which the region can build over time. It reflects consideration of major travel patterns; the need for some "minimal coverage" of rural areas; and recreational bicycle travel opportunities both within the Capital District and between this region and others (e.g., the Adirondack Park, the Hudson and Mohawk River Corridors). It is recognized that it will not always be feasible to improve the specific facilities marked on the map; in these cases, the potential to either use "softer" treatments (e.g., "if no shoulder can be provided along part of a road, put up 'Share the Road' signs") or provide accommodations on nearby alternatives should be explored. In addition, the group was reminded that in rural areas, bicycle treatments also serve as pedestrian treatments; it was suggested that this point, along with a reinforcement of the message that policies on sidewalk construction and maintenance need to be developed and consistently applied, be prominently noted in the Task Force's next report.

2. Provide a "model" to get a sense of the magnitude of needed improvements at the regional level

The Task Force set forth the idea of using the network to determine what treatments would be necessary at the regional level based on prevailing standards -- particularly, the FHWA standards set forth in the *Selecting Roadway Design Treatments to Accommodate Bicycles* document (tables from which were distributed at a Task Force meeting a few months back). A sense of the total cost -- and time frame -- of accommodating bicycle travel in the region could be developed in this matter. This is one of the tasks to be pursued by the CDTC staff in the next month or so (see "Action Items").

3. Serve as a long-range plan for bicycle travel

ISTEA requires that a bicycle and pedestrian transportation plan be developed and incorporated into the MPO's long-range plan. In turn, bicycle and pedestrian projects can be pursued using Surface Transportation Program funds if they are designed pursuant to this plan. The Regional Bicycle Network, by virtue of its coverage, offers a strong regionwide reference for development of a system of bicycle accommodations. Coupled with the other products of the Task Force's work, and enhanced by the inputs of CDTC's Subcommittee on Bikeway and Pedestrian Planning, this network will clearly meet the ISTEA requirement for a plan.

4. Serve as a starting point for local planning

Municipal bicycle/pedestrian circulation plans tend to include more local roadways than do plans such as the Regional Bicycle Network. Still, the regional network provides these local plans with a "spine" of sorts for their networks, identifying the primary facilities for both through and local traffic.

Pilot Projects

The group took up the issue of pilot projects -- proposed projects illustrating application of a range of the tools it sees as important to enhancing the environment for bicycle and pedestrian travel. In previous discussions, the group seemed to be leaning towards developing one or a few free-standing corridor projects (e.g., the "Downtown Albany to SUNY" corridor); at this meeting, however, the idea generating considerable enthusiasm was that of *using projects on the current TIP as the pilot projects*. As envisioned, the TIP would be reviewed for projects having some potential for inclusion of bicycle and/or pedestrian elements; projects meeting this condition would then be examined so as to determine what treatments would be desirable. To keep manageable the amount of technical work necessary to do this, it was decided to limit the examination to projects being designed in the next three years -- on the TIP tables, this would be those projects shown as having preliminary engineering work taking place in the 1995-96, 1996-97 and 1997-98 budget years. (This also seems appropriate given the expected May 1995 date for the next New Visions conference, at which these pilot projects would be set forth for all the other Task Forces' consideration for the first time.) Projects either earlier or later than these years will be checked in a more cursory fashion, to ensure that no critical opportunities are missed.

In addition to being examined "by themselves," the TIP projects will be mapped so as to determine whether relatively small, additional bicycle/pedestrian projects *not* on the TIP would if pursued bridge gaps in the bicycle/pedestrian travel system. Destination treatments and intermodal connections will also be explored. Finally, it was suggested that statistics on accidents involving bicycles or pedestrians could be reviewed as a way of identifying additional locations in need of bicycle or pedestrian accommodations. The availability and quality of such information will be investigated by CDTC staff.

