

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

**DATE/TIME/PLACE:** Wednesday, February 22, 1995, 5:30 - 7:30 PM, Colonie Community Center

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Brad Birge (CDRPC), Emily H. Goodman (citizen member), Bob Kirker (Town of Wilton Highway Committee), 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: The Task Force indicated it was comfortable with the wording of the Vision Statement as presented in the record of the December 28 meeting.

Proposed Additional Priority Network Mileage: The Task Force concurred with the idea of adding Priority Network mileage in Schenectady and Rotterdam as proposed in the February 6 update on staff work. One question raised regarding the Priority Network was that of whether Kings Road would be preferable to Albany Street as a priority facility, as the former includes a long stretch which is relatively straight and flat between Old State Road and the Schenectady County line. It was decided that Albany Street would be acceptable if Kings Road was part of the larger Regional Bicycle Network; a subsequent check of that network confirmed that it does include the subject segment of Kings Road.

Notes on "Working Environment": The Task Force was briefly updated on several developments which took place since the last meeting in December.

1. *Federal, State Fiscal Situations:* At the federal level, the possible consolidation of USDOT and its funding programs is being explored. Still, CDTC's New Visions effort will continue on the assumption that a given amount of money above and beyond basic needs will be available; the functional difference is that it may be distributed over a longer period of time (e.g., \$600 million over the next 25 years instead of over the next 20 years). Thus, as the Task Forces go about their work, there should be no real effect on how they identify their sets of desirable actions.

(One example of how the extended timetable for funding could affect Task Force work was illustrated in the Expressway Management Task Force's development of a "staging plan" for one part of its recommendation set. The Task Force considered the idea of accelerating development of some components of its Intelligent Transportation System, but decided that the current Federal and State fiscal climates made a slower pace ambitious enough.)

Not much hard information is available yet on future State investments in transportation. The working assumption could be that a "do more with less" or "do more with what's already allocated" philosophy would come about; as some larger capital projects are already being scaled back or called into question completely (e.g., Northway Interchange 3 construction, rehabilitation of Northway bridges between Interchanges 2 and 8), it should not be expected that high-cost capital projects to enhance the bicycle/pedestrian environment (e.g., the I-787 ped/bike bridge) would be pursued at as large a scale as when originally conceived, if at all.

2. *Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Status:* The next planned update of the TIP was the 1995-2000 update; fiscal circumstances have put this update on hold. As this "hold" status is a change from the previous expectation, which was "no new projects," there is no effective difference with regard to opportunities to pursue bicycle/pedestrian-related improvements.

The earlier "no new projects" expectation was rooted in the realization that available funds which could have gone to a TIP update this year had already been substantially allocated, and what little remained available could likely have been used up by cost overruns on major projects already on the TIP.

The current expectation is for there to be funding available for a number of new projects added to the TIP when the 1996-2001 update takes place.

3. *New Visions Schedule*: A current schedule for the New Visions effort was distributed. The effort will continue at its own pace, in spite of the USDOT reorganization and fiscal considerations noted earlier.
4. *ANCA Report*: The Adirondack North Country Association released its *Bicycle Master Plan for the Adirondack North Country Region of New York State*, which sets forth analyses and recommendations for enhancing the cycling environment in that 14-county region (which includes Saratoga County). It was noted that the Task Force's *Make Your Community More Bicycle- and Pedestrian-Friendly* brochure was liberally excerpted in the report, indicating the value of this concise summary of steps to enhance the cycling and walking environments. (*Update on Task Force Brochure: some possible paper stocks for printing have been identified; the goal is to have a quantity produced such that members can take a handful with them after the April meeting.*)
5. *SUNY Summer Course in Urban Design -- Urban Bikeway Concept*: This summer, the Geography and Planning Department at SUNY/Albany will be offering a six-week Urban Design course for which the subject will be the "downtown to SUNY (and on to Crossgates Mall)" corridor concept plan on which Alicia Fernandez gave a presentation at the October 1994 Task Force meeting. The aim is to develop the bikeway's design specifications to the point that the City of Albany, the State Office of General Services and State DOT would be able to submit it as a proposal for funding or, alternatively, to pay for its development themselves. The class starts May 30; Thyag (who will be teaching the course) plans to sit in on Task Force meetings when time permits to keep the group posted on the progress of the design work.

## REPORT ON STAFF TECHNICAL WORK

Since the last meeting in December, CDTC staff has been performing the technical work necessary to make the objective case for pursuing the Task Force's recommendations. Some early findings of this work were presented as a way of illustrating how this case can be made. They are attached as an appendix.

## ADDITIONAL ITEMS

Additional Ideas for Enhancing Cycling and Walking: With development of its "required products" complete, the Task Force was invited to spend a few minutes brainstorming possible additional recommendations to make in the Phase Two report. Two types of ideas came up in this exercise: identification of possible actions or tools for decisionmakers to consider as they plan their road improvement work, and guidance to "bear in mind" in the transportation planning process. Some of the ideas raised were as follow:

### *Actions/Tools*

1. Shoulder Provision: While crosswalk markings, "share the road" signs and the like are desirable low-cost means of raising motorist awareness of cyclists and pedestrians, the most critical element of the road system for cyclists is the availability of adequate travel pavement or shoulder width to use a given route. Providing for reasonable physical separation from motor vehicles benefits cyclists of all ability levels; thus, it is logically the first order of business not only to maintain existing cycling levels but to encourage more shifts from driving to cycling.
2. Lane Markings/Striping: Particularly at those locations where current cycling/walking levels are *not* high, clear lane/shoulder markings and crosswalk markings are important means of raising and maintaining driver awareness of <sup>(a)</sup>the possible presence of cyclists or pedestrians in an area and <sup>(b)</sup>where their vehicles should be as they travel through the area. This can make the travel environment more predictable to the cyclist or pedestrian.

In addition, as not all cyclists or pedestrians obey traffic laws, these markings give *them* guidance as to where *they* should be on or along the roadway.

