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Disclaimer

This report was funded in part through a grant from the Federal Highway Administration [and Federal
Transit Administration], U.S. Department of Transportation. The views and opinions of the authors [or
agency] expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the U. S. Department of
Transportation.

This report was prepared in cooperation with the Town of Schaghticoke, Village of Schaghticoke, the
Capital District Transportation Committee, the New York State Department of Transportation,
Rensselaer County, the Capital District Transportation Authority, and the Capital District Regional
Planning Commission. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of these
government agencies.

The recommendations presented in this report are intended to address current transportation-land
use compatibility issues and help support the Town and Village of Schaghticoke’s efforts to improve
the quality of life in the Village and Hamlet of Melrose by creating a pedestrian friendly streetscape
and a slower and safer traveling environment. The recommendations are conceptual in nature and
are presented to characterize the types of improvements that are desirable, and that may be
implemented as part of future transportation improvement and/or land use projects. All concepts
will require further engineering evaluation and review.
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Introduction

1.1 Background

To better plan for its future, the Town of Schaghticoke completed a Comprehensive Plan in 2005. A central theme of that plan is a strong desire by Town residents to maintain their community’s rural, small town character. The plan recognizes, however, that increasing traffic volumes – especially truck traffic – on Routes 40 and 67 are jeopardizing the character that is cherished by residents. As a result, the Comprehensive Plan established as its major transportation goal the following:

*Provide a safe and un-congested transportation system for vehicles and pedestrians consistent with the residential and rural nature of the town.*

The plan included several recommendations to help the Town reach this goal; these recommendations are also appropriate for the Village as well. They are to:

- Encourage street connectivity, particularly in subdivisions.
- Promote the use of access management techniques including reducing curb cuts on major arterial roads.
- Explore making downtown streetscape improvements in the Village and Hamlet areas.
- Investigate the use of traffic calming measures and speed limit reductions in the Village and Hamlet areas.
- Enhance bicyclist and pedestrian safety through a shared roadway system.
- Work with NYSDOT to establish a truck route to control truck traffic on Route 40.

This study is a follow-up activity to the Schaghticoke Comprehensive Plan. The purpose is to improve the safety of the Route 40 corridor – for all modes of transportation – in a manner consistent with the rural nature of the Town and Village, while at the same time exploring downtown streetscape improvements and traffic calming measures to enhance the character of the Village of Schaghticoke and the Hamlet of Melrose.

The timing of this study is fortuitous, as the bridge carrying Route 40 over the Hoosic River is scheduled to be replaced by the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) in 2011-2012, with design getting underway in 2010. In light of NYSDOT’s commitment to Context Sensitive Solutions, this fortunate circumstance presents an excellent and imminent opportunity for the Village and Town to incorporate some elements of their corridor vision into a Federally-funded transportation improvement project.
The study is being funded jointly by the Town and Village of Schaghticoke and the Capital District Transportation Committee (CDTC) through its Community and Transportation Linkage Planning Program. The Linkage Program is an implementation program related to CDTC’s New Visions 2030 Regional Transportation Plan. The Route 40 Corridor Study supports the program strategies of developing pedestrian friendly design standards; creating an integrated multi-modal transportation network; developing activity centers, town centers, and transit corridors; and creating a greater mix and intensity of land uses. This study will not only benefit the Town and Village, but will benefit the region as it will assist CDTC in advancing the New Visions 2030 regional principles at the local level.

The consultant team for the Route 40 Corridor Study, McFarland Johnson (MJ) and Project for Public Spaces (PPS), is responsible for organizing the vision for the corridor. MJ and PPS conducted this study under the direction of a Study Advisory Committee, consisting of members of the Town and Village of Schaghticoke, the Capital District Transportation Committee, the Capital District Regional Planning Commission, the New York State Department of Transportation, and the Rensselaer County highway and planning departments.

### 1.2 Study Area and Context

Located in the northwest corner of Rensselaer County, the Town and Village of Schaghticoke have historically been centers for agriculture and industry. Although industrial activity has declined in Schaghticoke over the years, the area continues its strong agricultural tradition to this day. However, this tradition is being challenged by increasing residential development, particularly for commuters to large employment centers in Albany and Troy. Development both within and outside of these two communities has begun to strain the transportation system, particularly Route 40, which bisects both the Village of Schaghticoke and Hamlet of Melrose, while also serving as an important north-south route in this part of the Capital Region. See Figure 1.1 for a map showing where the study area is situated within the Capital Region.

The segment of Route 40 being evaluated under this Corridor Study is approximately 5.0 miles in length, with the southern study limit located at the Route 40/Melrose Valley Falls Road (County Route 117) intersection in the Hamlet of Melrose. The northern study limit is located at the Route 40/Route 67/Stillwater Bridge Road (County Route 125) intersection at the northern edge of the Village of Schaghticoke. See Figure 1.2 for a map of the study area.

The study area contains three segments with distinctive characteristics, and many sections of this report are organized by segment for the reader’s convenience. These segments are:

- **Hamlet of Melrose:** In the southernmost 0.4 miles of the study area, Route 40 passes through a small, compact and historic community known as the Hamlet of Melrose.
Figure 1.1  Regional Map

Map Source: Capital District Region Planning Commission
**Figure 1.2** Study Area Map

Map Source: NYS GIS Clearinghouse
• Rural Segment: Land use along the 3.3-mile-long segment of Route 40 between the Hamlet of Melrose and the Village of Schaghticoke is primarily single-family residential and agricultural in nature.

• Village of Schaghticoke: The northernmost 1.3 miles of the study area falls within the Village of Schaghticoke, another historic community and the most densely developed portion of the study area.

1.3 Vision Statement and Study Principles

Members of the consultant team and Study Advisory Committee collaborated to develop the following Vision Statement for the Route 40 Corridor Study:

Route 40 is the life line of the Town and Village of Schaghticoke, as well as an important route in the larger Capital Region. It must strike a balance between the provision of mobility for through traffic and the needs of the communities it traverses. Proactive transportation and land use planning will assist the corridor in accommodating future economic growth while still preserving historic assets. Looking forward, Route 40 should serve as the catalyst for building community capital and the link that binds great places together.

Additionally, the following guiding principles were established to direct the efforts of the consultant team throughout the development of the Route 40 Corridor Study:

• Engage residents and other stakeholders in planning for the future of their community.
• Coordinate transportation and land use planning decisions to maintain historic character and leverage public investment for community benefit.
• Design a multi-modal transportation system and enhance roadway safety for all users, including pedestrians and bicyclists.
• Design streets to respect and enhance the community and encourage vehicular speeds appropriate to the surrounding context.
• Concentrate development in existing centers and connect to neighboring developments to encourage non-vehicular travel, conserve open space, enhance the viability of transit and preserve historic development patterns.
• Create community gathering places with a mix of activities that attract a broad cross section of people.
• Encourage a mix of compatible land uses to enhance accessibility to goods and services.
• Encourage architecture and site planning practices that reflect historic development patterns and beautify the corridor.
1.4 Public Participation Overview

Outreach conducted during this study included regular meetings with the Study Advisory Committee, face-to-face meetings with other key stakeholders (i.e., representatives from Hoosic Valley Central Schools, Schaghticoke Fairgrounds, and the A.E. Diver Library), and two Community Workshops held at the elementary school.

The purpose of the First Community Workshop, held on December 6, 2008, was to assess and brainstorm improvement ideas for the Route 40 corridor in the Town and Village of Schaghticoke. It started out with a presentation on the qualities of great public spaces; then workshop attendees were broken into four groups with each group focusing on one of the following locations:

1. The area in the vicinity of the Route 40/Route 67/Stillwater Bridge Road (County Route 125) intersection at the northern edge of the Village of Schaghticoke. This area includes the Schaghticoke Fairgrounds, the Hoosic Valley Center shopping plaza, and Hoosic Valley Central Schools.
2. A segment of Route 40 in the northern portion of the study area that includes a Stewarts Shop and the Schag a Val Restaurant.
3. The Village Core – i.e., the segment of Route 40 between the Hoosic River bridge and the A.E. Diver Library.
4. The Hamlet of Melrose.

The groups evaluated their assigned site using the “Place Game.” The Place Game ignites a creative process about how to make a place vital and how to improve the experience of people in a place. This structured exercise asks participants to use common sense and intuition, along with structured observation and interview skills, to allow them to very quickly see the good and bad qualities of a place using the characteristics listed below.

Comfort & Image
- Overall attractiveness
- Feeling of safety
- Cleanliness/quality of maintenance
- Comfort of places to sit

Access & Linkages
- Visibility from a distance
- Ease in walking to the place
- Transit access
- Clarity of information/signage
Uses & Activities
- Mix of stores/services
- Frequency of community events/activities
- Overall busy-ness of area
- Economic vitality

Sociability
- Number of people in groups
- Evidence of volunteerism
- Sense of pride and ownership
- Presence of children and seniors

Once participants evaluated their site, they were then asked to formulate improvement recommendations and summarize their group’s ideas for:

- What they liked best about the site;
- Short-term improvements;
- Long-term vision; and
- Partnerships and local talent to help implement these ideas.

Finally, each group reported back to all workshop participants, describing the issues and opportunities they identified for their specific area. A summary of the December 6, 2008 Community Workshop is included in Appendix A.

A Second Community Workshop was held on October 8, 2009 to present and explain the transportation and land use recommendations that had been developed over the course of this study. It was noted that many of the recommendations originated from residents’ ideas generated at the first Community Workshop, and that these ideas had been further developed and refined based on input received from the Study Advisory Committee.

The primary tool used to gather feedback from this workshop was a comprehensive “Resident Opinion Survey” that attendees were asked to complete. The completed surveys were used to compile a summary of the group’s general feelings regarding the corridor recommendations presented (i.e., “strongly in favor,” “somewhat in favor,” “neutral,” “somewhat oppose” and “strongly oppose”), but they also offered an opportunity to provide general or specific comments regarding transportation and land use issues along the Route 40 corridor. A summary of the second Community Workshop, including a summary of results from the completed surveys, can be found in Appendix A.
1.5 Environmental Justice

On February 11, 1994, President Clinton issued Executive Order 12898, “Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations.” It was created to ensure that federal government activities that may adversely affect human health or the environment do not disproportionately impact minority or low income populations. This Executive Order is closely related to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. As a federally funded agency, the Capital District Transportation Committee is required to be in compliance with these federal regulations.

For CDTC, Environmental Justice Target Population Areas are defined as any Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ) with low income, minority, or Hispanic populations equal to or greater than the regional average. The regional averages based on 2000 U.S. Census population data are:

- Minority Population = 11.2%
- Hispanic Population = 2.6%
- Low Income Population = 8.9%

With respect to the Schaghticoke Route 40 Corridor Study, demographic data indicates that there are no areas of special concern in the study area.
2  Land Use & Transportation System Assessment

2.1 General Environment

2.1.1 Current Land Uses

Figure 2.1 contains a map showing existing land uses within the study area. Descriptions of the various land uses present along the Route 40 corridor are provided below.

Hamlet of Melrose:
The Hamlet of Melrose offers a clustered mix of services within walking distance of the residential core that include Esquire Food & Drug, a post office, a fire station, Melrose Methodist Church, a gift shop, and an automotive repair shop. The former Getty gas station site is in a state of disrepair and does not positively reflect on the Hamlet. It is inconsistent with the historic character of the area.

There is a pocket park at the intersection of Route 40 and Melrose Valley Falls Road dedicated to local residents that have served their country.

Rural Segment:
The Town of Schaghticoke, within the study area and exclusive of the Hamlet of Melrose, is primarily single-family residential and agricultural in nature. There are several intermittent commercial, industrial and institutional developments that front onto Route 40. The low-density development pattern creates large swaths of contiguous undeveloped land (totaling 25,490 acres in the Town as a whole) and preserves the rural character of the area.