ACTION ITEMS

- * CDTC to:
 - * apply FHWA bicycle treatment tables to Regional Bicycle Network
 - * start examining the 1994-99 TIP as a source of pilot projects
 - * look into the availability of statistics on accidents involving bicycles and pedestrians
 - * start preparation of a writeup on the Task Force's Phase Two products (bearing in mind that a "common format" for Phase Two reports is still to be developed)
- * **Next Task Force meeting: Wednesday, October 12, 5:30 - 7:30 PM, Colonie Community Center, 1653 Central Avenue (across from Lake Electronics).** Room assignment to be announced in future mailing. Meeting agenda to include presentation/discussion of early results of staff work listed under "CDTC to:" above.

start writeup

- include explan. of context for network
 - comment on "14/4 as minimum"
 - check out accident statistics stuff
 - note that in rural areas, bike accom often=ped accom
 - Ivan's comment on need to have sidewalk policy, coherent and consistently applied
- *

**RECORD OF MEETING
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ISSUES TASK FORCE**

DATE/TIME/PLACE: Wednesday, October 12, 1994, 5:30 - 7:30 PM, Colonie Community Center

IN ATTENDANCE: Brad Birge (CDRPC), Alicia Fernandez (Niagara Mohawk/SUNY Albany), Emily H. Goodman (citizen member), Katrina Neugebauer (Troy Architectural Program), Bob Kirker (Town of Wilton Highway Committee), Don Odell (Albany County Planning Department), Jeff Olson (NYSDOT), Don Robertson (NYSDOT - Region 1), Bert Schou (CDTA), Steve Strichman (Schenectady 2000), Ivan Vamos (Hudson River Valley Greenway Communities Council), Russell Ziemba (Rensselaer County Environmental Action), Steve Allocco (CDTC)

DISCUSSION SUMMARY

Note: Any handouts referenced in the summary are attached for those who did not attend the meeting. The summary generally follows the order of the agenda distributed at the outset of the meeting.

Task Force Housekeeping: Several short items were reported on at the start of the meeting. First, Bob Kirker of the Town of Wilton was introduced. Bob will be taking Zim Smith's place on the Task Force. Next, note was made of the National Highway Institute's Bicycle/Pedestrian Planning course and the NYSDOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Conference, both held recently in Albany. CDTC attended both events; materials from them are available for review at the CDTC offices.

Two upcoming events were noted: a presentation by Peter Calthorpe at the State Museum on October 27 at 7:30 PM (flyer attached), and an upcoming Mohawk-Hudson Wheelmen meeting on November 3 (7:30 PM, St. Michael's Church, Killen Park, Colonie) at which Jeff Olson, Don Robertson and Steve Allocco have been invited to speak.

Status Report -- Make Your Community More Bicycle- and Pedestrian Friendly: Work prior to the September meeting concentrated on clarifying the "audience" for the information and preparing the outside blurb and acknowledgments. Final cosmetic work, including scanning in some photos for the cover, selecting paper stock for duplication and producing a number of draft copies, should be completed shortly.

It was suggested that copies of this flyer be made available at the Calthorpe visit. This idea was investigated after the meeting, and the final determination was that the document *cannot* be publicly distributed prior to being approved by the Planning Committee. This is because the Task Force is an advisory committee, not a policymaking body, and thus it is not in the position to generate and distribute CDTC "public use" documents on its own. If the Calthorpe visit was strictly a "New Visions" participants' workshop, it might be possible to distribute the document in draft as "what we have to date;" however, given the likelihood that the presentation will be attended by a considerable number of people not involved with the New Visions effort, this cannot be done. The next meeting of the Planning Committee is on November 2; Brad and Steve were given carte blanche by the Task Force to work to finish document preparation, and if this can be completed in time for the pre-Committee meeting mailout (October 24 or 25), it will be placed on that meeting's agenda for approval.

Regional Bicycle Network: The results of applying the FHWA's suggested bicycle treatment standards to the Regional Bicycle Network were displayed; it was observed that particularly when "Group A" cyclist standards were applied, these treatments often would not imply major projects -- wide right-side lanes, in most cases. Even "Group B/C" treatments are not "unrealistic" -- basically, bike lanes in the urban areas and shoulders in the rural areas. One lingering question remains: as some have put it, "Group A" cyclists will usually not be deterred by conditions from using a given facility or route unless it is flat-out impassable; thus, the Task Force needs to decide whether it would be more beneficial to design for "Group B/C" cyclists, and if so, whether for *all* facilities on the network or just some prioritized set (see "Priority Treatment Network" section below).