3. *Pavement Reallocation*: In managing our street system, the operating assumption has always been that travel lane, shoulder and median widths should be as great as possible to maximize roadway capacity. While this relationship does hold true -- reducing these widths does reduce capacity -- going by this assumption in practice has resulted in a street system which largely *discourages* cycling by minimizing the amount of space available for it. To remove the disincentives to cycling presented by roadway profiles, we should consider reallocating total pavement width -- through restriping and, in some cases, minor reconstruction such as narrowing of a wide median -- to ensure the "reasonable separation" of cyclists from motor vehicles cited above. The Wolf Road "laboratory" concept to be discussed on Page 5 could provide a good example of how pavement reallocation can work.
4. *Traffic Calming*: The discussion of pavement reallocation flows into consideration of traffic calming, as many applications of traffic calming are simply aggressive reallocation efforts. While drastically narrowing streets or closing them to motor vehicle traffic are the typically cited examples of traffic calming, the comment raised in Task Force discussions was that modest traffic calming at strategic locations can remove some major barriers to safe bicycle and pedestrian travel. An example cited was on bridges: if it is not possible to widen the travel surface of the bridge to provide a wide shoulder, bike lane or sidewalk, reducing the speed limit or slightly *narrowing* the center-stripe-to-outside-stripe width of the travel lane should enhance cyclist safety by reducing the likelihood that a motorist will very suddenly encounter a cyclist in the travel lane.
5. *Grates/Grate Strips*: When installing new drain grates, the grate strips should run *perpendicular* to the travel lane to eliminate the possibility of a cyclist catching a tire. Existing grates can be modified easily by welding strips of steel across them; this would not be likely to have a significant effect on the ability of water to pass through the grate.

An additional note regarding storm drains was that they should be kept at the same level as the pavement around them.

6. *Bike Racks on Buses/at Intermodal Facilities*: A truly intermodal transportation system should recognize the fact that people might combine bike travel with bus, train or even plane travel to complete a trip. In addition to installing bike lockers and/or racks at the region's airports and train stations, we should be examining the potential for bike racks to be installed on buses *and* determine the key transit stops (e.g., along popular routes, at park-and-ride lots, et cetera) at which locker/rack provision would be most beneficial.
7. *Travel Maps Identifying Preferable Bicycle Routes*: When area residents decide to bike a little further than usual, tourists decide to ride from some local point or longer-distance cyclists enter the Capital District, a map or series of maps identifying the region's key cycling routes would enable them to "better educate their guesses" on how to travel through the area. The Mohawk-Hudson Bike-Hike Trail map is a popular guide to one particular facility which is almost entirely Class 1 and thus understood to be safe; there might be a way to produce a basic map which directs cyclists to those roads with the best combinations of directness, coverage, available services and motor vehicle traffic conditions for their purposes.
8. *Signage*: Motor vehicle travelers get considerable guidance as to the best routes to take for their destinations; while signage need not be as prevalent for cyclists as it currently is for cars, directional signs at access points on the Bike-Hike Trail as well as signs indicating where roads take cyclists when they *leave* the Trail are two examples of informational signage which would particularly benefit two groups: occasional trail users who are not familiar with where it goes, and the longer-distance cyclists noted above.

Other types of signage which would be beneficial if supplied in greater number would be "Pedestrian Crossing," "Bike Route," "Share the Road" and similar signs. These signs could produce two types of benefits:

- \* they could raise and maintain motorist awareness of the possible presence of cyclists and/or pedestrians, as would the lane markings and stripings noted earlier; in addition,

- \* investing in these signs could be a form of "validation" of these modes of travel in motorists' minds; this could in turn translate to greater respect for and consideration of cyclists and pedestrians on the roadways.

9. Accident Information: The point was raised that motor vehicle/bicycle and motor vehicle/pedestrian accident information is sparse and difficult from which to draw conclusions, for two reasons: many of these accidents are not reported, and accident reports do not capture much detail *about* these accidents such that the hazardous elements of a location can be determined. One example of the latter would be right turns on red (RTORs). The basic problem with RTORs is that they tend to become "right turns after a rolling stop" -- the driver is watching for an adequate gap in oncoming traffic, and thus may not check thoroughly enough for pedestrians or cyclists in the path of his/her turn.

The suggestion was raised that additional information on the nature and possible cause of accidents involving cyclists or pedestrians should be collected. It was noted that this might entail modification of the standard traffic accident report form; this idea could be included in the Task Force's report, with the understanding that any change to the accident report form would probably best be lobbied for by advocacy groups -- the New Visions effort is not aimed at developing recommendations for changes to State agency procedures.

#### *Points of Guidance*

1. Bridge/Structure Concerns: There are only a few bridges carrying streets over the Hudson or Mohawk Rivers; wherever possible, these bridges should accommodate cyclist and pedestrian travel. ISTEA (Section 1033) requires that when the deck of a bridge upon which bicycle travel is permitted is replaced or rehabilitated with federal funds, the bridge should after this work is completed accommodate bicycle travel. "Accommodate" is a vague term, as simply having a cross-section which *allows for* bicycle travel could be considered an accommodation; the sentiment expressed in Task Force discussions was that accommodation should produce a genuine *improvement* in how bikeable the bridge is. This approach should similarly hold true for pedestrians, as there are few facilities which are legally usable by cyclists but not pedestrians.

"Providing for genuine improvement in bikeability/walkability" could mean structural work to widen the bridge structure or the pavement portion of the bridge deck; alternatively, it might entail traffic calming as described earlier.

This philosophy should also apply to elevated roadway structures not technically considered 'bridges' upon which cyclists and pedestrians may travel, with one example being the segment of Henry Johnson Boulevard between Central and Sheridan Avenues in Albany.

2. Target Special Sites: Early in Phase Two, the Task Force compiled a list of major destinations to serve as a reference, highlighting the need to provide access to employment *and* recreational sites, downtowns *and* remote areas, local transit *and* interregional travel facilities, and so on. Discussions of the results of staff examinations of pavement conditions on the Priority Bicycle Network (see Appendix) raised the reminder that different types of destinations will require different accommodations. The example with regard to pavement condition was school areas: with greater likelihoods of students cycling on the roads, and with many of these students being regular riders but still arguably not "expert" cyclists, holding pavement conditions to a higher standard might be one way to enhance safety in these areas. Simply put, better pavement presents fewer obstacles and makes avoidance of *other* obstacles (cars, dogs, et cetera) easier. A few other general statements on destination types and the accommodations they warrant could be included in the Phase Two report.
3. Wolf Road as a "Laboratory" for Bicycle/Pedestrian Accommodation: It was noted that with two projects on the current TIP and the potential for reallocation of pavement to provide bike lanes, Wolf Road could be the target of an early effort at applying several of the techniques for better bicycle and pedestrian accommodation identified by the Task Force. These might include the following:
  - \* sidewalks and/or connections of land uses along the road
  - \* bike lanes
  - \* separate stop lines for left-turning cyclists

- \* pedestrian phases at signals OR right turn on red prohibitions

Perhaps as a conceptual illustration, these tools could be presented in a basic "Wolf Road Bicycle/Pedestrian Circulation Plan" in the Phase Two report.