There are also negative impacts that result from this development pattern; it separates residences from one another, as well as from schools, jobs, retail and recreational facilities, which reinforces automobile dependency, forces Route 40 to carry both local and regional trips, and impedes the mobility of the segment of the population that does not drive, including many seniors and children. Dispersed land uses also diminish the opportunity for natural gathering places and spontaneous interaction with other members of the community - a situation exacerbated by the Town’s lack of a community center that would fill some of this void.
New suburban-style subdivision development in the Town of Schaghticoke (e.g., near the southern intersection of Route 40 and Route 67) further impedes the potential for interaction and pedestrian activity due to its isolation from urbanized centers, single-use character and disconnected street patterns (i.e., cul de sacs). Lot sizes, however, are consistent with Village and Hamlet development and, as with older residential development along Route 40, housing units tend to be clustered together, which preserves open space and scenic vistas.

**Village of Schaghticoke**

Having been largely built around the turn of the 20th century, before the proliferation of the automobile, the Village of Schaghticoke has a fine-grained mix of land uses that provide a variety of services within walking distance of residences. The Village Hall, two churches, a post office, the Legion Hall, the A.E. Diver Library, the Hoosic Valley Central Schools, the Schaghticoke Fairgrounds, a number of restaurants and convenience retail stores, the Hoosic Valley Center shopping plaza, and several commercial and industrial employers are all within the Village’s boundaries. The Hoosic Valley Farmers Exchange, at the southern end of Lower Main Street, itself employs approximately ten people and generates several tractor-trailer trips each day.

Route 40 serves as the spine of the Village, with the residential core bounded by two commercial nodes: one around the northern intersection of Routes 40 and 67 and the other around the intersection of Route 40 and Lower Main Street. These nodes serve as gateways into the historic center of the Village and offer a number of activity generators that attract people during various times of the day. Newer commercial developments in both nodes have large setbacks and front Route 40 with large parking lots or gas pumps, which do not contribute to an enticing pedestrian environment.

The residences are primarily single-family homes, but multi-family dwellings, such as the contextual apartment building on East Street, are in harmony with the Village setting.

There is a small pocket park at the intersection of Main Street and School Street that serves as a soldiers monument but is severely underutilized. The developed area around Route 40/67 is largely surrounded by contiguous underdeveloped land, whose terrain offers natural viewsheds, wildlife habitat and some recreational opportunities. Despite the close proximity of the Hoosic River and Electric Lake, however, there are few formalized means of accessing the water.
Figure 2.1  Current Land Uses in Study Area  

Map Source: Town of Schaghticoke 2005 Comprehensive Plan
2.1.2 Current Zoning

Hamlet of Melrose
The Hamlet of Melrose consists of one single zoning classification. This “Hamlet District” allows for both residential and commercial uses and encourages new development that is consistent with traditional development patterns. One- and two-family housing units are allowed as-of-right, and special permits allow most other commercial and institutional uses that are consistent with a Hamlet setting. Lot sizes are generally smaller than in the rest of the Town of Schaghticoke, and the currently underdeveloped areas of the Hamlet provide a logical opportunity for future development in an existing center. This opportunity for density, however, is severely limited by a lack of sewer service and Rensselaer County's current septic requirements.

Rural Segment
The majority of the study area in the Town of Schaghticoke consists of “RA - Residential Agricultural” and “R60 - Residential” zoning, both of which allow for one dwelling unit per three acres. As-of-right, acceptable developments include one-family dwellings, agricultural and horticultural crops and livestock, storage or processing of farm produce, and municipal buildings and uses. There is one area (near the southern intersection of Route 40 and Route 67) that appears to have been rezoned to “R40 – Residential” to allow for subdivision development. This classification allows for single-family homes by-right, at a density ranging from one unit per half-acre to one unit per two acres.

There are isolated locations along Route 40 that are zoned “HC – Highway Commercial,” which allows for agricultural and horticultural crops and livestock, storage or processing of farm produce, municipal buildings and uses, and mining and excavation. Through special permits, these areas can also house a variety of retail and commercial uses, such as restaurants, professional offices and service retail. Of all the zoning classifications in the Town, only HC allows for multi-use buildings. The allowable density of this zoning category is roughly one structure per acre.

Overall, the existing zoning code allows for significant low-density, single-use development that may not be consistent with the desires of the Town’s residents. As referenced in Volume 2 of the Town of Schaghticoke Comprehensive Plan, “full buildout conditions would allow for an additional...26,686 residents” (using an average household size of 2.75 people). Realization of such sprawling land use consumption would undermine the Town’s efforts to maintain the historic and rural character of the area. It would also have detrimental effects on wildlife, water quality, and traffic congestion.
Figure 2.2  Current Zoning in Study Area

Map Source:
Town of Schaghticoke 2005 Comprehensive Plan
Village of Schaghticoke
There is currently no zoning regulation in the Village of Schaghticoke. This is not an entirely undesirable situation. The conventional practice of Euclidean zoning, which removes housing from other daily destinations and often mandates minimum on-site parking requirements, favors automobile travel over walking and biking and is partially responsible for many of the nation’s current transportation challenges. Most of the existing development in the Village would be illegal by typical zoning codes, as would innovative reuse of existing structures, such as the A.E. Diver Memorial Library, which was once the Diver residence.

New development opportunities will arise, however, and the Village should have regulations in place that preserve the desirable elements of its character and encourage architecture and site planning practices that contribute to, rather than detract from, the community.

2.1.3 Historic Character

Hamlet of Melrose
The old housing stock in the Hamlet of Melrose, on lots with minimal street frontage and with features such as front porches and stoops, conveys the long history of this community. Commercial buildings, such as those housing Stuff and Nonsense and S.R.M. Motors, also appear to be older structures with an agricultural architectural quality.

Newer commercial developments, however, such as Esquire Food & Drug and the abandoned Getty station, were not designed with the Hamlet’s history in mind and detract from its overall aesthetics. Additionally, the Methodist church and the post office front Route 40 with parking lots rather than continuing the historic practice of minimizing building setbacks from the street.

Melrose grew up at the intersection of two historic turnpikes in the early 1800s, and later at the historic junction between the railroad and the roadway. The old, connected street pattern is still evident today and contributes to the walkability of the Hamlet. Walkability, however, would be greatly enhanced with even basic pedestrian infrastructure and other commercial destinations that would encourage people to congregate and linger.
Rural Segment
The Town of Schaghticoke is historically an agricultural area, and it has largely retained this legacy. Its scenic viewsheds and the wildlife that proliferate here are closely connected to this agrarian nature and are highly valued by local residents. Businesses along Route 40 that relate to this agricultural economy further reinforce this rural character. Commercial enterprises that do not connect to the Town’s past detract from the historic image of Route 40.

There are no visual cues to remind people that the Town was once a place inhabited by various Indian tribes, despite the fact that Schaghticoke is a native name for “the place where the waters mingle.”

New residential development in the corridor is largely out of context with its history. Subdivisions do not use historical street layouts; the architecture tends to be modern and suburban; and many trees are needlessly removed to create grass lawns.

Village of Schaghticoke
The Village of Schaghticoke has a very rich history that is conveyed today through its urban form. Many existing buildings date back to the 1800s, and their relationship to the Village’s streets harkens back to a time when these public spaces served as forums for social and economic exchanges. The buildings that line Route 40 are very close to the highway, generally 6 to 15 feet from the edge of pavement, and many dwellings have front porches, minimal sideyards and entrances that face the street – physical features that occupants likely discount given the intrusive nature of current traffic volumes and behaviors.

Old structures, such as the municipal building and quite a number of homes, should be preserved to continue to connect the Village to its history. The loss of local architectural assets, such as the old school house, diminishes the ability to pass on the Village’s history to future generations. Adaptive reuse strategies, such as the library and the Vadard technology company, are commendable practices for avoiding irreversible damage.

Other local features, such as the Route 40/67 railroad bridge and views of Electric Lake, are also visual reminders of the community’s historic roots as a mill town. Overall, these resources and others could be made more evident for the education of both residents and visitors alike.
2.1.4 The Streetscape

Hamlet of Melrose
The streetscape in the Hamlet is automobile-oriented and does not create a comfortable or enjoyable pedestrian experience. There are no sidewalks or other pedestrian amenities. With the exception of the Stuff and Nonsense gift shop, retail and institutional signage detracts from the area. Most parking lots, again aside from that of Stuff and Nonsense, do not buffer the view of parked cars from motorists or pedestrians. Highway signage and lighting, as well as the numerous utility poles, fail to give the community a unique aesthetic, and there are no gateway treatments that convey a sense of arrival. Fortunately, some buildings are located close to Route 40; this has the potential to contribute to a distinctly recognizable urban center.

Rural Segment
The rural setting of Route 40 through the Town of Schaghticoke provides for scenic views, but these are increasingly disturbed by dispersed development. The low-density development pattern does not necessitate much in terms of streetscape elements. There are short stretches that utilize more context sensitive guardrail, rather than the standard steel design. Highway lighting and roadway signage are not unique, and roadside landscaping and retail signage are inconsistent. Further, large building setbacks encourage higher vehicular speeds.

Village of Schaghticoke
The Route 40 streetscape is not contributing to the Village’s potential as a walkable community. In general, there is insufficient space for roadside enhancements, such as street trees, benches, or stand-alone pedestrian scaled lighting. Utility poles (to which highway-scaled lighting fixtures are attached), mailboxes, and standard roadway signage are practically the only objects between the edge of pavement and the buildings that front Route 40. Evidence exists that these items are routinely impacted by motor vehicles, creating maintenance issues as well.

There are sidewalks in most places of the Village, but the presence of a landscaped buffer between the street and the sidewalk varies significantly. Poor drainage has led to some sidewalk segments being covered with sand and gravel, while other sidewalk segments are in very poor condition due to
age. There are also important pedestrian connections where sidewalks do not exist, such as the stretch of Route 40 between Stewarts and the Hoosic Valley Center and the schools.

### 2.1.5 Projects Planned/Under Construction

There are no major development projects currently being planned in the study area. In general, development is proceeding at a slow but consistent pace, one lot at a time.

In the Town of Schaghticoke, 284 one- and two-family homes were built between 1992 and 2002. This is not an insignificant rate of change and, over time, will substantially reshape the corridor’s landscape if measures are not taken to protect the community’s valued character.

The bridge carrying Route 40 over the Hoosic River is scheduled to be replaced by the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) in 2011-2012, with design getting underway in 2010. This is a fortunate circumstance as it represents a great opportunity for the Village and Town to incorporate some elements of their corridor vision into a Federally-funded transportation improvement project.

### 2.2 Transportation

#### 2.2.1 General Roadway Characteristics

Route 40 is a two-lane rural minor arterial that runs in a north-south orientation, connecting Schaghticoke residents with the City of Troy to the south and Washington County to the north. Route 67, an east-west route that traverses Rensselaer and Saratoga Counties, overlaps Route 40 in the northernmost 1.5 miles of the study area. Pavement width, surface condition and speed limit information pertaining to Route 40 is provided below.

**Hamlet of Melrose**

Travel lanes are 11 feet wide in this part of the study area, with paved shoulders varying in width from 2 to 4 feet. Route 40 is uncurbed in the Hamlet section. Pavement condition is generally good. The posted speed limit is 40 mph. The speed limit is regularly exceeded, partially due to the lack of visual cues communicating to motorists that they are entering a historic hamlet.

**Rural Segment**

Two roadway cross sections can be found in this part of the study area. The older section, located closer to the Hamlet of Melrose, features 11-foot-wide travel lanes, 3 to 4-foot-wide shoulders, and pavement in good condition. The newer section, located closer to the Village of Schaghticoke, features 12-foot-wide travel lanes, shoulders varying in width from 8 to 10 feet, and excellent pavement conditions. No curbing is present. The posted speed limit is 55 mph, which is appropriate
for most of this lightly developed, rural corridor. However, the speed limit transition that occurs at
the southern boundary of the Village of Schaghticoke – from 55 mph to 35 mph – is abrupt and
severe; consequently, speed limit compliance in the southern part of the Village is poor.

**Village of Schaghticoke**

Travel lanes are 10 feet wide in the Village, with paved shoulders varying in width from 2 to 4 feet
(except on the bridge over the Hoosic River, where no shoulders are present). At one location within
the Village, the shoulders have a rounded shape to also serve as gutters for conveying stormwater
runoff. Pavement conditions within the Village range from fair to good. Route 40 is uncurbed in the
Village, although it is reported that curbs did exist at one time before being buried by repeated
asphalt overlays. The posted speed limit is 35 mph, which seems high to many SAC members
considering the densely developed Village setting and small building setbacks. A long grade in the
Village affects travel speeds as vehicles naturally accelerate while traveling downgrade; vehicles
have also been observed to accelerate before ascending this same grade from the other direction.