Steve Strichman of Schenectady 2000 reported on an upcoming local planning effort which may take advantage of the Task Force's regional network development effort. A soon-to-be-scheduled meeting of representatives of a number of Schenectady 2000 Task Forces, NYSDOT and CDTC will take up the question of better connections between Vale Park and other uptown sites and the downtown and waterfront areas. The Regional Bicycle Network may serve as the starting point for development of a local bicycle/pedestrian travel plan, after which the issue of possible Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and/or Enhancement Program projects to complete key connections within the local network will be taken up.

Vision Statement: Sample "vision statements" were distributed, to illustrate ways in which a single sentence or two can summarize what a long-range plan for enhancing bicycle and pedestrian travel opportunities looks to achieve. Without a vision statement to crystallize this aim, there might be less-than-optimal use of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Issues Task Force's other products, as other participants in the CDTC process (e.g., other Task Forces, the Planning and Policy Committees) might not understand what this group was trying to work towards in generating its recommendations. Task Force members should give some thought to what the vision might be, and pass any ideas along to CDTC for inclusion in a list of possibilities to be mailed out prior to the next meeting.

Priority Treatment Network: The group was provided with a set of sample bases for identifying a priority network. As envisioned, this network would be a set of streets, *along with their shoulders and walkways as appropriate*, which would be held to a higher standard for both routine maintenance and periodic reconstruction than the remainder of the region's roadway system (which as a whole should be better maintained for bicycle and pedestrian travel than it is at present). In addition, a priority network could be the focus of special efforts to heighten motorist awareness of cyclists, through the use of "Share the Road" signs, buffer zones between motor vehicles and bicycles, and other means. The handout illustrated what the network would look like if developed from two common approaches: based on the functional classifications of roadways (first two plots) and by daily or rush hour traffic volumes.

Task Force members took a little time to review the plots, and the suggestion was raised that looking at these evaluations *alongside* the Regional Bicycle Network might be the best way to designate a set of priority facilities within the set of previously identified "desirable routes." CDTC staff will prepare evaluations and a couple of possible priority systems using this approach for the next meeting.

During this discussion, the concept of a priority network for *pedestrian* travel was also raised. As envisioned, it would provide important connections and crossings for pedestrians in three main areas: in and near the region's Urban Cultural Parks; along and leading to transit routes; and in major shopping areas. (Staff note: major *educational and employment* centers were not specifically suggested during this discussion; given their prominence in the Task Force's listing of areas which should be the beneficiaries of improved access and destination treatments, perhaps they should be taken into consideration as well in developing a priority network.) Perhaps at the next meeting, some time should be taken to see if this concept can be better fleshed out.

"Current Events": Three recent developments were noted:

- * NYSDOT's proposal to build a pedestrian (/bicycle?) bridge over I-787 in downtown Albany;
- * a public meeting held by NYSDOT on the resurfacing of Route 20 between Routes 158 and 146 in Guilderland; and
- * the Albany Service Corps' being available for fieldwork

The two NYSDOT-related items raised the thought that perhaps the Task Force should be notified early in the process of those projects which might have potential bicycle/pedestrian travel implications; Don Odell was nominated and approved by the group to write a letter to NYSDOT requesting that this be done in the future. Also, the I-787 bridge proposal raised the suggestion that someone be invited to the next Task Force meeting to give a presentation on it; at this writing, it had just been confirmed that Dick Carlson (Region 1's Planning and Program Manager) and a representative from Region 1 Design will be making a presentation to the Urban Issues Task Force on the proposal on October 20. Given space and time constraints, the staff decision was to *not* put the word out to the Bicycle/Pedestrian Task Force on this meeting, but instead to send out a summary of the presentation. However, perhaps fittingly given the new status bestowed upon him by the rest of the group, Don Odell was informed of the meeting and will be in attendance. It was also decided that given the current status of this proposal, it would not be

appropriate to ask NYSDOT to make a second presentation at the next Bicycle/Pedestrian meeting; it would arguably be more appropriate to request a presentation once a structure design has been selected and project development has progressed to the issue of bicycle and pedestrian accommodations at either end of the bridge and away from it.