The Phase Two report will provide additional detail on all of these concepts, along with any other concepts the Task Force may deem worth highlighting. Ideally, it will serve both as a shopping list of desirable treatments at particular locations and as a general primer on how to enhance the bicycle- and pedestrian-friendliness of the Capital District.

Benefits of Accommodations: Ivan noted a recent Washington Post article on the desirable elements of planned communities, as indicated by the findings of a poll of a group of consumers who bought or shopped for homes in such communities. Most noteworthy about the article (attached) was the finding that the third most frequently indicated desirable amenity (after low traffic/quiet and natural, open space) was "walking and biking paths." Coupled with other studies which have found that proximity to these paths can in fact increase home values, the article is a good reminder of the positive impacts on quality of life of bicycle and pedestrian accommodations.

## **ACTION ITEMS**

- \* CDTC to continue evaluation of Task Force recommendations and work on preparation of Phase Two report.
- \* **Next Task Force meeting: Thursday, April 27, 5:30 - 7:30 PM, Colonie Community Center, 1653 Central Avenue (across from Lake Electronics).** Meeting to concentrate on continued discussion of evaluation findings, plus some discussion of any additional items (along lines of those in "Additional Items" section, pp. 2-5) the Task Force wishes to include in Phase Two report.

## APPENDIX STAFF TECHNICAL WORK

*Note: by necessity, some technical background was provided at the meeting (and appears here as well) to illustrate how the numbers presented were derived; in the Phase Two reports, however, while there will be more of this background, it will be relegated to the appropriate supporting documents or technical appendices, and the basic "pitch" presented in the main report will be more concise.*

*The basic findings of technical work to date are shown here in large text and boxes; narrative explaining methodologies or providing interpretation are not boxed.*

Current Cycling/Walking Conditions: The Priority Bicycle Network was used as the basis for "in the field" evaluations of current provisions for cyclists.

### *Currently Acceptable Facilities*

- \* 139 of 263 (or 53%) state-numbered roadway miles on the Network are already of adequate width for FHWA Group A cyclists;
- \* 141 of 263 (also 53%) state-numbered Network miles are adequate for pedestrians (that is, they have either sidewalks or shoulders 5' or more in width).

It is recognized that there are some problems with these measures which still need to be resolved. For example, the "Group A-adequate" evaluation still needs to determine how many of these miles are *continuous*; there are cases where a road may be adequate for a mile, but inadequate for some length between that adequate section and another adequate network facility. As for pedestrian adequacy, the shoulder allowance would suggest that Route 9 in Halfmoon and Clifton Park, with 55+ MPH speeds, is adequate for pedestrian travel. Efforts to refine these evaluations are underway, as are evaluations of the non-state mileage.

### *Accessibility*

One of the five overriding considerations of the New Visions effort is social equity. The way in which the transportation system functions can have a profound effect on opportunities for basic mobility. While enhancing the bicycle and pedestrian travel environments could have an effect on trip mode decisions for people who have a choice in the matter (in particular, those who own cars), the true social benefit of these enhancements will come in making it easier for those people who *cannot* drive and *must* walk, bike, use transit, or employ some combination of these modes to get around.

"Accessibility" is a measure of the *competitiveness* of cycling or walking with driving. In essence, it considers the question of whether, on travel time and comfort bases, cycling and walking are viable alternatives to driving. To get a measure of accessibility, the CDTC staff developed a procedure for using its regional traffic model to compare the travel times associated with motor vehicle use, cycling and walking. (As will be discussed in the section on benefits, the procedure assumes that the comfort and general desirability of cycling or walking can be reflected in average speed.)

Using the afternoon rush hour as the basis and trip length limits of 2 miles for pedestrians and 5 miles for cyclists, the procedure assumes that a trip is bikeable or walkable within 20 minutes of the time a car trip would take. As CDTC evaluations have found that average motor vehicle speeds increase as trips get longer (because there is a greater likelihood that longer trips will use higher-speed arterials and highways), this logic (coupled with the two- and five-mile caps) limits "accessible" trips to those which are realistically walkable or bikeable for the average person.

Looking at the year 2015 -- the New Visions effort's horizon year -- the accessibility findings are as follow:

**Walking:** 15,000 of 46,700 PM peak hour trips of 2 miles or less would be accessible via walking

**Cycling:** 91,000 of 115,000 PM peak hour trips of 5 miles or less would be accessible via cycling. Recognizing that cyclists might be more willing to travel an extended distance, it was also calculated that about 116,000 of 175,000 trips of 10 miles or less would be accessible.

The 1990 numbers are a little lower than these -- 12,500 for walking and 88,000 for cycling. The 1990 Census found that in the Capital District, about 19,000 people walk to work, and 700 bike. Thus, we can argue the following:

Comparison of the Census results with the findings on accessibility suggests that bicycle travel is *vastly* underutilized relative to the opportunities it presents, while walking if anything is very well utilized, particularly in the cities.

Priority Network Costs, Benefits:

*Costs*

CDTC staff calculated the estimated cost, section-by-section, of upgrading Priority Bicycle Network roadways to FHWA Group A pavement widths. The totals were as follow:

**ESTIMATED COST OF PRIORITY NETWORK UPGRADE TO FHWA GROUP A PAVEMENT WIDTHS:**

State Roads:	\$ 60 million
Non-State Roads:	<u>\$ 12-19 million</u>
TOTAL:	\$ 72-79 million

It was noted at the Task Force meeting, however, that developing the Priority Network might not "cost" this much as far as taking funds away from other items would be concerned. The Infrastructure Task Force has been examining the idea of improving all roads to AASHTO<sup>1</sup> design standards when they are ready to be rehabilitated, with the rationale being that this would extend facility life and enhance safety. In a large number of cases, upgrades to AASHTO standards would also result in FHWA Group A cross sections. Thus, one way to look at the dollar amounts involved would be to consider only the cost of developing the Priority Network on those facilities for which the AASHTO guidelines would not result in Group A-width pavement. This issue will be explored further as Phase Two winds down and as the various Task Forces' recommendations are considered together during Phase Three.