2.2.2 Intersections

Numerous side roads intersect Route 40 throughout the study area. The characteristics of these
intersections are summarized in Table 2.1 on the next page. Noted undesirable intersection
characteristics include:

- Acute intersection angle. Intersection angles of less than 60° are generally to be avoided, if
  possible. Roads intersecting at acute angles require large pavement areas to eliminate lane
  encroachments, a condition that creates longer crossing distance for pedestrians and
  bicyclists. Acute-angle intersections tend to limit visibility for all roadway users, particularly
  for drivers of trucks, and they also increase the exposure time for vehicles crossing the main
  traffic flow.

- Insufficient intersection sight distance. The driver of a vehicle approaching an intersection should have an
  unobstructed view of the intersection to permit the driver to anticipate and avoid potential collisions.
  Also, drivers of stopped vehicles should have a sufficient view of the intersecting highway to decide
  when to enter the intersecting highway or to cross it. The sight distance needed is directly related to
  vehicle speeds.

- Excessive main road vehicle speeds at intersections. Related to intersection sight distance,
  above, excessive main road vehicle speeds (i.e., speeds well in excess of the speed limit and
  what is expected by stopped motorists) make it more difficult for stopped vehicles to judge
  the adequacy of gaps in traffic and to decide when to enter or cross the intersecting highway.
- Poorly defined intersection corners. Intersections with an indistinct “footprint” lack the needed visual cues for drivers to safely navigate through the intersection.

### Table 2.1
Study Area Intersection Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersecting Side Road(s)</th>
<th># of legs</th>
<th>Type of Intersection Control</th>
<th>Side Road Intersecting Angle</th>
<th>Undesirable Intersection Characteristics¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hamlet of Melrose</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melrose Valley Falls Road (CR 117)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minor road stop</td>
<td>50º</td>
<td>1,2,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Street</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Minor road stop w/</td>
<td>70º / 70º</td>
<td>2,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Hara Lane</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minor road stop</td>
<td>90º</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dotty Avenue</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minor road stop</td>
<td>80º</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rural Segment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinewoods Road</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minor road stop</td>
<td>90º</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell Road</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minor road stop</td>
<td>90º</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malm Road</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minor road stop</td>
<td>90º</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northline Road / Gutbrodt Road</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Minor road stop</td>
<td>70º / 70º</td>
<td>2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matalas Road</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minor road stop</td>
<td>50º</td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bracken Road</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minor road stop</td>
<td>35º</td>
<td>1,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansen Road</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minor road stop</td>
<td>75º</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madigan Road</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minor road stop</td>
<td>85º</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadowview Drive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minor road stop</td>
<td>80º</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 67 / East Schaghticoke Road</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>60º / 80º</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Village of Schaghticoke</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minor road stop</td>
<td>55º</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishermans Lane</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minor road stop</td>
<td>90º</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Main Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minor road stop w/</td>
<td>30º</td>
<td>1,2,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Street (see note below)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minor road stop</td>
<td>25º / 80º</td>
<td>1,2,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minor road stop</td>
<td>90º</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minor road stop</td>
<td>90º</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minor road stop</td>
<td>85º</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minor road stop</td>
<td>55º</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Avenue</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minor road stop</td>
<td>40º</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearl Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minor road stop</td>
<td>90º</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stillwater Bridge Road (CR 125) / Route 67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>80º / 80º</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Undesirable Intersection Characteristics:
1 = Acute side road intersecting angle
2 = Insufficient intersection sight distance
3 = Excessive main road vehicle speeds
4 = Poorly defined intersection corners
5 = Excessive speeds as vehicles try to beat red light

Note:
The Route 40/School Street intersection includes a right-turn-out only leg (25º) and an in/left-turn-out leg (80º).
2.2.3 Traffic Volumes
Recent traffic volumes were obtained from NYSDOT for Route 40 and for adjacent segments of Route 67. The reports provided show the number of vehicles passing a specific location on an hourly basis, with readings taken over a seven-day period. The average weekday and weekend counts are then multiplied by seasonal and local conditions factors to get the estimated Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT). Figure 2.3 shows the AADT volumes for the various portions of the study area.

In terms of hourly variations, Route 40 typically has two distinct peak periods coinciding with the morning and afternoon weekday commuting hours. Further, traffic volumes during the afternoon peak period are consistently higher than during the morning peak.

2.2.4 Truck Traffic
A concern was raised by the Study Advisory Committee (SAC) regarding heavy trucks that travel through the Village of Schaghticoke. Aggravating the situation is a long, moderately steep grade in the middle of the Village. Truck drivers frequently use engine brakes to control their speed as they descend this grade, and truck drivers have been observed to accelerate in the center of the Village as they prepare to ascend the same grade from the opposite direction.

The NYS 2006 Highway Sufficiency Ratings report includes an estimate of 7% trucks for this segment of Route 40, which is higher than average for a facility of this type. SAC members specifically noted the number of large trucks that use Route 40 through the Village to transport products manufactured at the Fort Miller precast concrete plant in the nearby Town of Easton. The Hoosic Valley Farmers Exchange, located at the southern end of Lower Main Street, also generates several tractor-trailer trips each day. Route 40 is not included in NYSDOT’s list of Qualifying (National Network) and Access Highways designated for use by Special Dimension Vehicles in New York.

Through truck traffic volumes are not extreme but they are appreciable. It is the combined effect of the Village setting, adjacent land uses and small building setbacks, narrow travel lanes, and moderately steep grades that cause operational difficulties and quality of life impacts as trucks pass through the Village. There is a need to minimize the negative effects of truck traffic within the Village.
Figure 2.3  Daily Traffic Volumes in the Study Area

Map Source: NYS GIS Clearinghouse
2.2.5 Crash History

An analysis of the crash history along the Route 40 corridor was conducted to determine the location and severity of crashes along the corridor. Crash information was provided by NYSDOT for the years 2002-2007. During that six-year period, there were a total of 179 crashes in the study area, including two fatalities and 60 crashes involving injuries. Two crashes, including one of the fatalities, involved pedestrians. Figures 2.4, 2.5 and 2.6 summarize the crashes by location and severity in the Hamlet section, along the rural segment, and in the Village of Schaghticoke, respectively. These figures also differentiate between intersection and non-intersection crashes.

As these figures show, the locations with the highest concentration of crashes from 2002-2007 include:

- Hamlet of Melrose (0.4 mile segment, including intersections with Melrose Valley Falls Road, Church Street, O’Hara Lane and Doty Avenue) – 26 crashes, including 1 involving a fatality and 15 involving injuries
- Schaghticoke Village Center, from Bridge over Hoosic River to Pearl Street (0.6 mile segment) – 31 crashes, including 7 involving injuries
- Vicinity of Route 40/Farm to Market Road/ East Schaghticoke Road intersection (0.3 mile segment) – 29 crashes, including 10 involving injuries
- Vicinity of Route 40/Route 67/Stillwater Bridge Road intersection (0.2 mile segment) – 20 crashes, including 9 involving injuries
- Vicinity of Route 40/Malm Road and Route 40/Gutbrodt Road/Northline Road intersections (0.3 mile segment) – 9 crashes, including 2 involving injuries
- Vicinity of Route 40/Bracken Road intersection (0.2 mile segment) – 7 crashes, including 4 involving injuries
- Vicinity of Route 40/Hansen Road and Route 40/Madigan Road intersections (0.2 mile segment) – 7 crashes, including 2 involving injuries

The crash rate for the entire 5.0-mile-long corridor is 2.26 crashes/MVM (million vehicle miles). The NY statewide averages are 3.66 crashes/MVM and 2.81 crashes/MVM for undivided two lane State Highways in urban and rural settings, respectively. Table 2.2, below, breaks down the crashes by study area segment, and compares the crash rates to the statewide averages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Hamlet of Melrose</th>
<th>Rural Segment</th>
<th>Village of Schaghticoke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of segment (miles)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of crashes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crash Rate (crashes/MVM)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison to State Average</td>
<td>137% / 221% (urban / rural)</td>
<td>62% (rural)</td>
<td>75% (urban)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2.4 Route 40 Crash History – Hamlet of Melrose (2002-2007)

Map Source: NYS GIS Clearinghouse
Figure 2.5  Route 40 Crash History – Rural Segment (2002-2007)

Map Source: NYS GIS Clearinghouse
Figure 2.6  Route 40 Crash History – Village of Schaghticoke (2002-2007)

Map Source: NYS GIS Clearinghouse
2.2.6 Driveways / Access Management

State highways such as Route 40 serve as the primary network for moving people and goods. These transportation corridors also provide access to businesses and homes and have served as the focus for commercial and residential development. If access is not properly designed and managed, these highways will be unable to accommodate the access needs of development and unable to retain their primary transportation function. Therefore, access management needs to balance the right of reasonable access to private property with the right of citizens to safe and efficient travel.

Characteristics of good access management include:

- **Well defined driveway edges** – Driveways should be designed with clearly defined borders that safely channel traffic from the roadway to a parking area. Wide open curb cuts cause confusion by mixing entering and exiting traffic, creating additional conflict points, and often obscuring sidewalks.
- **Adequate spacing between driveways, and between driveways and intersections** – Adequate spacing of driveways provides the distance and time necessary for drivers to react to vehicles entering or exiting a driveway.
- **Limited number of driveways per parcel** – Under ideal situations, one driveway per parcel is desirable to help reduce the number of curb cuts and the associated conflict points.

In general, poor access management is not yet a widespread issue on Route 40. The properties with access management issues are isolated to a few locations, including:

- **Hamlet of Melrose:** Esquire Food & Drug, Melrose Fire Company, abandoned gas station
- **Rural Segment:** Darrow Brothers Equipment Company, Donnier’s Service Station
- **Village of Schaghticoke:** Mobil gas station/convenience store, gravel lot formerly used as overflow parking for Hoosic Valley Central School and an adjacent vacant commercial property

Improved access should be considered at these locations the next time a roadway improvement project is programmed or land use changes are initiated for the property requiring local approval.

**Access Management Priority Network:**

The Capital District Transportation Committee has defined an Access Management Priority Network for the Capital Region as part of its New Visions 2030 Regional Transportation Plan. This network was established based on a performance measure known as Level-of-Compatibility (LOC) which ranges from “A”, the most desirable, to “F”, the least acceptable. The LOC measures the conflict...
between residential uses and traffic as well as commercial uses and traffic. The measure is based
on driveway spacing, the number of residential or commercial uses in the corridor and the traffic
volume. To be included on the access management priority network, the road segment must meet
two criteria:

- The road segment must show a high degree of conflict between commercial or residential
  land use and traffic, resulting in poor compatibility (Level of Compatibility D, E or F); and
- Additional road segments where either the potential for commercial development or intrusion
  of vehicle traffic through residential corridors is high, or significant deterioration in arterial
  corridor function is forecast to occur by 2015.

The Route 40 corridor, from the Route 67 intersection south of the Village of Schaghticoke to the
Route 67 intersection on the north side of the Village, has been noted as having a Residential Level
of Compatibility of D for both current conditions and when projected out to 2015. This means that
residents in the Village experience some notable conflict with traffic, from a quality of life
perspective. Traffic impacts in such corridors can range from air quality to noise, visual and safety
concerns. Tools are available to alleviate the conflict between residential uses and traffic such as:

- Endorse an access management plan/policy for this portion of the Route 40 corridor
- Strengthen land use planning and coordination
- Promote alternatives to automobile travel
- Explore the possible use of “traffic calming” actions to improve the livability of residential
  arterial corridors
- Support investment in access management improvements and other actions that promote
  overall objectives of arterial corridor management

2.2.7 Pedestrian and Bicycle Accommodations
The only pedestrian facilities within the study limits are
located in the Village of Schaghticoke, which has a
reasonably good network of sidewalks. One obvious
deficiency in the Village’s sidewalk network is that the
sidewalks on both sides of Route 40 terminate
approximately ¼ mile south of the Route 40/Route
67/Stillwater Bridge Road intersection, where three major
pedestrian destinations exist – the Hoosic Valley Central
Schools, the Hoosic Valley Center shopping plaza, and the
Schaghticoke Fairgrounds. Consequently, pedestrians are
frequently observed walking on the side of the road along
this segment of Route 40.