The Service Corps opportunity raised the idea of an inventory of a "triangle" consisting of parts of Bike Route 5 and the Mohawk-Hudson Bike-Hike Trail. This is currently on the Corps' list of planned projects. The schedule calls for participants to get an "early look" at the Bike-Hike Trail during the Fall, and then to get into the real work in the Spring. In addition to inventory work, trail *maintenance* is a big part of what the Corps will do; being an Albany-based group, however, issues of liability may limit this maintenance work to sections of the Trail within the City.

A standard form will be developed for Service Corps participants to use in conducting their inventories. For on-road facilities such as Bike Route 5, some examples of what data might be collected follow:

- * shoulder width OR outside lane width
- * shoulder paved/unpaved?
- * general condition of riding surface (good/fair/poor)
- * general amount of debris -- glass, gravel, etc. -- on riding surface (none, a little or a lot)
- * railroad crossings or other spot barriers?
- * "disappearing shoulder" (e.g., shoulder ends at bridge)?
- * adjacent parking? (yes/no)
- * road's speed limit
- * sharp curves/limited sight distance?
- * adequate signage or other navigational aids?

A number of other items are possible; it will be necessary to limit the form to a few key elements necessary to make a determination on the quality of a route or trail segment. This is necessary not only to make it easy to learn how to make judgments out in the field, but to keep the data collection process moving, as the evaluations might break a facility down into segments as short as 1/4 or 1/2 mile each, and if there were 20 questions to answer on each segment, it could take quite a bit of time to get a complete inventory. As the form is developed, it will be sent out to Task Force members for review and comment.

Pilot Projects from Transportation Improvement Program: Work continues; the goal is to have a summary together for the November meeting, with the hope of getting started with discussions of "what to ask for." Beyond add-ons to existing TIP projects, the idea was raised that a few possible separate bicycle/pedestrian initiatives could be set forth for consideration as well. These initiatives could emulate successful programs in other parts of the country, such as Seattle's *Bike Spot Improvement Program*, under which the city budgets \$100,000 each year for repairs to potholes, damaged streetlights and other problems reported to the city by cyclists. A "set-aside" program of this sort could also be used for the *initial installation* of bicycle and/or pedestrian accommodations, such as separate bike stop lines at intersections, bicycle racks or lockers; "spot-paving" to provide short-distance sidewalks or bikeways crossing barrier areas; or traffic calming measures. Task Force members may wish to give this idea some thought in anticipation of developing a list of possible TIP proposals at the November meeting.

Following the "TIP projects" discussion, Alicia Fernandez made a short presentation of a "Downtown to SUNY (to Crossgates)" bicycle/pedestrian concept plan prepared for a planning course at SUNY/Albany. The emphasis of the project was to develop a connection between the campus and downtown which would provide students with improved access to the rest of the city -- particularly to downtown. The concept is similar to the "downtown to SUNY" pilot project idea suggested in Task Force discussions some time ago. The idea raised following the presentation was that if the concept could be revisited by a next group of students with the aim of better fleshing out the details (although the concept as presented was pretty strong for something prepared in only four weeks), it could have potential for implementation by the City, NYSDOT and the State Office of General Services.

Possible Meetings with Other Task Forces: The Infrastructure Task Force is curious as to what Bicycle/Pedestrian is thinking with regard to priority treatment facilities and what this "priority treatment" would be; as this concept is further developed in the coming months, a meeting of representatives of each Task Force may be in order, perhaps in either December or January.

The group was reminded that Urban Issues would like to set up a joint meeting in November, particularly to address possible pedestrian treatments; Brad Birge, Emily Goodman and Don Odell expressed interest, and they would be joined by Bert Schou, who sits on both Task Forces. Again, anyone interested in sitting in on this discussion should let CDTC know. "Where" and "when" should be established soon.