*Accessibility Benefits*

---

To estimate bicycle accessibility benefits, the bicycle/pedestrian travel model was run with speeds on Priority Network roads increased from 10 MPH to 13 MPH. This was based on three assumptions:

1. A roadway on which cyclists enjoy adequate separation from motor vehicles allows for more maneuvering room to avoid obstacles, increasing average speed.
2. Average speed is a fair proxy for the "attractiveness" of a roadway, and can be used to reflect the increased likelihood that someone will choose to use it if the proper accommodations were in place.
3. 10 MPH is a reasonable, leisurely cycling pace; a 30 percent increase in simulated speeds to reflect improved safety and comfort still does not result in a difficult pace.

Evaluations of the Priority Network found that about 500 trips of 5 miles or less, and about 13,500 trips of 10 miles or less, would become "bike-accessible" with the Network improved to Group A standards.

A similar exercise was undertaken for pedestrian travel, assuming that the greater physical separation provided for by the Priority Bicycle Network would enhance pedestrian comfort and willingness to walk as well. To model this effect, pedestrian speeds on Network roads were increased from 2 to 3 MPH.

It was found that improving the Network would increase by about 3,000 the number of trips 2 miles or less which would be walk-accessible.

Enhancing pedestrian access would also require consideration of intersection treatments and other "non-linear" issues; the means and costs of these additional treatments are still being evaluated.

*Potential Use and Aggregate Benefits*

The main problem in getting bicycle/pedestrian projects funded has historically been that they were not expected to get many travelers to change from cycling to walking, and thus in turn that they would not generate the magnitudes of benefits that car-oriented projects tend to. CDTC's analyses of the potential use of the Priority Network and the resulting aggregate or "societal" benefits offers a counterargument: with growing congestion, which first and foremost will result in the lowest average speeds for the *shortest* trips (which are the best candidates for conversion to cycling or walking), getting a relatively small number of drivers to shift from driving for these short lengths to cycling or walking both <sup>(a)</sup>is not an unreasonable expectation and <sup>(b)</sup>could produce significant aggregate benefits in terms of the value of travel time saved and pollution reductions.

Preliminary findings for selected levels of traveler response to opportunities presented by the Priority Network are as follow:

<b>SHIFTS TO CYCLING</b>			
<b>% of Potential Switching</b>	<b>Annual Savings</b>	<b>"Justified" Investment (\$M)</b>	<b>Investment /Yr x 15</b>
0.6% (550) of trips <=5 Mi	\$31 M	\$39 M	\$2.6M
2.7% (2500) of trips <=5 Mi	\$145 M	\$128 M	\$8.5 M
0.6% (1050) of trips <=10 Mi	\$39 M	\$48 M	\$3.2 M

## SHIFTS TO WALKING

% of Potential Switching	Annual Savings	"Justified" Investment (\$M)	Investment /Yr x 15
0.6% (275) of trips <=2 Mi	\$16 M	\$23 M	\$1.5 M
2.7% (1250) of trips <=2 Mi	\$55 M	\$68 M	\$4.5 M
0.6% (700) of trips <=5 Mi	\$31 M	\$40 M	\$2.7 M

*NOTES: Shifts to cycling produce greater benefit because on average, they remove longer motor vehicle trips than do shifts to walking.*

*"Justified Investment" is based on a standard employed by NYS DOT and CDTC in determining whether a project would provide for a given minimum amount of benefit per million dollars of project cost. It is calculated here as \$1 million of total project cost for every 25 "excess vehicle hours of delay" the project would remove.*

Recognizing that Capital District weather and the need to run errands from time to time could keep many shifts to cycling or walking from being in effect five days a week, factoring these numbers by 40 percent (to reflect cycling or walking two days a week) would illustrate the benefits of encouraging even *intermittent* use of cycling or walking: factoring the first entries on each table, there would still be annual savings of over \$12 million attendant to shifting to cycling, and over \$6 million annually for shifting to walking. The respective "justified investments per year" levels would be estimated at \$1 million and \$0.6 million.

As noted earlier, the Priority Network could help facilitate these shifts by enhancing accessibility for several thousand trips; it is important to note that any *other* action which would encourage these levels of response would be expected to produce comparable benefits. Thus, there should be continued exploration of ways to encourage greater cycling and walking, for the previous two tables illustrate the potential gains to be realized in doing so.

**Potential Effects of Prohibiting Right Turns on Red (RTORs):** In the section on accident information, it was noted how RTORs tend to become rolling stops, introducing hazards for cyclists and pedestrians. One idea discussed by the Task Force in past meetings has been the *restriction* of rights on red at intersections where this is a problem. CDTC staff evaluated the potential effects of RTOR prohibition at a number of locations where they are <sup>(a)</sup>presently permitted and <sup>(b)</sup>occurring in significant numbers. The findings were that in general, this restriction would *not* have significant effects on average delays either for the intersection as a whole (with any signal timing changes necessary to accommodate the right turners) or for the right-turning vehicles which would now have to wait for a green light:

## AFTERNOON PEAK HOUR

Changes in average delay attendant to RTOR prohibition:

1-4 seconds per vehicle

Additional cost of delay (@\$5.66/hour) attendant to RTOR prohibition:

\$6-\$300 per day

While these estimates suggest that RTOR prohibition imposes a very small delay cost in exchange for increased cyclist and pedestrian safety, the problem noted in reviewing CDTC's inventory of 400 signalized intersections was that there are not very many signalized intersections at which <sup>(a)</sup>there are significant pedestrian traffic and <sup>(b)</sup>right turns on red are permitted. (One example found was Madison Avenue/Eagle Street in Albany; right turns are permitted on the Madison Avenue approaches.) The remaining question is thus as follows:

If higher volumes of pedestrian traffic either are already accompanied by RTOR prohibition or serve to *prevent* "rolling stops" by their sheer number, is the real problem with RTORs at intersections with lower pedestrian volumes but other design features or nearby elements? Can these features/elements be identified, to give guidance on selective RTOR prohibition?