Sidewalk termination just south of the Schag a Val Restaurant, in the north end
of the Village
Sidewalk conditions range from very poor to like-new condition. Sidewalk curb ramps, where they do exist, do not meet current Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) guidelines. Crosswalks, which serve to direct pedestrians to appropriate crossing location, and to alert motorists of the fact that they have entered an area of pedestrian activity, are nonexistent in the Village. Further, sidewalks are discontinuous at residential and commercial driveway locations, contributing to pedestrian discomfort.

No pedestrian infrastructure exists in the Hamlet of Melrose, which is unfortunate given the hamlet’s great potential to be a walkable community – i.e., there is a clustered mix of services within walking distance of the community’s residential core.

Within the study area, bicyclists are accommodated on the paved shoulders. With the exception of a one-mile-long segment in the middle of the study area where the shoulders are 8-10 feet wide, the shoulders on Route 40 are generally 2-4 feet wide, which is less than desirable for bicycling. Route 40 contains a ¼-mile-long grade in the Village of Schaghticoke; in this location, the shoulders are rounded to also serve as gutters, forcing bicyclists into the 10-foot-wide travel lanes or onto the sidewalks. One other particularly bad location exists at the northern end of the Hamlet of Melrose, where old railroad bridge abutments are located immediately adjacent to narrow shoulders, forcing bicyclists to use the travel lanes in this area.

### 2.2.8 Transit and Ridesharing

Bus service for the Route 40 corridor is provided by the Capital District Transportation Authority (CDTA). Bus Route No. 96 – the “Rensselaer Rural” route – operates from Monday through Friday, traveling to Troy once each morning, and departing Troy once each afternoon. The bus has a designated stop at the Hoosic Valley Center shopping plaza, but will stop at any safe location along the Route 40 corridor if signaled by waving.

A little-used park-and-ride lot exists on Chestnut Street at the southern end of the Village. There is no signage directing residents and commuters to this lot, and it’s existence is not widely known.

The Capital District Transportation Committee (CDTC) and the Capital District Transportation Authority (CDTA) conducted a survey of commuters from mid-February through April 2009 in the greater Schaghticoke area (northern Rensselaer and southern Washington Counties) to determine the market for alternative transportation options and to ascertain the feasibility of a well-located park-and-ride lot. The survey results indicate that there is interest in using alternative forms of transportation in the Schaghticoke area but, for any of them to be feasible, a park-and-ride lot would
need to be either created or formalized in the Village. The similar work hours of the respondents, and the fact that most commute to Albany or Troy, indicates that there is a potential market for a vanpool and carpools. Appendix D contains a more detailed summary of the survey results, as well as a copy of the survey itself.

Transit Priority Network:
The Capital District Transportation Committee (CDTC) has defined a Transit Priority Network for the Capital Region as part of its New Visions 2030 Regional Transportation Plan. This network is defined by the Capital District Transportation Authority's existing route structure with particular emphasis on the system’s strongest transit corridors. These corridors represent priorities for transit supportive improvements such as bus stops, park and ride facilities, sidewalks and crosswalks. The Route 40 Corridor is on the CDTC Transit Priority network.

2.2.9 Drainage
Storm water runoff in the Route 40 corridor is managed using a combination of open and closed drainage systems. The drainage networks in the Hamlet of Melrose and Village of Schaghticoke are in poor condition. The open ditches, gutters and culverts between those two communities are in fair to good condition, with no apparent deficiencies. More detailed descriptions of the drainage systems within the Hamlet and Village areas are provided below.

Hamlet of Melrose:
There is a history of drainage problems in the Hamlet, including a heavy rain event in 2009 that overburdened the existing drainage network, causing damage to residential properties to the west of Route 40, along Avenue A. NYSDOT maintenance crews have completed some drainage improvements in the Hamlet area in recent years, but problems still remain. An analysis of the system’s capacity as compared to the watershed runoff should be conducted to determine where capacity improvements may be needed.

In the center of the Hamlet, there is a network of approximately eight inlets that are in poor to fair condition. There are no ditches and very few gutters, so rainwater mostly flows ineffectively along the edges of the roadway shoulders. There is a ponding problem just south of the Route 40/Melrose Valley Falls Road intersection where water from a small driveway ditch intercepts the roadway runoff at an inlet that is partially blocked by leaves and silt. This ponding is compounded by an underdrain system 100 feet to the west which drains a hillside, presumably in order to protect a residence. Water from the underdrain adds to the flows in the driveway ditch, presenting a problem once it reaches Route 40.
At the northern end of the Hamlet, there is a storm sewer network near the abandoned railroad underpass abutments; this system is also in poor condition. The inlets are prone to getting clogged with leaves and other debris, and the pipes are partially filled with silt. On the west side of the road, a retaining wall restricts the shoulder width which leads to water ponding within the travel lanes. On the east side, an eroded ditch carries water to the inlets near the abandoned abutments. In total, there are approximately five inlets in poor condition that outlet to a creek near Pinewoods Road.

**Village of Schaghticoke:**

In the northernmost 1,500 feet of the study area (i.e., between the Route 40/Route 67/Stillwater Bridge Road intersection and the Stewart’s Shop), there is a series of inlets along the east side of Route 40 that outlet to a stream or wetland across the street from Stewart’s. This network also picks up the parking lot inlets associated with Stewart’s and the Hoosic Valley Center shopping plaza. The surface runoff on the east side is not channelized in any way and appears to pool on the edge of the road until it infiltrates into the soil or finds one of the inlets. On the west side of Route 40, a grass swale conveys runoff south past the fairgrounds and into an inlet 600 feet north of Stewart’s. Visual inspection could not determine how this inlet connects to the others.

From the high point 250 feet south of Stewart’s, water flows down the edge of the roadway shoulder to a point 200 feet north of Pleasant Avenue where paved gutters have been formed within the shoulders of the road. The paved gutters continue to inlets at the Route 40/Pleasant Avenue/School Street intersection, which are part of a storm sewer trunk line that comes down Pleasant Avenue. It is assumed that this storm sewer outlets in the ravine near School Street, although no outlet was found. The paved gutters continue down the hill to a pair of inlets just north of the intersection of Route 40 and Lower Main Street near the Mobil gas station. This pair of inlets connects to another on Main Street and probably outlets behind the church on School Street. A single inlet on the south side of the church outlets directly to the Hoosic River Gorge. Due to the small number of inlets along this segment of Route 40, heavy rain events frequently produce sheet flows within the travel lanes.

The watershed on the south side of the Hoosic River is bounded by a high point on Route 40 approximately 600 feet north of the railroad overpass. Water on the west side of the road is channeled by a curb and flows towards the Hoosic River until it reaches an inlet in front of St. John’s Church. Water entering this inlet leaves the roadway and enters a stormwater network that crosses the church parking lot and probably outlets behind the church. On the east side of Route 40, water sheet flows off the edge of the road onto private property until just north of the intersection with Fishermans Lane, where concrete curb on both sides of the road carries flow to inlets near the bridge.
3 Recommendations for the Route 40 Corridor

This section outlines a series of recommendations for the Route 40 corridor; they are intended to improve safety for all modes of transportation, including walking and bicycling. Within the Hamlet of Melrose and Village of Schaghticoke, many of these recommendations will have the additional benefit of enhancing the character of those two communities. The recommendations respond to the problems identified through local observations and an analysis of existing conditions, input provided by Study Advisory Committee members, and feedback received during the Community Workshops.

The locations of the various recommended improvements described below are shown on the “Transportation Improvement Concept Plans” at the end of this section (Figures 3.2 through 3.7). These plans also include conceptual-level sketches for some of the more significant proposed roadway improvements.

3.1 Traffic and Safety Improvements

3.1.1 Roadway Cross Section / Bicyclist Accommodations
Much of the dialogue at one of the Study Advisory Committee (SAC) meetings was dedicated to roadway cross section elements and dimensions. Summaries of those discussions are broken down by study area segment and provided below.

Hamlet of Melrose:
Consistent with Melrose’s historic, hamlet context, a roadway cross section consisting of narrow travel lanes and shoulders, on-street parking spaces where appropriate and where space allows, vertical curbing, grass snow storage/pedestrian buffer areas, and concrete sidewalks is envisioned for this segment of the study area. Refer to the narrative below for the Village of Schaghticoke for additional discussion regarding cross section dimensions, including considerations for bicyclists.

Rural Segment:
Between the Hamlet of Melrose and the Route 40/Hansen Road intersection, the existing roadway shoulders are too narrow to safely accommodate the farm equipment that utilizes the roadway to access the adjacent fields, as well as the occasional bicyclist. Eight-foot-wide paved shoulders are envisioned for this segment of the study area. In the short term, it is recommended that the edge lines be moved one foot closer to the roadway centerline the next time they are scheduled to be repainted. This will provide some additional separation/protection for farm equipment and bicyclists; the narrower lanes may also have a traffic calming effect.
**Village of Schaghticoke:**
Similar to the Hamlet of Melrose, a roadway cross section consisting of narrow travel lanes and shoulders, on-street parking spaces where appropriate and where space allows, vertical curbing, snow storage/pedestrian buffer areas, and concrete sidewalks is envisioned for this segment of the study area. Available right-of-way is limited in the residential portions of the Village, so cross section dimensions were discussed at great length during one of the SAC meetings. Based on the assumption that the highway boundaries (i.e., the outer limits of the right-of-way) are located at or very close to the existing back edges of sidewalk, there is only 45 to 47 feet available for the roadway, shoulders, sidewalks and snow storage/pedestrian buffer areas. Considering these dimensional constraints, and the desire to maintain two continuous 5-foot-wide sidewalks along Route 40, the following options are available for the roadway cross section in the Village:

![Image](Photo: NY Route 29 in Greenwich, NY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Sidewalk</th>
<th>Grass Strip/ Snow Storage</th>
<th>Shoulder/ Curb Offset</th>
<th>Travel Lane</th>
<th>Travel Lane</th>
<th>Shoulder/ Curb Offset</th>
<th>Grass Strip/ Snow Storage</th>
<th>Sidewalk</th>
<th>Pavement Width</th>
<th>Total Width</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td>5'-6&quot;</td>
<td>1'</td>
<td>11'</td>
<td>11'</td>
<td>1'</td>
<td>5'-6&quot;</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td>24'</td>
<td>45'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td>5'-6&quot;</td>
<td>2'</td>
<td>10'2</td>
<td>10'2</td>
<td>2'</td>
<td>5'-6&quot;</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td>24'</td>
<td>45'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td>4'-6&quot;</td>
<td>2'</td>
<td>11'</td>
<td>11'</td>
<td>2'</td>
<td>4'-6&quot;</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td>26'</td>
<td>45'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td>4'-6&quot;</td>
<td>3'</td>
<td>10'2</td>
<td>10'2</td>
<td>3'</td>
<td>4'-6&quot;</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td>26'</td>
<td>45'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td>3'-6&quot;</td>
<td>3'</td>
<td>11'</td>
<td>11'</td>
<td>3'</td>
<td>3'-6&quot;</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td>28'</td>
<td>45'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td>3'-6&quot;</td>
<td>4' bike lane3</td>
<td>10'2</td>
<td>10'2</td>
<td>4' bike lane3</td>
<td>3'-6&quot;</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td>28'</td>
<td>45'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td>3'-6&quot;</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14'4</td>
<td>14'4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3'-6&quot;</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td>28'</td>
<td>45'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Dimensions shown are for a 45-foot-wide corridor (back edge of sidewalk to back edge of sidewalk). Increase the grass strip/snow storage width in areas where more width is available.
2. Less than NYSDOT standard for minimum travel lane width for an urban arterial (11').
3. Less than NYSDOT standard for minimum bike lane width (5' with curb).
4. 14-foot-wide travel lanes, also known as wide curb lanes, are intended to accommodate both motor vehicles and bicycles.