ACTION ITEMS

- * CDTC to:
 - * attend and prepare summary of NYSDOT presentation to Urban Issues Task Force on I-787 Pedestrian Bridge proposals
 - * work with Brad Birge on "Make Your Community..." cosmetic and text preparation for Planning Committee review
 - * continue TIP review for bicycle/pedestrian "add-ons"
 - * evaluate Regional Bicycle Network using common "priority treatment" bases to develop a couple of possible priority networks
 - * work on developing a standard form for Service Corps participants to use in evaluations of trail and bike route conditions

- * **Next Task Force meeting: Wednesday, November 30, 5:30 - 7:30 PM, Colonie Community Center, 1653 Central Avenue (across from Lake Electronics).** Room assignment to be announced in future mailing. Meeting agenda to include:
 - * vision statement development
 - * priority treatment network concepts
 - * possible TIP pilot projects update
 - * development of additional possible TIP projects (see discussion on Page 3)

**RECORD OF MEETING
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ISSUES TASK FORCE**

DATE/TIME/PLACE: Wednesday, November 30, 1994, 5:30 - 7:30 PM, Colonie Community Center

IN ATTENDANCE: Brad Birge (CDRPC), Bob Bump (Mohawk-Hudson Wheelmen), Emily H. Goodman (citizen member), Bob Kirker (Town of Wilton Highway Committee), Don Odell (Albany County Planning Department), Don Robertson (NYSDOT - Region 1), Bert Schou (CDTA), Steve Allocco (CDTC)

DISCUSSION SUMMARY

Note: Any handouts referenced in the summary are attached for those who did not attend the meeting. The summary generally follows the order of the agenda distributed at the outset of the meeting.

Task Force Housekeeping: Several handouts were distributed as followups to discussions at the October meeting: materials from the Urban Issues Task Force meeting at which NYSDOT gave a presentation on the I-787 pedestrian bridge, along with a letter from Ivan Vamos to Dick Maitino (Region 1 Director) in support of the proposal; copies of Don Odell's letter to Region 1 Design in regard to issues raised at the public meeting on the Route 20 project in Guilderland; and copies of the "Make Your Community More Bicycle- and Pedestrian-Friendly" document as approved by the CDTC Planning Committee on November 3. Also distributed for information was an article from a recent issue of the Urban Transportation Monitor on a 4.5 mile bike lane constructed along the Moorpark Freeway in California. A final note was in regard to past discussions of the possible abandonment of the Canadian Pacific Rail Voorheesville line, part of which (between Voorheesville and the Port of Albany) was identified as a desirable bike/hike corridor, should it ever become available. CP Rail informed CDTC on November 30 that it *will* in fact be initiating abandonment proceedings, most likely beginning in January or February of 1995. The tracks will most likely continue to be used until October or November of 1995, when improvements are completed on the track line selected as the preferred alternative to this one for G.E. turbine shipping. CDTC, NYSDOT, the NYS Department of Environmental Conservation, the Town of Bethlehem and other agencies will meet in January to figure out all the necessary details surrounding the purchase of this line as a transportation corridor preservation action.

NYSDOT Highway Design Manual -- Chapter 18 (Facilities for Pedestrians and Bicyclists): Don Robertson reported that Chapter 18 has been released in draft for review by NYSDOT divisions and regions; the draft manual appears to provide a good deal of detail on *how* to include pedestrian and bicyclist amenities once the determination has been made that they should be included, while leaving somewhat open to the discretion of the technical staff the issue of *whether* they should be included. CDTC staff will return to the TIP project review (see next section) to see what the Chapter 18 specifications might imply for the selected set of projects evaluated, with a particular eye towards the question of whether these specifications suggest *different* treatments from the FHWA guide, "*Selecting Roadway Design Treatments to Accommodate Bicycles.*"

Pilot Projects from Transportation Improvement Program: The first draft results of the TIP review were distributed. (There are two documents contained in this review: the three-page "Draft Summary Listing," and the 19-page "Draft Discussion.") Task Force members are asked to review this material and come up with any suggestions in two areas:

- * General content/categories of information: Additional types of information to include in the summaries.
examples: - major trip generators located near the project
 - is the facility on the Regional or Priority Bicycle Networks? (for latter, see next section)
 - jurisdiction (agency responsible for project implementation)

- * Additional detail on desirable treatments or other concerns: Based on first-hand experience with cycling or walking in the vicinity of the project, either additional information on the nature of cycling/walking problems encountered or additional actions which would be desirable.