Pavement Condition on the Priority Network: In past discussions, it has been noted that adequate pavement or shoulder width alone is not sufficient to make a road "acceptable" for bicycles. In addition to being free of debris, pavement needs to be free of buckling, major cracks, chipping or loose chunks to be reasonably safe for bicycle travel on tires generally 2" wide or less. Conventional roadway condition scoring would rate "good" (a score of 7 or 8 on a 1-10 scale, with 10 being new pavement) or "fair" (score of 6) pavement which would present a number of these obstacles. A further problem lies in the tendency of the structural design of roadways to result in deterioration first at the outer edges of the pavement, *where cyclists will tend to ride*. Thus, in addition to pavement *width*, it is important to determine pavement condition to get a better sense of how much of our street system is truly "accessible" to cyclists.

CDTC staff evaluated the condition of pavements on the Priority Bicycle Network, based on fieldwork by NYSDOT and CDTC staff using NYSDOT's *Pavement Condition Rating Manual*. By lane-mile, the totals were as follow:

<b>PRIORITY BICYCLE NETWORK</b>			
<b>Lane Miles by Condition Score</b>			
	<u>Score</u>		
<u>Ownership</u>	<u>8-10</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>1-6</u>
STATE	230	197	271
<u>LOCAL</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>45</u>
TOTAL	263	279	316
	(31%)	(33%)	(36%)

*NOTES: 1-5 = Poor; 6 = Fair;  
7-8 = Good; 9-10 = Excellent*

A condition score of 8 is perhaps the minimum at which a pavement would be consistently comfortable for the average cyclist. The table indicates that about 70 percent of the Priority Network is presently below this level. The question of whether to propose a minimum pavement condition standard -- e.g., 7 as "acceptable," 8 as "desirable" -- was raised, with the note that it would cost an estimated \$19 million to bring all of the network at least up to "acceptable." (Generally, roads deteriorate to a score of about 4 before they are rehabilitated; this proposal accelerates the schedule considerably.) The Task Force decided instead to emphasize the "adequate width" concerns as first priority. There is a reasonable logic to this decision, as noted earlier: adequate physical separation from motor vehicles does provide cyclists with room to maneuver around obstacles; it is better to first ensure the availability of this maneuvering room. As noted in the section on targeting special sites, the group *did*, however, suggest that roads near schools were an example of where higher pavement condition standards might be particularly beneficial from a safety standpoint.

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

FROM: Steve Allocco

DATE: March 9, 1995

**RE: February 22 Meeting Summary; Details on Next Meeting**

Enclosed please find a summary of the February 22 meeting. Apologies for the delay in getting it to you, but as those in attendance seemed to find the results of recent staff bike/ped technical studies interesting, I decided to include a fair amount of this material as an appendix. Thus, if you're not interested in getting a number fix, simply disregard the appendix; once reading the appendix, you can avoid the background narrative by only reading the larger text in the boxes.

The next meeting of the Task Force will be held on **Thursday, April 27, 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 continue discussing the results of staff evaluations of the Task Force's recommendations; also, given the considerable response to the opportunity provided for "general idea" brainstorming at the February 22 meeting, we can continue this exercise to ensure that Phase Two report is as comprehensive a discussion of your ideas as possible. In the meantime, please feel free to call, fax or write if any questions or comments come up.

Enclosure

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

**DATE/TIME/PLACE:** Thursday, April 27, 1995, 5:30 - 7:30 PM, Colonie Community Center

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Brad Birge (CDRPC), Emily H. Goodman (New York Bicycling Coalition), Bob Kirker (Town of Wilton Highway Committee), Katrina Neugebauer (Troy Architectural Program), Don Odell (Albany County Planning Department), 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.*

Current Bicycle/Pedestrian Travel and their Benefits: Beyond Census journey-to-work information, there is little hard data available on bicycle and pedestrian travel in the Capital District. The CDTC staff used the findings of its *Household Travel Survey* along with the 1990 Census results and the CDTC regional traffic model to generate estimates of bicycle/pedestrian tripmaking and the public benefits they produce (in terms of the negative impacts of motor vehicle travel *avoided*). The first handout (entitled "Estimates of Bicycle and Pedestrian...") summarizes the results of this investigation. It should be noted that the estimates are for travel by persons 16 years or older, between discrete origins and destinations -- it does *not* include "children going to the schoolyard" or "pleasure trips" starting and ending at one point.

Followup on "Accessibility" Evaluations: At the February Task Force meeting, there was a discussion of the concept of *accessibility* -- the competitiveness of cycling or walking with driving for a given trip. A trip was considered "accessible" to cyclists or walkers if it could be made within 20 minutes of the time it would take via car. At the April meeting, there was a revision to the figures presented and a qualification to the definition of accessibility.

*Revision*

The original analysis of accessibility did not adequately reflect the out-of-car time associated with car trips -- walking between wherever the vehicle was parked and the origin or destination of the trip. To reflect this additional time, five minutes were added to either end of each car trip. The "Updated Figures..." handout presents the resulting findings on accessibility.

*Qualification*

The initial evaluation of "accessibility" was strictly based on travel time -- particularly for cyclists, it implicitly assumed a willingness to use any legally accessible roadway regardless of motor vehicle traffic characteristics. By this measure, to take one example, a trip from Albany Airport to Northway Mall (via Albany Shaker and Wolf Roads) is "accessible." The second page of the "Updated Figures..." handout lists some sample "accessible trip" volumes on roadways not commonly considered "accessible" to the average rider.

The argument can be made that the initial "accessibility" evaluation only applies to "Group A" cyclists -- experienced, highly skilled riders. As the Bicycle Federation of America estimates that less than 5 percent of the 100 million people in the U.S. who own bicycles would be considered Group A cyclists, the initial investigation only applied to a small proportion of the general population. Thus, a "Group B" accessibility determination was pursued to better reflect accessibility to average adult riders.

While the initial "Group A" analysis only shut down limited access highways and those facilities where bicycle and pedestrian travel are prohibited, the "Group B" analysis makes roads progressively less attractive as we move up in their hierarchy. For example, a subdivision street would be very attractive; the collector road it feeds into is less

attractive; the minor arterial the collector feeds into is still less attractive; and so on. The "Interim Estimates..." handout shows the results of this approach. Perhaps the most surprising finding of this investigation is that  $\frac{2}{3}$  of all trips 5 miles or less in length are *still* accessible to Group B cyclists; as the side-by-side graphics entitled "GROUP A" and "GROUP B" (on the sheet following the "Interim Estimates..." handout; also enclosed for those in attendance 4/27) show, the difference lies in Group B cyclists' making greater use of lower-order streets to complete these trips. (The arrows give a sense of the shifts away from the arterials; these graphics are not meant to show where people currently make cycling trips, nor do they reflect the potential benefits of the Priority Bicycle Network.)