The consensus of the SAC was that Option 4 – consisting of 10-foot-wide travel lanes and 3-foot-wide shoulders – was the most desirable allocation of widths in both the Village and Hamlet areas. Although it was recognized that 3-foot-wide shoulders were not ideal for bicycle use, it was believed that the narrow width would discourage the haphazard on-street parking that currently occurs in the
Village while providing some separation for the occasional bicyclist. It was also understood by the SAC that 10-foot-wide travel lanes do not meet the NYSDOT standard for arterial travel lane width; however, the committee is in favor of the narrower width, believing that it will help calm traffic, enhancing safety for all modes of transportation in these more urbanized segments of the Route 40 corridor.

3.1.2 Intersections

Section 2.2.2 of this report identified numerous intersections within the study area with undesirable safety and/or operational characteristics. Following is a list of short-term and long-term intersection improvements that would address these undesirable characteristics. Some of these recommended improvements could be implemented as part of NYSDOT’s regular maintenance programs, while others involve more extensive work and would most likely need to be included in a future Federal Aid transportation improvement project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersecting Side Road(s)</th>
<th>Recommended Improvements¹</th>
<th>Short-Term (0-5 yrs)</th>
<th>Long-Term (5+ yrs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamlet of Melrose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melrose Valley Falls Road (CR 117)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3A or 3B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Street</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Hara Lane; Doty Avenue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Segment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinewoods Road; Campbell Road; Malm Road; Matalas Road; Hansen Road; Madigan Road; Meadowview Drive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northline Road / Gutbrodt Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bracken Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 67 / East Schaghticoke Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Schaghticoke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishermans Lane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Main Street / School Street</td>
<td>1,2,3A</td>
<td>(see note below)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Avenue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stillwater Bridge Road (CR 125) / Route 67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Recommended Improvements:
1 = Traffic calming on main road to reduce vehicle speeds (see Section 3.1.4)
2 = Use curbing to better define intersection corners
3A = Realign/reconstruct intersection so that intersection angle is closer to 90°
3B = Reconstruct intersection as a modern roundabout
4 = Adjust profile of Route 40 and/or side roads, and/or cut back roadside slopes to increase sight distance

Note:
Improvements to the existing Route 40/Lower Main Street/School Street intersection will presumably be completed as part of the Hoosic River Bridge Replacement project.
3.1.3 Access Management

Section 2.2.6 of this report identified several driveways in the study area that are wide enough to create motorist confusion. Specifically, the wide open access at these locations makes it unclear to entering and exiting vehicles where they should be positioned, creating numerous potential conflict points. Access to these parcels should be brought into reasonable conformance with NYSDOT’s Policy and Standards for the Design of Entrances to State Highways (commonly referred to as the “Driveway Design Policy”) as part of future roadway improvements, or should land use changes be initiated for the property requiring local approval. Refer to the figures at the end of this section for the locations of needed access management improvements.

To assist the Town and the Village with driveway design and other access management issues, draft Access Management Guidelines have been prepared for the Route 40 corridor and are included in Appendix B.

3.1.4 Traffic Calming

The Study Advisory Committee members and a number of other local stakeholders, including representatives from the A.E. Diver Library and Hoosic Valley Central Schools, repeatedly expressed concerns about vehicular speeding in both the urbanized and rural portions of the corridor. To address these concerns, a program of traffic calming measures is being recommended.

Traffic calming is the combination of mainly physical measures that alter driver behavior, and improve conditions for pedestrians, bicyclists and residents. It involves strategic physical changes to roadways that reduce vehicle speeds. Currently, the New York State Department of Transportation, in collaboration with local communities, is undertaking a traffic calming initiative to improve safety and slow speeds on specific routes in the Finger Lakes region. If this initiative is successful, it may be expanded to other areas of the state.

Objectives of NYSDOT’s traffic calming initiative include:

- Improving safety and convenience for all road users -- including area residents, motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists, and people with disabilities -- by controlling points where they meet and reducing vehicle volumes and speeds to be compatible with adjacent land use.
- Improving the physical environment and community quality of life by lowering vehicle-generated noise, pollution, and disruption.
- Creating a green and inviting streetscape.
• Altering driver behavior by reducing aggressive driving, encouraging drivers to be considerate of others sharing the road and promoting walking and cycling.

Traffic calming measures can generally be divided into two categories:

1) The use of physical restrictions to lower the speed at which a reasonable and prudent driver feels safe and comfortable. Example measures include street narrowing (including features that make the street seem narrower, like curbs and street trees), reduced speed limits, speed-timed traffic signals, medians/pedestrian refuge islands, designated pedestrian crosswalks, roundabouts, speed humps and tables, lane constrictions, tight curves, and turning radius reductions.

2) Measures that give greater priority to pedestrians, bicyclists and residents. Example measures include aesthetic treatments such as: landscaping; use of special paving and/or markings; decorative benches, light poles, fountains, sculptures and/or kiosks; accommodations such as sidewalks, pedestrian bulb-outs, mid-block crosswalks, and bicycle lane markings; and improved signage and distinctive entrances (gateways) as demarcation for the traffic-calmed area.

Traffic calming measures that fall under the first group, above, will be discussed in this section of the report. Traffic calming measures that fall under the second group are mostly discussed in Sections 3.2 – Pedestrian and Streetscape Improvements, and 3.3 – Hoosic River Crossing.

Hamlet of Melrose:
Through traffic on Route 40 passes through the Hamlet of Melrose in less than a minute. Inattentive drivers are probably not even aware that they are passing through a historic community with several properties that generate pedestrian traffic. In Melrose, there is a need to (1) provide visual cues to motorists approaching the Hamlet from the north and south that they are entering a Hamlet area and that speed reduction is warranted; and (2) create a traffic-calmed zone within the Hamlet itself that gives greater priority to pedestrians and residents, and that communicates to motorists the need to travel slowly in this area.

For the portions of Route 40 immediately north and south of the Hamlet, a combination of the following traffic calming measures is recommended:

• Speed reduction warning sign (north approach only)
• Driver feedback radar signs
- Innovative speed reduction pavement markings, such as peripheral transverse pavement markings and converging chevrons. These speed reduction measures work by giving drivers the perception that they are speeding up when they are in fact maintaining the same speed.
- Gateway signage (e.g., “Welcome to Melrose”), possibly in conjunction with attractive landscaping. At the southern approach, this gateway could be combined with the existing, underutilized pocket park/soldiers memorial near the Route 40/Melrose Valley Falls Road intersection.

The traffic calming measures noted above would be relatively inexpensive to implement. A more expensive traffic calming measure, but one that would be very effective at reducing vehicle speeds in the Hamlet would be the conversion of the existing Route 40/Melrose Valley Falls Road intersection to a modern roundabout. Doing so would also address the safety and operational issues that exist at this location, as discussed in Section 2.2.2, and the center of the roundabout would be a logical location for the gateway feature/soldiers memorial discussed above.

Recommended traffic calming measures for Hamlet area itself include:

- High-visibility crosswalks
- Vertical curbing
- On-street parking
- Roadside features, such as sidewalks and street trees, that communicate to motorists that they are in an urbanized area (see Section 3.2 for additional discussion)

Rural Segment:
The need for speed reduction is most prevalent in the vicinity of the several side roads that intersect Route 40 in this portion of the study area. Route 40’s horizontal and vertical alignment, combined with minimal roadside development, invites high speeds, creating safety issues for vehicles entering or crossing Route 40 at these side roads. The innovative pavement markings described above (i.e., peripheral transverse pavement markings and converging chevrons) are recommended at some of the more problematic rural intersections. Narrowing of the travel lanes, as discussed in Section 3.1.1, may also reduce vehicle speeds to some extent.

The current speed limit between the Hamlet of Melrose and the Village of Schaghticoke is 55 mph. The resulting speed limit transition at the southern entrance to the Village - 55 mph to 35 mph - is too abrupt, resulting in poor speed limit
compliance in the south end of the Village. One possible solution to this problem would be the installation of a speed reduction warning sign, as described above for the Hamlet of Melrose. Another possible solution is the establishment of a 0.3 to 0.5-mile-long 45 mph speed zone south of the Village. In conjunction with the establishment of this speed zone, one or both of the following traffic calming measures should be considered:

- Driver feedback radar signs
- Innovative speed reduction pavement markings (e.g., peripheral transverse pavement markings or converging chevrons)

The Route 40/Route 67/East Schaghticoke Road intersection would fall within the limits of this proposed 45 mph speed zone. Conversion of this currently signalized intersection to a modern roundabout would also serve as an effective traffic calming measure.

**Village of Schaghticoke:**

The relatively straight horizontal alignment of Route 40 in the Village gives drivers the perception that traffic is the highest priority, inviting speeds higher than appropriate for the urbanized setting. A long grade in the Village exacerbates the problem as vehicles naturally accelerate while traveling downhill, and motorists have a tendency to accelerate before ascending this same grade from the other direction. Lastly, the long, straight bridge over the Hoosic River, with its high curbs, creates a “gun barrel effect,” leading to vehicle speeds that are inappropriate for this urbanized area.

Similar to the Hamlet of Melrose, there is a need to (1) provide visual cues to motorists approaching the Village from the north and south that they are entering a Hamlet area and that speed reduction is warranted; and (2) create a traffic-calmed zone within the Village’s residential zone (i.e., from Chestnut Street to Stewart’s) and commercial zone (i.e., from Stewart’s to Hoosic Valley Central Schools) that gives greater priority to pedestrians and residents, and that communicates to motorists the need to travel slowly in this area.

For the portions of Route 40 immediately north and south of the Village, a combination of the following traffic calming measures is recommended:

- Speed reduction warning signs
• Driver feedback radar signs
• Innovative speed reduction pavement markings (e.g., peripheral transverse pavement markings and converging chevrons)
• Gateway signage at the northern entrance to the Village, possibly in conjunction with attractive landscaping.

A more expensive traffic calming measure, but one that would be very effective at reducing the speeds of vehicles approaching the Village from the north, would be the conversion of the existing signalized Route 40/Route 67/Stillwater Bridge Road intersection to a modern roundabout. The middle of this roundabout would also make a good location for the gateway feature mentioned above.

Traffic calming measures recommended for implementation within the Village include:

• Horizontal curvature on the new bridge over the Hoosic River
• Realignment of the Hoosic River bridge to create a four-way intersection with Second Street, or realignment of the Hoosic River bridge north approach to include a tighter curve (as shown in Figures 3.5A and 3.5B)
• High-visibility crosswalks
• Center islands at both entrances to the residential zone: (1) south of Chestnut Street, and (2) between Stewart’s and the Schag a Val Restaurant (the latter would also serve as pedestrian refuge island for a mid-block crosswalk)
• Vertical curbing
• On-street parking
• Roadside features, such as sidewalks, benches and street trees, that communicate to motorists that they are in an urbanized area (see Section 3.2 for additional discussion)

It is hoped that several of the traffic calming measures listed above can be implemented as part of the Hoosic River Bridge Replacement project (NYSDOT PIN 1335.18), currently scheduled for construction in 2012.

### 3.2 Pedestrian and Streetscape Improvements

A number of issues related to pedestrian safety and comfort have been identified throughout the urbanized portions of the study area. Members of the public who attended the first community workshop cited a number of issues related to missing sidewalks and crosswalks, a general lack of amenities, insufficient separation of the sidewalk from the roadway, and poor aesthetics. In order to
address these deficiencies, the following improvements are recommended. The locations of the recommended pedestrian and streetscape improvements for the Hamlet of Melrose and the Village of Schaghticoke are shown on the figures at the ends of Sections 3 and 4.

Hamlet of Melrose:
Sidewalks are lacking throughout the Hamlet of Melrose, despite significant pedestrian traffic. Sidewalks, constructed in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, should be installed on both sides of Route 40 from Melrose Valley Falls Road to Doty Avenue. (These pedestrian facilities would need to be maintained by the Town.) Where there is sufficient width, either a planted or colored/textured strip should be constructed between the sidewalk and the edge of pavement in order to protect pedestrians from passing traffic. Street trees planted in this space will also serve to beautify the Hamlet and slow traffic. Where driveways and curb cuts interrupt sidewalks, the sidewalk treatment should continue across the driveway to alert drivers to the potential presence of pedestrians.