One important note is that about 80 percent of the projects examined in this review will be pursued by NYSDOT -- arguably the implementing agency in the Capital District most financially capable of "doing the most." Actions unworkable to them would likely not be realistic for local agencies either. Thus, it will be important for the Task Force to balance a desire to make significant changes in how bicyclists and pedestrians are accommodated on the roadway system with what NYSDOT feels can realistically be done. NYSDOT's insights on the treatments suggested in the TIP review should be given real weight as "reality checks" as the Task Force finalizes its Phase Two products over the next 2-3 months.

Priority Bicycle Network: A first-draft network for bicycles was presented. The Priority Network identifies those facilities on the 1,000± mile Regional Bicycle Network which would be deemed "most critical" -- those which should be seen as the "bare minimum" set which the Capital District should work towards making more bicycle-friendly. It could also be suggested that the importance of these facilities justifies a *higher* level of accommodation than either the FHWA Group A or Group B/C suggested treatments would indicate, as it is often on these priority facilities that the main barriers to safe, comfortable cycling are found -- people may be willing and safely able to ride on local, lower-volume roads on either end of their trip, but it can be the portion of the trip on the major facilities which is most daunting.

As the term is applied to the Network, *priority facilities*...

- * ...have few practical alternatives nearby (as any alternate routes would add significant length to a trip)
- * ...are parts of major travel routes -- they connect major activity centers with each other and are the most critical parts of connections between these activity centers and major residential areas
- * ...are accessible to residential areas via local (non-through), lower-volume roads
- * ...thus, they have high *potential* for use as bike routes, with the proper accommodations

The first-cut Priority Network attempts to balance route directness with minimizing *barriers* to safe travel. As the panels below show, the result is analogous to a rope which is fraying at either end: the intact section is the priority link, which hosts any of a number of typical barriers to be mitigated, while the frayed ends are local, non-priority facilities accessing it.

Task Force members offered comments and suggested a number of additions to the network. Copies of the draft network map will be sent out in advance of the December meeting; the attached 11" x 17" foldout which follows gives an indication of how Regional Network facilities in the Colonie/Guilderland area would be prioritized. As CDTC staff continues work on cost estimation and applying some of the *performance measures* discussed a while back, the eventual Priority Network will be the basis for this work, and not the entire Regional Bicycle Network. The RBN will serve as the area's overall plan, identifying all the desired bicycle routes.

Vision Statement: Deferred to next meeting. Ideas for possible statements should be sent to CDTC by about December 20, to be included in a mailout of preparatory materials for the December 28 meeting.

ACTION ITEMS

- * CDTC to:
 - * Modify Priority Bicycle Network map based on group suggestions; tally total mileage and miles by responsible agency; get map duplicated for distribution.
 - * Continue work on cost estimation based on FHWA and NYSDOT Highway Design Manual Draft Chapter 18 bicycle treatments.
 - * Continue work on packaging the Task Force's Phase Two products into a draft plan document.
- * Task Force members to :

- * Review draft discussion of possible bicycle/pedestrian components of 1994-99 TIP projects, with the aim of developing suggestions on:
 - * additional general information on project locations which would be useful (e.g., nearby trip generators, responsible agencies, etc.)
 - * additional actions which would be desirable at the locations listed, based on personal experiences or shared "war stories"
- * Develop thoughts on "vision statement" on what the Task Force wants the Capital District bicycle/pedestrian environment to be like in the year 2015; get any thoughts along these lines to CDTC by December 20 or so to be included on list of ideas mailed out prior to next meeting
- * **Next Task Force meeting: Wednesday, December 28, 5:30 - 7:30 PM, Colonie Community Center, 1653 Central Avenue (across from Lake Electronics).** Meeting agenda to include:
 - * vision statement development
 - * continued discussion of Priority Bicycle Network; approval if possible
 - * continued discussion of TIP project review document

TO: Members of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Issues Task Force
Other Interested Parties

FROM: Steve Allocco

DATE: December 5, 1994

RE: November 30 Meeting Summary; Details on Next Meeting

Enclosed please find a summary of the November 30 meeting. For those of you who did not attend, handouts from that meeting are also provided.