Pedestrian Treatments: At its June 1994 meeting, the Task Force discussed and approved the idea of developing and applying *advisory sidewalk warrants* to give some directions as to "where to start" in providing better accommodation of pedestrian travel. Three "warrant" bases were investigated: a "traffic volume/speed" basis which considers exposure to motor vehicle traffic; a "potential for errands" basis which considers the proximity of residential, office and retail activity; and a "recreational walking" basis which considers residential density.

In attempting to develop any of these three possible warrants, the same problem seems to come up: depending on where the "cutoffs" are set, either *almost none* of the area's roadways or *almost all* of them tend to have pedestrian treatments warranted. More troubling still, to date CDTC has not found an objective warrant basis which flags the locations which have been the most frequent subjects of complaint -- major travel corridors in the inner suburbs, in particular.

The possible warrants tested by CDTC to date have generally been more aggressive than the warrants contained in NYSDOT's recently released *Pedestrian and Bicycle Facility Scoping Guide*, excerpts of which were distributed at the meeting. As such, the NYSDOT document's warrants may be as aggressive as the Task Force can hope to be at this time, unless communities decide on their own to start accommodating pedestrians without a standard suggesting that they do so.

In addition to the NYSDOT guide, copies of a guide produced by the Florida Department of Transportation's Pedestrian and Bicycle Program were also distributed. The "Walkable Communities" guide provides some handy illustrations of how to go about making a community more pedestrian-friendly. Given the way in which this document presents pedestrian accommodation techniques in a clear, approachable format, distributing this document to Capital District municipalities would be an important step in educating decisionmakers on how to enhance the liveability of their areas.

Discussion of the difficulty in providing a targeted listing of locations at which pedestrian accommodation should be made a priority *did* raise one idea which might be a workable means of providing specific, localized guidance to municipalities looking to become more pedestrian-friendly. If maps of serviceable sidewalks could be secured from local public works departments, *strategic connections* could be identified as ways to create continuous pedestrian networks. CDTC will investigate the availability of these maps.

Task Force Technical Report: In the context of the New Visions effort, the purpose of the Technical Report is to provide additional information (beyond that presented in the 10-20 page New Visions-wide "Executive Summary") to people wishing to invest some time in becoming familiar with the Task Force's investigations and recommendations. As the introductory note to the draft Report outline (mailed out on April 18) indicated, the Technical Report could also serve as a stand-alone reference for use in developing plans for enhancing the Capital District's bicycle and pedestrian travel environments. Given this larger potential function, the group was asked for comments on the outline, particularly along the lines of items to *add* in order to make the report as comprehensive and useful a reference as possible. The following ideas were raised; along with others raised at previous meetings, they could be presented in an "additional steps which would enhance bicycle/pedestrian planning at the municipal and regional levels" discussion.

0. Note: The draft outline included a section on "existing conditions," but did not have a section on *future* conditions. A section on projected future conditions will be included.
1. Cycling-Specific Pavement Photo Log: At the February meeting, a copy of NYSDOT's *Pavement Condition Rating Manual* was circulated during a discussion of pavement conditions and their effects on cycling safety. The *Manual* is in essence a photo log which guides the "scoring" of pavement condition on a 1-10 scale. The

idea was raised that a photo log illustrating the dangers presented by pavement condition and spot-level defects (e.g., raised drainage grates, road seams) could guide smaller-scale maintenance and improvement programs.

2. *Economic Importance of Cycling and Walking*: The Task Force has concentrated on identifying the steps necessary to make cycling and walking more viable forms of transportation. Still, because accommodation of cycling and walking can yield significant benefits in the areas of recreation, tourism and the general quality of life -- and because these benefits can in turn produce very real *economic* benefits -- the "economic logic" of investing in these modes of travel should be prominently noted.

*As one example of how bike-friendliness can be promoted, Ivan provided a copy of a recent "in-flight magazine" article (copy enclosed) on bicycle touring in Holland. The article presents Holland as an attractive place for bicycle touring; in addition, by noting that Northwest Airlines travelers can take a bike with them free as one of their two checked pieces of luggage, Northwest presents itself as accommodating to cyclists, who are often faced with charges of \$50 to \$90 or more to bring their bikes with them when flying.*

3. *Additional "Networks" (Section 3b)*: Existing facilities, such as the Mohawk-Hudson Bike-Hike Trail, the canal system, and Bike Routes 5 and 9 should be noted.
4. *Regional Bike Map*: There should be a way to draw on the popularity of the Mohawk-Hudson Bike-Hike Trail map as a motivator for development of a regional bike map. (Note: and of the facilities which would be indicated on such a map.)

It could be argued that the Capital District's problem with regard to regional bike maps is that there are not many existing bike facilities to *put* on such a map. The Genesee Transportation Council (the Rochester area MPO) got around this problem by putting out a bike map showing the "rideability" of different streets based on field observations (see October 1994 Task Force Status Report); development of such a map for the Capital District might be an option.