Crosswalks should be clearly marked across all legs of the Route 40/Melrose Valley Falls Road and Route 40/Church Street intersections. Since mail is not delivered in the Hamlet and must be picked up from the Post Office, crosswalks are also warranted across O’Hara Lane and Route 40 in front of the Post Office. The latter would benefit from yield markings approaching the crosswalk, in-pavement lighting, and/or some of the innovative pavement markings described in Section 3.1.4.

Several on-street parking spaces should be provided in front of Esquire Food & Drug and Melrose Methodist Church to provide easy access to local destinations and help create the character of a commercial center. A buffer – landscaping or wooden fence – should be constructed to screen the church parking lot, as is currently done across the street at the Stuff and Nonsense gift shop.

Lastly, a new pedestrian connection should be provided between Route 40 and Melrose Valley Falls Road; one possible location for such a facility is along the stream bed just south of the Melrose Fire Company. This trail would shorten the walking distance between many residences and the Hamlet’s other uses.

Village of Schaghticoke
There are sidewalks through much of the Village, but there are missing links in the sidewalk network that should be completed; specifically, around the pocket park at the Route 40/School Street intersection, and in the area between the Schag A Val Restaurant and Stewart’s and the Schaghticoke Fairgrounds, Hoosic Valley Center and Hoosic Valley Central Schools. Also, the entire
network of sidewalks needs to be brought into compliance with the Americans with Disability Act, with curb ramps installed at all sidewalk/street junctions. As was recommended for Melrose, where driveways cross over sidewalks, sidewalk material should be continued. Maintenance responsibility for these pedestrian accommodations will remain with the Village.

Currently, the buffer between the sidewalk and the roadway is asphalt or grass in poor condition. This area, which doubles as snow storage in the winter, should be improved with consistent colored/textured concrete or asphalt, turfblock or new grass. Street trees should be planted in this space to “green” the street, slow traffic, protect pedestrians and provide opportunities for rainwater to filter into the soil. To improve vehicular safety and further improve the aesthetics of the Village, the utility poles along Route 40 should ultimately be buried underground. This would also allow for easier snow removal.

Crosswalks are also needed where pedestrians are currently crossing, such as between the pocket park and Chrissy’s, and across Route 40 in front of the library. These Route 40 crossings should be supplemented with pavement markings and/or in-pavement lighting that indicate the potential presence of pedestrians. Where sufficient right-of-way exists, small planted medians should be installed that provide refuge for crossing pedestrians and force traffic to slow by diverting their travel path; these are particularly appropriate for the crossing between the Mobil station/Post Office and the Village Hall, and between Stewart’s and the Schag A Val restaurant.

On-street parking spaces should be maintained for businesses on Lower Main Street and provided in front of the A.E. Diver Library. These allow for easy access to local businesses and help to slow traffic through the Village.

A new pedestrian path should be provided between Route 40 and School Street across from Fifth Street. This connection will shorten walking distances between various destinations in the Village.

Physical improvements can help slow traffic, but so can the presence of people and activity on the street, which then further encourages people to linger in the public realm. Providing places for people to sit and gather near Route 40, especially near activity generators like Chrissy’s and the library, are an easy way to seed street life. Benches are best used when placed in these strategic locations and are clustered together with other amenities, such as lighting, shade trees and waste receptacles.
3.3 Hoosic River Crossing

The Hoosic River Bridge is a vital link in the Route 40 corridor. It delivers regional traffic on which many Village businesses rely, and it is the physical connection between the Village core and the Village neighborhood immediately south of the river. Under PIN 1335.18, NYSDOT will soon begin planning how to address the bridge’s poor structural condition, and this project provides an opportunity to further enhance its role in the area. A re-designed bridge can help achieve a number of important community goals.

There are a variety of ways to allocate the space on the bridge, as reflected in the two alternative cross sections shown in Figure 3.1. The exact cross section will be determined as part of the project development process for PIN 1335.18, but a number of elements should be present. First, the bridge must provide ample pedestrian accommodations on both sides of the bridge. The current bridge does provide sidewalks, but they are much too narrow and close to moving traffic to encourage adults and children to walk.

Second, the new bridge should also provide ample space for pedestrians to sit and enjoy the scenic views of the Hoosic River below. Interpretive signage should also be provided that identifies and describes the history of the area, including information about the Schaghticoke Indian Tribe, the Schaghticoke Dam and Electric Lake, and other historic industries and cultural influences.

Third, the bridge must provide safe accommodation of bicyclists. There are a number of residents who ride from one end of the Village to the other, including children who ride to school. As depicted in the cross section alternatives, bicycles can be accommodated in a number of ways. Class II bicycle lanes can be provided in each direction. These are much more visible when painted a vibrant color (see photo at right). However, on-street bicycle lanes effectively widen the roadway, which may serve to speed up traffic when bicycles are not present. Alternatively, a two-way multi-use path could be provided on one side of the bridge. This facility would provide more protection for less experienced cyclists.

Finally, all reasonable strategies should be utilized to control traffic speeds across the bridge. Narrow travel lanes and curb-to-curb width are critical; the travel lanes on the bridge are currently only 10’ wide and traffic still moves too fast for the urban context. Although wide lanes and shoulders simplify plowing and are considered a safety feature for occasional emergencies, they will encourage higher traffic speeds the vast majority of the time. Aesthetic roadside elements such as decorative light fixtures and placemaking elements like hanging flower baskets and colorful banners also announce arrival into an area where slower vehicular speeds are appropriate.
Note:
The dimensions shown above are for illustrative purposes only. Actual bridge cross section dimensions will be determined during the project development process for NYSDOT PIN 1335.18

Figure 3.1 Cross Section Options for the Hoosic River Bridge
3.4 Transit and Ridesharing

As noted in Section 2.2.8, the Capital District Transportation Committee (CDTC) and the Capital District Transportation Authority (CDTA) conducted a survey of commuters from mid-February through April 2009 in the greater Schaghticoke area (northern Rensselaer and southern Washington Counties) to determine the market for alternative transportation options.

Although more than 67% of respondents currently drive alone to work, 70% indicated that they would be willing to consider some form of carpooling, ridesharing, or vanpooling to work. These results are encouraging, as the most logical way to build up transit in a market such as this is carpooling (2 - 5 people); followed by vanpooling (5 - 14 people); and then transit (40-person buses). Appendix D contains a more detailed summary of the survey results, as well as a copy of the survey itself.

As gas prices continue to rise, more people will be considering transit for their commutes. To be able to capture additional riders, existing bus service to Troy (CDTA Route 96) should be extended to run into Albany, where most area residents work. The current frequency of one round-trip per day still seems reasonable at this time, as does the current schedule, which arrives in Troy at 7:30 am and returns at 5:00 pm.

To raise the profile of transit in the corridor, formal bus stops should also be created in the Village of Schaghticoke and the Hamlet of Melrose along CDTA Route 96. These stops should be centrally located and outfitted with a shelter structure to protect from rain and sun, a bench, a waste receptacle, and a bus service schedule. If transit service is eventually expanded into the evening hours, a light fixture should also be provided for safety.

To address the desire for a secure park-and-ride facility, the current commuter lot should be relocated from behind the Trinity Episcopal Church (off of Chestnut Street) in the Village of Schaghticoke. As noted in Section 2.2.2, there is a sight distance problem at the intersection of Route 40 and Chestnut Street, and additional traffic should not be channeled to this location unless this deficiency is addressed. The commuter lot could be relocated to the Hoosic Valley Center parking lot, where there is excess parking capacity during the day. Further, it should become a formal facility advertised on CDTA’s and CDTC’s online carpool matching service, www.ipool2.org.
3.5 Truck Traffic Mitigation

As noted in Section 2.2.4, there is a need to minimize the negative effects of truck traffic within the Village. Fortunately, NYSDOT is in the process of addressing this issue through the development of a trucking policy that recognizes the fact that highways serve multiple purposes and must accommodate the historical, natural and unique characteristics of New York communities, not just traffic. In developing this policy, NYSDOT has established the following objectives:

- Reduce large truck traffic in local communities.
- Create three tiers of highways diverting large trucks to the most appropriate highway considering community context, safety, and operational factors for all users of the highway.
- Improve the quality of life for communities affected by trucks by lowering noise and visual disruptions, and emission levels; and improving motorist, pedestrian and bicycle mobility and safety.
- Reduce risks to communities, tourism areas, school areas, environmentally unique areas, scenic byways, and designated bike routes located along identified short cut routes.
- Reduce the rate of deterioration to the useful pavement life and ride-ability of affected highways.

NYSDOT has identified several strategies for reducing large truck traffic in local communities. Of these, the following four strategies have the most potential of addressing the truck traffic situation in the Village of Schaghticoke:

- Installation of traffic calming measures – See Section 3.1.4.
- Modify large truck permits to keep trucks on the National Network – Large trucks with Oversize/Overweight Permits will be excluded from using some shortcut highways. NYSDOT is informing carriers of routes to avoid.
- Safety inspections on short cut routes – NYSDOT has been investigating safe, alternative locations to pull over and inspect vehicles.
- Guide signs to keep trucks on the National Network. (The National Network consists of the Interstate system and a small number of other designated highways.)

Further, in October 2008, NYSDOT issued a draft regulation for large truck routings that balances the need for large trucks to serve the State’s economy with the need to promote sustainable economic development, tourism and improved quality of life for local residents. The draft regulation, which applies to all combinations of vehicles with a cab and one or more trailers 45 feet or longer,
establishes a hierarchy for how trucks should travel the entire State, requiring that large trucks use interstate highways when possible, designated State highways if interstate access is not reasonably available, and other State highways only when reasonably necessary.

This new truck policy is being implemented initially in the Finger Lakes region, with plans of eventually expanding it to the rest of the State. In its current state, the regulation would allow large trucks to use “Tier 3” highways like Route 40 only when (1) the highway provides exclusive access to the specific terminal, facility or site for the pickup or delivery of merchandise or other property; or (2) when use is reasonably necessary to access the specific terminal, facility or sites for the pickup or delivery of merchandise or other property or to return to a National Network highway.

In the short term, implementation of the traffic calming measures described in Section 3.1.4 should mitigate the negative effects of truck traffic within the Village. In the longer term, there is cause for hope that NYSDOT will establish a trucking policy that will eliminate a significant amount of large truck traffic in communities such as Schaghticoke.

More information regarding NYSDOT’s large truck freight movement policy and strategies for reducing large truck traffic in local communities can be found on the Internet at https://www.nysdot.gov/programs/truckpolicy.

### 3.6 Drainage

Four drainage problems were identified in Section 2.2.9 of this report that need to be addressed. They are:

- **Hamlet of Melrose:** South of the Route 40/Melrose Valley Falls Road intersection, a drainage network consisting of gutters, scattered drop inlets and pipes has been overburdened by runoff from upland properties during several heavy downpours in the last few years, sometimes leading to water flowing across Route 40 and causing damage to residential properties located between Route 40 and Avenue A.

- **Hamlet of Melrose:** At the north end of the Hamlet, in the vicinity of the abutments for a now-removed railroad overpass, a drainage system consisting of shallow ditches, drop inlets and pipes is ineffective at removing stormwater from the roadway during heavy rain events. The drop inlet grates are prone to being clogged by leaves and other debris, which is contributing to the problem.

- **Village of Schaghticoke:** The drainage system along the steep section of Route 40 (i.e., between Fourth and Pearl Streets) is characterized by widely scattered inlets, and shallow
gutters within the roadway shoulders. Heavy rain events often produce sheet flows within the travel lanes.

- Village of Schaghticoke: At the northern end of the Village, between Stewart’s and the Hoosic Valley Center shopping plaza, a flat grade, combined with widely scattered inlets and an absence of ditches or gutters, leads to ponding along the roadway edge during and after wet weather.

The first step to solving any of the problems described above is to conduct a detailed analysis of the area’s hydrology. These problems all occur in areas where roadway reconstruction has been recommended – i.e., within the Hamlet and the Village. As with all major rehabilitation or reconstruction projects, NYSDOT would conduct a comprehensive hydrologic analysis of the watersheds encompassing these roadway segments as part of the design process. This analysis would be used to develop a properly-sized open, closed or combined drainage design solution that protects both the highway and adjacent lands from rainfall and runoff, eliminating the problems that exist today.