One early correction to the record: the first paragraph on Page 3 indicates that an 11" x 17" foldout comparison of the Regional and Priority Bicycle Networks is attached; as our copier is currently having some difficulty with paper that size, we ended up going with 8 1/2" x 11". Apologies if the result is difficult to make out in spots; we're planning to get full-size copies of the draft Priority Bicycle Network out in advance of the next meeting, which will be held on **Wednesday, December 28, from 5:30 to 7:30 PM at the Colonie Community Center, 1653 Central Avenue, Colonie** (across from Lake Electronics). At this meeting, we will pick up with the items listed under "Action Items" in the meeting summary. If you will not be able to make it to the meeting, please feel free to call, fax or write to let me know of any ideas or questions you may have. Hope to see you then.

Enclosure(s, for 11/30 meeting non-attendees)

**RECORD OF MEETING
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ISSUES TASK FORCE**

DATE/TIME/PLACE: Wednesday, December 28, 1994, 5:30 - 7:00 PM, Colonie Community Center

IN ATTENDANCE: Brad Birge (CDRPC), Emily H. Goodman (citizen member), Don Odell (Albany County Planning Department), Don Robertson (NYSDOT - Region 1), Ivan Vamos (Hudson River Valley Greenway Communities Council), Steve Allocco (CDTC)

DISCUSSION SUMMARY

Note: Any handouts referenced in the summary are attached for those who did not attend the meeting.

Vision Statement: As noted in past meetings, a vision statement which describes the Year 2015 cycling/walking environment in a single sentence or two can provide transportation decisionmakers with a reference point -- a direction in which to go in the coming years. As it might be applied in the CDTC process, the statement could be a "reality check" for Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) candidate projects, by considering the question of whether a given candidate would *further or at least not conflict with* the vision statement.

The group reviewed a list of six possible vision statements, eventually modifying one of them to come up with the following:

"The Capital District will be a place where people can choose to bicycle or walk with confidence, safety and security, such that both modes will become integral parts of the transportation system."

This statement implies a need for several changes both in the region's mindset regarding cycling and walking and in the transportation planning and investment processes. The Task Force's recommendation package provides the tools for achieving these changes.

During work on the vision statement, a question was raised as to whether USDOT's national goal of **doubling the percentage of all transportation trips made by bicycling and walking while also reducing by 10 percent the number of injuries and fatalities to bicyclists and pedestrians** would in itself be a key part of a vision statement. While it was decided instead to go with the statement presented above, there was support for the idea that the Task Force endorse the national goal in its recommendations and present it as a goal for the Capital District.

Priority Bicycle Network: The ±341 mile draft Priority Bicycle Network, with modifications suggested at the November meeting, was reviewed. The distribution of Network mileage about the four counties correlates fairly well with the distribution of total highway mileage;¹ still, it was suggested that a few more miles be designated for Schenectady County. CDTC staff will review the network and identify a small number of additional streets which will improve coverage in Schenectady and Rotterdam. Beyond these desired additions and the suggestion that the Mohawk-Hudson Bike-Hike Trail be added to the map as a reference (and to clarify why the Priority Network is largely blank in the Niskayuna/Colonie area), the group concurred with the general coverage and logic of the Network.

¹For those who may be interested, several regression analyses were run comparing land area, total roadway mileage, Regional Bicycle Network mileage and Priority Network mileage. The R² (correlation coefficient) for Priority Network mileage versus total roadway mileage is .70; by comparison, the R² for total *Regional* Network mileage versus total roadway mileage is .62. The strongest correlation was found between total Regional Network mileage and land area, at .91; the coefficient for Priority Network mileage versus land area was .43.