5. *Existing Facilities*: Section 2.b.i. will note that one *characteristic* of the Capital District's bicycle/pedestrian travel environment is "few dedicated facilities;" both dedicated and otherwise, these facilities should be identified in the report.
6. *Suggestions for Additional Items under "Other Recommendations"*:
  - \* continue efforts at bringing advocacy groups into the planning process
  - \* note and incorporate other individual and group planning and advocacy efforts in the region (the Saratoga County Heritage Trail Committee, NYBC, Capital Regional Cycling, et cetera) -- this would be an important step in maintaining lines of communication with the cycling/pedestrian community.
  - \* hold a monthly bicycle/pedestrian issues forum?  
*(Note: distribution of informally-written reports or "hot sheets" on issues raised at these fora could be useful ways of getting information out to the interested community and responsible public agencies.)*
  - \* add a bicycle/pedestrian advocate to the CDTC Planning and Policy Committees  
*(Note: this idea was raised with both "voting member" and "non-voting member" variants. Early exploration by the CDTC staff of the issues which would be raised by this idea -- ranging from the "consensus" criterion applied to CDTC committee votes to the more philosophical question of "what specifically would the group be looking to change through membership, and could being a pest at regular meetings without having membership accomplish the same thing? -- suggested that this sort of recommendation will likely be a source of much contention as the New Visions effort winds down and the Committees enter the "post-New Visions" era.)*

*Miscellaneous Items*<sup>1</sup>: To keep the Task Force informed of current happenings in the field of cycling/walking as transportation, articles from three recent issues of the *Urban Transportation Monitor* were distributed. Note with regard to the article on bicycle use of highway shoulders (from the April 14 issue) that there was a major typo in the

---

<sup>1</sup>Note: these items were raised at the *beginning* of the meeting to provide some "food for thought" when additional ideas for inclusion in the technical report were considered later on.

third column: the accident rate as shown under item 3 works out to about 4.1 billion accidents per million miles of travel, or one accident every 1.3 feet. Had the exponent been properly printed as -6 instead of 6, the accident rate would have worked out to .008 accidents per million miles of travel -- far closer to the definition of "negligible."

#### **ACTION ITEMS**

- \* CDTC to prepare draft technical report. Probably on a "chapter by chapter" basis, rough draft to be mailed out by June 1.
- \* CDTC to contact transportation and public works agencies for information on availability of sidewalk maps or other sidewalk inventories.
- \* **Next Task Force meeting: Thursday, June 15, 5:30 - 7:30 PM, Colonic Community Center, 1653 Central Avenue (across from Lake Electronics).** Meeting to concentrate on discussion of draft technical report.

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

FROM: Steve Allocco

DATE: May 11, 1995

**RE: April 27 Meeting Summary; Details on Next Meeting**

Enclosed please find a summary of the April 27 meeting. The next meeting of the Task Force will be held on **Thursday, June 15, 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 draft Technical Report, which should get out to you in rough form by June 1. In the meantime, please feel free to call, fax or write if any questions or comments come up.

Enclosure(s, for those not in attendance 4/27)

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

**DATE/TIME/PLACE:** Thursday, June 15, 1995, 5:30 - 7:00 PM, Colonie Community Center

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Brad Birge (CDRPC), Emily H. Goodman (New York Bicycling Coalition), Don Odell (Albany County Planning Department), Don Robertson (NYSDOT - Region 1), Bert Schou (CDTA), Ivan Vamos (Hudson River Valley Greenway Communities Council/NYBC), Steve Allocco (CDTC)

**DISCUSSION SUMMARY**

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

The goal of the meeting was to catch Task Force members up on CDTC staff technical activities and solicit their inputs with regard to the "content, look and feel" of the Technical Report.

Followup on "Sidewalk Maps" Idea: At the April meeting, discussion of the difficulty in prioritizing areas for pedestrian treatments raised the suggestion that as one starting point, *strategic connections* between existing sidewalks to each other or to more logical termini could be identified from sidewalk maps which local public works agencies might have on file. CDTC looked into this idea; to date, early indications were that some the smaller cities (e.g., Cohoes, Mechanicville) had such maps available. Exploration of this question continues; at a minimum, the Task Force Technical Report should contain a discussion of using this sort of inventory, whether in map or tabular form, as a guide for answering the question of "where to begin." (see also "Places to Start" on Page 2)

Status of "Make Your Community..." Brochure: Between 800 and 900 copies of the map have been distributed; a second printing will likely take place when supply dwindles to a critical level.

Field Study on Bike/Ped Travel: It was observed that while the "Estimates of Bicycle and Pedestrian Travel in the Capital District" handout distributed at the April 27 meeting gives a general idea of the overall presences of cycling and walking in the region's transportation system, it does not provide insights on these modes of travel "on the road," at a particular location or in a general area. In response, it was noted that CDTC and NYSDOT are getting underway with a study intended to address this "data gap." CDTC and NYSDOT will be collecting information in the field on bicycle and pedestrian traffic, so as to get some numbers on volumes on bike/ped facilities and in the general mix of traffic. In addition to eventually being able to make comments to the effect of "five percent of rush hour travel into downtown Albany is made by bicyclists or pedestrians," it is expected that a "flow map" of sorts -- a map of pedestrian and bike volumes along major facilities -- will be developed as a result of the in-field data collection. This study will benefit from CDTC's existing signalized intersection traffic count database, which includes morning and afternoon peak period pedestrian flows at the 400 busiest intersections in the Capital District. In addition to "number" information, CDTC will be taking pictures at a variety of locations to illustrate <sup>(1)</sup>the problems faced by cyclists and pedestrians and <sup>(2)</sup>some examples of local bike/pedestrian-friendly facility design.

Status of Albany Main Line Abandonment Discussions: As has been noted in past meetings, CP Rail recently initiated abandonment proceedings for the "Albany Main Line," a 26-mile stretch of rail running from the Port of Albany/Kenwood Yards to Delanson. CDTC convened a group of potentially affected public agencies and interested members of the public to discuss what the future use of this rail corridor might be. The general sentiment has been that the corridor should be preserved for transportation purposes of some kind, but there are a variety of ideas for what those transportation purposes would be, ranging from use as a bike/hike trail to continued railway use to development of an automobile route. The group continues to meet to discuss this question, along with the other relevant issues (e.g., how to purchase the right-of-way).

In addition to facilitating the working group meetings on this matter, CDTC staff has been developing estimates of the cost of converting the right-of-way to a bike-hike trail and contacting experts in the field of trail conversion (e.g., the Rails-to-Trails Conservancy) for information on available financing tools. CDTC will continue to keep the Task Force apprised of the progress of this work; in addition, Ivan Vamos joined the group at its July 5 meeting's discussions to

lend his expertise to the proceedings. At that meeting, discussion continued on the questions of <sup>(1)</sup>who was in the position to purchase the property and <sup>(2)</sup>once purchased, what its best use would be. More exploration of the background matters attendant to these questions is needed; the next meeting of the working group will be held in early August.

Update on Costs of Group B/C Cyclist Accommodations on the Priority Bicycle Network: At the February meeting, an estimated cost of \$72-79 million was presented for upgrading the Priority Bicycle Network to "Group A" standards. However, it was noted at the April meeting that as the "Group A" designation probably applies to no more than five percent of the 100 million or so people in the U.S. who own bicycles, accommodations to this level were probably not likely to encourage many shifts from auto travel to cycling.