Should the Town or Village wish to correct some of these problems before they are addressed by a major highway improvement project, it is recommended that they partner with NYSDOT to do so, as there may be an opportunity to implement certain drainage improvements into NYSDOT’s ongoing maintenance strategies. Such a partnership is already in place between the Town and NYSDOT, as they work to find a solution to the drainage problem in the Hamlet of Melrose, south of the Route 40/Melrose Valley Falls Road intersection. Although it is NYSDOT’s responsibility to maintain existing surface water drainage across and along the Route 40 right-of-way, previous upland development and/or connections/modifications to the highway’s storm drainage system – much of which have probably occurred without NYSDOT’s knowledge or approval – have affected the Department’s ability to do so.

Within the Village of Schaghticoke, the drainage structures and pipes along Route 40 are integrated into the Village’s storm drainage system and are currently the Village’s maintenance responsibility. Should NYSDOT undertake a major reconstruction project along this section of Route 40 in the future, replacement of the storm drainage system along Route 40 would likely be included. Under this scenario, the State would take over maintenance responsibility of the Route 40 storm drainage system after construction.
Figure 3.2 Route 40 Transportation Improvement Concepts: Hamlet of Melrose

**NOTE**

The ideas presented on this plan are conceptual in nature. The concepts are presented to characterize the types of improvements that are desirable, and that may be implemented as part of future transportation improvement projects. All concepts shown will require further engineering evaluation and review.
Figure 3.3  Route 40 Transportation Improvement Concepts: Rural Segment
Figure 3.4  Route 40 Transportation Improvement Concepts: Village of Schaghticoke, Part 1
Figure 3.5A  Route 40 Transportation Improvement Concepts: Village of Schaghticoke, Part 2 (Four-Way Intersection Option)
NOTE
The ideas presented on this plan are conceptual in nature. The concepts are presented to characterize the types of improvements that are desirable, and that may be implemented as part of future transportation improvement projects. All concepts shown will require further engineering evaluation and review.
**Figure 3.6 Route 40 Transportation Improvement Concepts: Village of Schaghticoke, Part 3**

**NOTE**

The ideas presented on this plan are conceptual in nature. The concepts are presented to characterize the types of improvements that are desirable, and that may be implemented as part of future transportation improvement projects. All concepts shown will require further engineering evaluation and review.

**LEGEND**

- Suggested location for new sidewalk
- Suggested location for unpaved shared use path
- Possible on-street parking location
The ideas presented on this plan are conceptual in nature. The concepts are presented to characterize the types of improvements that are desirable, and that may be implemented as part of future transportation improvement projects. All concepts shown will require further engineering evaluation and review.

Legend:
- Suggested location for new sidewalk
- Suggested location for unpaved shared use path
- Possible on-street parking location

**Figure 3.7 Route 40 Transportation Improvement Concepts: Village of Schaghticoke, Part 4**
4 Land Use Alternatives

In addition to the transportation improvements outlined in the previous section, there are a number of land use strategies that will help improve walkability, sustainability and retain the historic character of the different areas of the corridor. These are detailed below by location and the ideas for the Hamlet of Melrose and Schaghticoke Village core are shown graphically in Figures 4.1 and 4.2, located at the end of this Section.

4.1 Hamlet of Melrose

The Hamlet of Melrose has great potential to become a quaint rural community with a mix of uses. This strategy is consistent with the Town of Schaghticoke’s Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance. Current zoning allows for densifying this area – roughly 4 dwelling units per acre with sewer and water service. However, the Hamlet of Melrose currently does not have sewer service and public water is limited. Therefore, in conjunction with Rensselaer County’s stringent water quality requirements, effective zoning in Melrose requires a minimum lot size of 30,000 to 60,000 square feet. This does not allow for development that encourages walking, biking and transit use. To remedy this situation, the Town and County should expand the public water system to the entire Hamlet of Melrose, which would reduce the minimum lot size to 20,000 square feet (the equivalent of roughly 2 dwelling units per acre). A long term strategy should be to connect Melrose to the Troy sewer system. There are a number of potential funding sources for infrastructure projects like this that encourage smart growth development, including several from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

There are a number of infill development opportunities within the Hamlet that can be accomplished within the existing density limitations, and many more that will open up with the presence of water and/or sewer service. These include new commercial buildings along Route 40 in the commercial core of the Hamlet, redevelopment of the Getty station for community or commercial use with an outdoor presence, and new residential development between Route 40 and Melrose Valley Falls Road (facilitated by a possible new street connection between Church Street and Doty Avenue). It is suggested that any new development abide by the Draft Village/Hamlet Design Guidelines contained in Appendix C. Small commercial uses such as bed and breakfast hotels and hardware stores would be appropriate for the Hamlet context.
In the short term, a community gathering space should be created in front of the Methodist Church parking lot. This area should be landscaped, and amenities should be provided such as picnic tables and a community bulletin board. The area in front of Esquire Food & Drug should also be improved with new retail signage, outdoor retail displays, a coffee stand and outdoor seating.

4.2 Rural Segment

The segment of Route 40 between Melrose and Schaghticoke Village has recently been re-zoned for lower densities to maintain its rural nature and prevent medium-density sprawl development. This area could be further downzoned, or a transfer of development rights program could be used to transfer this density to the corridor’s existing centers. As described in the Town’s Comprehensive Plan, subdivision development should be clustered together to preserve open space and natural habitats. Additionally, farm stands should be allowed and encouraged to give the corridor a unique agricultural character.

Additional uses should be offered at the Schaghticoke Town Hall in order to create a community gathering place in this area that brings neighbors together and builds social capital. The 2009 summer concert series was very effective in bringing people out; this type of programming should be expanded to include such activities as barbecues, outdoor movies, children’s events and markets. Additional civic services, like postal service, day care, a senior center and a community center would also engage residents and encourage interaction with Town government. Finally, space could be provided to commercial and retail ventures like a coffee cart, professional offices or a thrift store. The community should be engaged in an exercise to brainstorm the type of services and activities that would be most useful and entertaining.

4.3 Village of Schaghticoke

The Village of Schaghticoke is largely built out, but there are a few opportunities for residential and commercial infill development, such as on Lower Main Street and in the Hoosic Valley Center parking lot. New development should be required to reflect historic site design and architectural patterns, as described in the Draft Village/Hamlet Design Guidelines contained in Appendix C. Similar to Melrose, small commercial uses like hotels, retail, and professional offices are contextual and should be encouraged. To allow visitors to find these uses, as well as existing businesses and
attractions, wayfinding signage should be provided for traffic traveling both north and south on Route 40.

A number of public space improvements in the Village core will also help enhance the vibrancy and attractiveness of this neighborhood. The pocket park in front of the Village Hall should also be improved to encourage more activity in the public realm; simple improvements include Wi-Fi service, movable tables and chairs, a vending cart, a community bulletin board and additional community events. A green public space could also be created in front of the church for outdoor gathering. The lawn in front of the library should also be more heavily programmed and activated. If the new bridge is constructed “off alignment,” as depicted in Figure 3.5A, a scenic lookout area with parking, amenities and trail access should be created in place of the northern landing of the current Hoosic River Bridge.
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Figure 4.1. Land Use Concept Plan – Hamlet of Melrose
Figure 4.2  Land Use Concept Plan – Schaghticoke Village Core

- Provide scenic overlook area with seating, interpretive signage, and lighting.
- Improve park amenities with ADA service, movable tables and chairs, vending cart and community bulletin board.
- New street trees.
- New pedestrian connection.
- On-street parking for library visitors and traffic calming.
- Programs events on their own.
- Bus stops with shelter, bench, waste receptacle, schedule and lighting.
- Infill residential development.
- Infill commercial development.
- Universal parking for barrier access and traffic calming.
- Wayfinding signage to library, retail, Legion Hall and on approaches to intersection.
- Scenic look out area with picnic tables, parking, etc.
- The space created by re-configured intersection for outdoor gathering space in front of church.

McFarland Johnson | Project for Public Spaces
5 Implementation & Funding

5.1 Overview and Timing

Sections 3 and 4 of this report describe a program of recommended improvements that build upon the principles developed for this study. Some of the recommended actions can be implemented almost immediately, while others may need to be accomplished over a period of 10 years, or even longer. Although the Town and Village may prefer to implement all of the recommendations immediately, an incremental approach is more realistic based on the availability of funding resources.

One fortunate circumstance is that the bridge carrying Route 40 over the Hoosic River is scheduled to be replaced by the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) in 2011-2012. That Federally-funded transportation improvement project presents an opportunity for the near-term implementation of some of the recommended improvements pertaining to the Village portion of the study area.

At the end of this Section are three “Implementation Matrices” (Tables 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3) – one each for the Hamlet of Melrose, the Village of Schaghticoke, and the rural segment of Route 40 connecting these two communities. These matrices were created to provide a framework for the completion of each recommended improvement.

A critical element of any implementation strategy is the assemblage of funds required to complete the various recommendations. To assist the Town and Village in this undertaking, the following subsection provides an overview of potential funding sources.

5.2 Potential Funding Sources

The recommended improvements described in Sections 3 and 4 may be funded with federal, state, local or private funds. It is not uncommon for a proposed project to draw upon some or all of these sources; however, it should be noted that the current economic uncertainty, combined with the demands and needs of aging infrastructure, has created a very competitive environment for grants and other forms of infrastructure funding.

Also, special grant programs available for specific transportation projects occasionally become available. The Town and/or Village should contact CDTC and NYSDOT when they are looking for funding for specific purposes to see what is currently available.
5.2.1 Federal Transportation Funding

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) provides significant funding for transportation infrastructure. Many of the funding programs that they administer, in partnership with State and local agencies, are described below. It should be noted that most federal funding programs are reimbursement programs.

Transportation Improvement Program

CDTC is the responsible Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for programming federal transportation funds for state and local highway and transit projects in the Capital Region. CDTC’s Policy Board includes NYSDOT, the region’s four counties, eight cities and several towns and villages. When funds are available, CDTC solicits communities for new transportation projects which could be partially funded as part of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Communities that are interested in having their project considered for funding must complete and submit a Project Justification Package for CDTC’s review.

A minimum requirement for roadway related projects to receive federal funding is that the facility must be on the federal aid eligible list and thus the roadway must function as a collector or arterial highway. Route 40 is eligible to receive federal aid; therefore, the reconstruction of Route 40, including associated pedestrian and bicycle facilities, can potentially be funded under this program. It should be noted however that, for the past several TIP funding rounds, funds available for new projects have been limited.

The aforementioned project – replacement of the bridge carrying Route 40 over the Hoosic River – is included on the current TIP with construction planned for 2011-2012. Identified as PIN 1335.18, this project is receiving federal funding through the FHWA's Highway Bridge Program.

The next solicitation for new projects is expected to occur in Fall 2009 for the 2010-2015 TIP. Projects awarded funding will be added to the outer years of the program, 2014 and 2015, respectively. A local match is expected from the project sponsor for most federal aid programs, typically amounting to 20% of the total project cost. (Subject to availability of state “Marchiselli” funds, this match could be reduced to 5% for many project types.) The following describes some of the larger federal aid funding programs available through the CDTC:

- **Surface Transportation Program (STP).** This program provides flexible funding that may be used by States and municipalities for projects on any Federal-aid highway; bridge projects on any public road; transit capital projects; and intracity and intercity bus terminals and facilities. The non-federal match requirement is 20%.
• **Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Improvement Program.** The purpose of the CMAQ program is to fund transportation projects or programs that will contribute to attainment or maintenance of the national ambient air quality standards for ozone, carbon monoxide, and particulate matter. Examples of eligible projects include transit improvements, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and roundabouts. The Federal share for most CMAQ projects, generally, has been 80%. However, under the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007, the Federal share for eligible CMAQ projects carried out with funds obligated in fiscal year 2008 or 2009, or both, may be, at the discretion of the State, up to 100% of the cost of the project or program.

The CDTC TIP also has a number of set-aside programs and NYSDOT administered programs that are solicited for at different times during the programming period of the TIP. Such set-aside programs include:

• **Transportation Enhancement Program (TEP).** This program offers funding opportunities to help expand transportation choices and enhance the transportation experience through 12 eligible activities related to surface transportation, including pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure and safety programs, scenic and historic highway programs, landscaping, historic preservation, and environmental mitigation. TEP is a reimbursement program and requires a minimum 20% local share of project cost. Minimum eligible project cost is $50,000; maximum is $2.5 million.