The handout providing information on the content and purpose of the Network is intended to answer some of the basic questions which other Task Forces will likely raise regarding the role of the Network as a planning guide. Recommendations as to clarifications/wording changes are welcome. Bicycle/Pedestrian Task Force members should give some thought to the question raised on the second page of that handout -- *what is the Task Force recommending for action on the Priority Network* -- to ensure that the functions of the Network as previously discussed will give it real "teeth" in the planning process.

Upcoming Staff Work: At this point, the Task Force has generated all of the basic products required of it for Phase Two of the New Visions effort. During January and February, CDTC staff will work on compiling this material into a plan document, using the handout on long-range plan contents developed to date as an outline. There will *not* be a January meeting. CDTC will solicit input, particularly from NYSDOT, on the viability of a lot of what the Task Force is proposing, as much of it would fall on NYSDOT for implementation. The present aim is to send out (to Task Force members and those other interested parties on the Task Force mailing list) a draft plan for comment at about the time the group would have met in late January.

During January and February, CDTC staff will also work on the "number crunching" end of the New Visions process, establishing plan costs and benefits and applying the core and supplemental performance measures discussed at the March, May and June meetings. The results of this work will in large part be the sorts of quantitative analyses which the Task Force has not gotten much into in the course of its work; still, the findings will be provided to the Task Force for informational purposes.

Other Items:

1. Don Odell reported that he received from NYSDOT Region 1 Design a reply to his October 21 letter on the Route 20 project in Guilderland; a copy of the reply is attached.
2. Ivan Vamos reported that he received from NYSDOT Region 1 Director Dick Maitino a reply to his October 20 letter on the proposed I-787 Riverfront Access bridge; a copy of the reply will be sent out to Task Force members when available.
3. Emily Goodman reported that the New York Bicycling Coalition (NYBC) has reorganized, established a new board of directors and expects to resume shortly its efforts at pushing for better cycling conditions.

ACTION ITEMS

- * CDTC to:
 - * compile Task Force Phase Two products into a plan document
 - * contact NYSDOT and others as necessary to get early input on the viability of the Task Force's proposals
 - * send draft plan document out to Task Force mailing list for review and comment (see below), probably around the end of January
 - * develop plan cost and benefit figures, apply core and supplemental performance measures to generate objective evaluations of the plan
- * Task Force members to:
 - * consider question of whether functions of Priority Network as discussed to date are sufficient (see Page 2 of handout entitled "The Priority Bicycle Network" for some possible functions not discussed in past meetings); get comments to CDTC
 - * review draft plan when available; get comments in to CDTC prior to February 22 meeting using "red pen approach" (mark up draft with any suggestions and send back) suggested at December meeting
- * **Next Task Force meeting: Wednesday, February 22, 1995, 5:30 - 7:30 PM, Colonie Community Center, 1653 Central Avenue (across from Lake Electronics).** Meeting to concentrate on discussion of draft plan, with short report on quantitative evaluations of plan.

TO: Members of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Issues Task Force
Other Interested Parties

FROM: Steve Allocco

DATE: January 4, 1995

RE: December 28 Meeting Summary; Details on Next Meeting

Enclosed please find a summary of the December 28 meeting. For those of you who did not attend, handouts from that meeting are also provided.

At this point, the Task Force has generated all of the basic products required of it for Phase Two of the New Visions effort. During January and February, CDTC staff will work on compiling these products into a plan document and on the necessary number crunching -- cost and benefit calculation, as well as application of the performance measures discussed at the March, May and June meetings. As it currently appears that the next New Visions conference may not take place until *after* May, we will have some time to take "second and third looks" at the plan to ensure that it covers all the issues brought up since the start of this effort.

The next meeting of the Task Force will be held on **Wednesday, February 22, 1995, from 5:30 to 7:30 PM at the Colonie Community Center, 1653 Central Avenue, Colonie** (across from Lake Electronics). At this meeting, we will discuss the content of the draft plan along with any early results of the quantitative evaluations. In the meantime, please feel free to call, fax or write if any questions or comments come up.

Enclosure(s, for 12/28 meeting non-attendees)