To present a more accurate picture of what level of accommodation would really be necessary to give the average cyclist the opportunity to ride on the Network, CDTC staff revisited the cost assessment using Group B/C standards. The resulting cost estimate is considerably higher: on the order of about \$118-129 million. CDTC staff proposed that this not be presented as "the price tag for the Task Force's recommendations," but rather as a comparative reference -- a table or graphic could be included in the report comparing the dollar amounts needed to resolve all motor vehicle congestion and bicycle travel problems, the "maximum potential benefits" of these investments in terms of fuel and delay savings, pollution reductions and other indices, and relative cost-effectiveness. CDTC will pull these numbers together; the point they would ideally make is in regard to a greater cost-effectiveness of investing in bicycle accommodation.

"Places to Start" -- Early Implementation Locations: It has been noted in past discussions that the Priority Network, the "Make Your Community..." brochure and other Task Force products identify a considerable number of steps which can be taken across the region to improve the bicycle and pedestrian travel environments, such that "where to begin" could be a daunting question. As a possible means of prioritizing some areas, CDTC staff developed a series of tables listing "early action" candidates (with problems reported) by county, based on past CDTC outreach efforts and Task Force discussions. This sort of information might lend itself well to being presented on a map; as an illustration of how this might look, a map from CDTC's Route 50 Traffic Study (entitled "1990 Deficiencies") was distributed.

A few additional locations, or extensions of locations identified in the draft tables, were raised in group discussions, including the following:

- \* Albany Shaker Road, Colonie (discontinuous shoulders, hostile drivers)
- \* Everett Road
- \* Route 9 by Siena College (no sidewalks)
- \* Sand Creek Road near Wolf Road (sidewalks come *within one block* of Wolf Road, then end)
- \* Western Avenue (Route 20) outside Albany (could extend defined section out to Route 146 or so)

These locations will be added to the inventory, along with any others passed along to CDTC prior to finalization of the report in September.

Technical Report Content, Layout: It was noted at the April meeting that the Task Force has considerable latitude with regard to the final content and look of the Technical Report. Thus, the Task Force has the opportunity to put a wide range of ideas on the table by listing them in the Technical Report. Several concept ideas or "areas of emphasis" were suggested in response to this note, including the following:

- \* Wolf Road area: Given the difficulty of traveling within this corridor by bike or on foot, could a trolley or loop bus route (with stops along Wolf Road in either direction) be considered?
- \* Balance of Pedestrian and Bicycle Concerns: Much of what the Task Force has developed in the way of specifics deals with *bicycles*. However, between "exclusively walking" and "walking to bus stops" (or to cars), pedestrian travel is probably as much as 50 times greater a presence in the system than bike travel (10 percent of trips versus 0.2 percent, respectively). The report needs to present more information and guidance on pedestrian needs, connections to transit, travel between neighborhoods, and the like.

- \* Importance of Providing a Bicycle/Pedestrian Travel Environment which is Safe and Appears So: The perception of danger is a significant deterrent to bicycle or pedestrian travel. Even if a road meets some guideline, whether it is "FHWA Group B/C" or whatever other reference is used, people will still not bike or walk on/along it if it does not seem safe. In some cases, it will require *overaccommodation* to present the actuality and appearance of safety; consideration should be given to taking such steps at the "next level," particularly in high-demand travel corridors.
- \* Education: Even though it is arguably not a CDTC function to conduct cyclist/pedestrian/driver education, the report should remind readers of the notion of education as a step toward reducing dangerous behavior.
- \* Right Turn on Red Prohibitions: This may be an appropriate tool for "blanket applications" in areas such as downtowns. Right turns on red (RTORs) often follow rolling rather than full stops; in addition, even where the full stop is made, the driver is usually concentrating on looking to the left for a gap in oncoming motor vehicle traffic, rather than on looking at the crosswalk in front of or to the right of his/her vehicle, where a pedestrian or cyclist may be. Particularly in busy areas where oncoming motor vehicle traffic commands this sort of attention, RTOR prohibitions would reduce potential bike/ped conflicts with cars in addition to increasing the overall speeds of bike/walk trips.

With regard to report layout, the idea of having the Report be a free-standing guide was repeated; toward this end, CDTC is exploring several ways of making it as approachable and positive (the latter in terms of conveying a "we can do this" feeling) as possible. The product of these explorations, a second draft document including the "action items," is tentatively scheduled to be sent out to the Task Force by *Wednesday, August 15* at the latest, and hopefully by *Friday, August 11*.

Miscellaneous Items: Ivan reported on two items. First, the Albany Service Corps (possibly with support from NYSDOT and other "road owners") will be marking road shoulders along a Greenway loop route from Albany down to the Rip Van Winkle Bridge (Route 23 between Hudson and Catskill) and back to Albany via Bike Route 9. The plan is for the shoulder markings to be spaced such that cyclists will be able to see the next marker along the route from the marker they are at. Passonno Paints will be supplying the paint needed for the markings; this public/private partnership is a good example of the sort of *leveraging* of public dollars which will become increasingly important in the "do more with less" fiscal environment expected for the coming years.

Ivan also noted a recent Times-Union special section on the Colonie Centennial celebration. Two elements of this celebration, a bike race and parade on Wolf Road (at separate times, of course), could present opportunities to highlight the potential benefits of making Wolf Road and other major roads in the Town more bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly.

## **ACTION ITEMS**

- \* CDTC to continue work on draft technical report. Draft should be mailed out by August 15.
- \* **Next Task Force meeting: Wednesday, August 23, 5:30 - 7:30 PM, Colonie Community Center, 1653 Central Avenue (across from Lake Electronics).** Meeting to concentrate on discussion of draft technical report.

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

FROM: Steve Allocco

DATE: July 6, 1995

**RE: June 15 Meeting Summary; Details on Next Meeting**

Enclosed please find a summary of the June 15 meeting. The next meeting of the Task Force will be held on **Wednesday, August 23, 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 continue to discuss the draft Technical Report; a working draft of the full report should get out to you by August 15. In the meantime, please feel free to call, fax or write if any questions or comments come up.

Enclosure(s, for those not in attendance 6/15)