• **Spot Improvement Program.** CDTC sets aside $100,000 of STP funds per year for projects that provide low cost pedestrian and bicycle improvements that are too small for other programs such as TEP. Spot Improvements are actions that address problems at specific locations such as intersections, short lengths of roadway, or single destinations (e.g., an office building or shopping center). They can be distinguished from other bicycle and pedestrian-related projects, such as development of new trails, in that they bridge physical or functional gaps in the system rather than in and of themselves providing new routes. All spot improvement projects are funded with a maximum of 80% federal funds and are capped. The remaining 20% is a local match and typically funded by the project sponsor.

• **Safe Routes to Schools (SRTS)** is a federal, state and local effort to enable and encourage children, including those with disabilities, to walk and bicycle to school and to make walking and bicycling to school safe and appealing. The SRTS program is 100% federally funded. Local and regional government, schools, and community non-profit organizations that are ready, willing and able to implement SRTS initiatives are eligible to apply for funding. All
proposed projects must have a minimum total cost of $25,000. The maximum total cost for non-infrastructure projects is $150,000; for infrastructure projects, $400,000.

- **Bicycle/Pedestrian Network Set-Aside** provides funding to implement modest-sized bicycle/pedestrian specific recommendations that were developed as part of a CDTC Linkage Program planning study or similar planning study or municipal program (e.g., municipal comprehensive plan, bicycle/pedestrian plan, sub area study, Generic Environmental Impact Statement (GEIS), etc.). There are no minimum or maximum funding levels associated with the set-aside and projects require a 20% local match.

- **Intersections, Queue Jumpers & Roundabouts Set-Aside** provides funding to implement some of the many roundabout candidates throughout the Capital Region. In keeping with the CMAQ eligibility requirements and intent, these projects are meant to reduce emissions by improving traffic flow – i.e. mobility benefits – for the greatest number of travelers regardless of mode, and result in reduced emissions. Safety benefits and the ability to fit well within the surrounding community’s planning efforts and goals will be important considerations in the evaluation of projects for this set-aside. There are no minimum or maximum funding levels associated with the set-aside and projects require a 20% local match.

Other TIP related Federal aid programs include:

- **Transportation, Community, and System Preservation (TCSP) Program.** Under this program, States, metropolitan planning organizations, local governments, and tribal governments are eligible for discretionary grants to plan and implement strategies which improve the efficiency of the transportation system; reduce environmental impacts of transportation; reduce the need for costly future public infrastructure investments; ensure efficient access to jobs, services and centers of trade; and examine development patterns, and identify strategies to encourage private sector development patterns which achieve these goals. The non-federal match requirement is 20%. In 2009, 11 projects in New York State were awarded grants, totaling approximately $4.7 million, under this very competitive program.

- **Federal Transit Funding Programs.** There are multiple transit-related federally funded programs administered by the NYS Department of Transportation that may be utilized to fund some of the recommended improvements. **Urbanized Area Formula Grants** and **Capital Investment Grants and Loans** are two funding sources that can be used for activities such as construction of passenger facilities, and bicycle and pedestrian access improvements to transit facilities and vehicles. The **Transit Enhancement Activity Program** includes funds designated for, among other things, pedestrian access and walkways.
5.2.2 Other Federal Programs

- **Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program.** This federally funded program provides community development grants to towns, villages, and cities with a population under 50,000, and is administered by the NYS Office of Community Renewal. A Notice of Funding Availability is issued in the early part of each year, inviting eligible communities to submit applications for funding in its annual competitive round for community development activities in the categories of Housing and Public Facilities (up to $400,000) and Public Infrastructure (up to $600,000). Also, on a continuous year-round basis, eligible communities are invited to submit requests for Economic Development projects, with a maximum eligible project cost of $750,000.

- **Recreational Trails Program (RTP).** This program is a trail trust fund financed by a portion of the federal gas tax attributable to off-highway vehicle use (snowmobiles, all-terrain vehicles, etc.). States receive an annual apportionment of which 30% must be used for motorized trail recreation, 30% for non-motorized trail recreation, and 40% discretionary with an emphasis on trail projects that serve compatible multiple uses. Eligible projects include trail development, acquisition of trail easement or rights-of-way, and trail maintenance activities. The program is funded by the Federal Highway Administration and administered by NYS Office of Parks and Recreation and Historic Preservation. Grant amounts range from $5,000 to $80,000, with a 20% minimum local share of project cost.

- **Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) Program.** Funded by the National Park Service and administered by the NYS Office of Parks and Recreation and Historic Preservation, this program provides matching grants to States and local governments for the acquisition and development of public outdoor recreation areas and facilities. The program is intended to create and maintain a nationwide legacy of high quality recreation areas and facilities and to stimulate non-federal investments in the protection and maintenance of recreation resources. LWCF grants are provided to the States, and through the States to local governmental jurisdictions, on a matching basis for up to 50% of the total project-related allowable costs for the acquisition of land and the development of facilities for public outdoor recreation and for fulfilling the program’s planning requirements.

5.2.3 State and Regional Funding Sources

- **Marchiselli Program.** The Marchiselli program provides municipalities with State funds to draw down Federal matching grants for local highway and bridge capital projects. Marchiselli funding covers 75% of the local share of federally-funded projects, leaving the local municipality responsible for 25% of the non-federal match, or 5% of the total project cost.
• **New York Main Street (NYMS) Program.** This program provides funding to assist New York State communities with their main street/downtown revitalization efforts. NYMS will provide grants to stimulate reinvestment in mixed-use (commercial/civic and residential) “main street” buildings or districts in order to address issues of code compliance, energy conservation, accessibility, and to provide affordable housing and job opportunities. The maximum and minimum funding requests are $200,000 and $50,000, respectively. Grants of up to $25,000 may be issued to communities for programs to plant trees and other landscaping, install street furniture and trash cans, provide appropriate signs in accordance with a local signage plan, and other ancillary activities to enhance the NYMS target area.

• **Environmental Protection Fund (EPF) Grants Program.** This program, administered by the NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation, provides matching grants for the acquisition or development of parks and recreational facilities for projects to preserve, rehabilitate or restore lands, waters or structures for park, recreation or conservation purposes. Funds may be awarded to municipalities or not-for-profits with an ownership interest for indoor or outdoor projects. Grants are also available for the acquisition, planning, development, and improvement of historic properties and heritage areas. Assistance toward the cost of projects shall not exceed 50% of the approved project cost, with a maximum of $600,000. Federal funds are allowed as a match for all projects.

• **Urban and Community Forestry (UCF) Grants Program.** This program, administered by the NYS Department of Environmental Conservation, seeks to encourage and assist municipalities as they develop and implement sustainable local urban forestry programs. Grants are designed to encourage communities to actively enhance tree cover along their streets and in their parks, to properly care for and maintain their community trees, to develop tree inventories and management plans, and to inform their residents of the value and benefits of urban trees. In 2008, approximately $900,000 in grant money was made available; communities were able to request from $2,500 to $75,000, depending on municipal population, with a 50/50 match requirement.

• **Hudson River Valley Greenway (HRVG) Conservancy Small Grant Program.** This state-sponsored regional program provides funding for trail planning, construction and amenities, historic landscape preservation, regional and local partnerships as well as many other resource enhancement and economic development projects.
required match, in an amount equal to the grant, may be made with cash, grants or contributions from other sources (including Federal and State funds), or the in-kind contribution of volunteer labor. Grant requests must range from $1,000 - $10,000 for projects involving or located in one municipality, and up to $20,000 for projects involving or located in two or more municipalities. As designated “Greenway Communities,” the Town and Village of Schaghticoke are also eligible to receive technical assistance and funding for local land use planning projects which support the goals of the Greenway program.

- **New York State Council on the Arts (NYSCA) Architecture, Planning and Design Program.** This program supports work in the fields of contemporary and restoration architecture, landscape architecture, urban and rural planning, urban design, historic preservation, graphic and industrial design, and architectural theory and history. Examples of eligible projects include streetscapes, design of public spaces, transportation linkages, growth management at a community’s edge, and open space planning. Grant amounts typically range from $7,500 - $25,000 for consultant fees; no local match is required.

- **Capital Region Vanpools.** A vanpool is a group of 5 - 15 people who commute together on a regular basis in a van. A private company called VPSI has been awarded funding through a NYSERDA/NYS DOT competitive solicitation to offer commuters in the Capital Region special discounted fares for the creation of vanpools. The package offered by VPSI on its vehicles includes insurance, all scheduled and unscheduled maintenance, loaner vehicles (vans are leased on a month to month basis) and there is no long term commitment. The Town and Village of Schaghticoke can assist residents with the formation of a vanpool by identifying potential participants, identifying a willing driver, and providing information about the program to residents. The NYSERDA/NYS DOT incentive is expected to be available through March of 2011. Estimated monthly costs for a vanpool from Schaghticoke to downtown Albany ranges from $60 to $140 per person per month, based on the number of participants (5 being the minimum). Additional information on vanpools can be found at [www.ipool2.org](http://www.ipool2.org).

NYSDOT’s [Preventive and Corrective Maintenance Programs](http://www.nysdot.state.ny.us) may present an opportunity to implement some of this study’s recommendations. Drainage system maintenance and restoration, asphalt overlays, traffic sign replacement, and application of new pavement markings are examples of such maintenance activities.

State funding of transportation projects or services may also be provided through [Legislative Member Items](http://www.nysenate.gov) from State Senate or Assembly representatives. To pursue this funding resource, the Town and/or Village should contact their local representatives at the beginning of the legislative session in January.
5.2.4 Local Funding Sources

A portion of the non-federal match to funding resources noted in Sections 5.2.1 and 5.2.2 usually comes from local sources. Smaller projects that do not use federal or state funding sources may be funded through a local highway public works annual budget. Municipalities also have the option to establish special assessment tax districts to create a revenue stream for specific purposes such as sidewalks.

5.2.5 Private Funding

Some of the roadside improvements described in this study, such as sidewalks, street trees and streetscape amenities, can be funded by developers within residential and commercial subdivisions as long as the requirements have been incorporated into the subdivision regulations.

Opportunities may also arise to form creative partnerships between the public and private sectors, where all involved parties receive some benefit from their resource contribution. A common example of a public-private partnership related to transportation is the implementation of intersection and capacity improvements in conjunction with a new commercial development. Although many other arrangements may be possible, the following are a couple of examples of public-private partnerships that may apply to the Route 40 corridor:

- Identify and work with business owners and property developers in the study area to share in the costs of pedestrian, access management, and traffic control improvements that facilitate safe and efficient access to those businesses and developments.

- Provide local tax incentives for businesses and developers that plan and construct new buildings and facilities in a manner that clearly supports the recommendations contained in this study.

5.3 Construction Costs

The “Implementation Matrices” located at the end of this section (Tables 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3) contain planning-level cost estimates for each of the recommendations described in Sections 3 and 4. It is important to remember that these are order-of-magnitude cost estimates, intended only to provide a general concept of what the cost of the improvement may be. They are based on schematic plans and aerial photography, and therefore cannot be presumed to be as detailed and precise as cost estimates prepared based on detailed topographic survey information and more advanced designs. Right-of-way costs are also not included in these estimates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Improvement</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Planning Level</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Reconstruct Route 40 in the hamlet area (0.4 miles) with context sensitive cross section elements (i.e., narrower lanes, consistent shoulder widths, curbing, closed driveway, on-street parking in center of hamlet)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Improve intersection safety within the hamlet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Route 40 / Melrose Valley Falls Road, reconfigure intersection as a conventional &quot;T&quot; intersection, relocate memorial and pocket park</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Route 40 / Melrose Valley Falls Road, reconfigure intersection as a modern roundabout, relocate memorial and pocket park</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Route 40 / Church Street: better defined corner radius, parking modifications</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Address existing drainage deficiencies</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Runoff problem south of Route 40 / Melrose Valley Falls Road intersection</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Funding problem in vicinity of old railroad bridge abutments (north end of hamlet)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Address access management issues at Melrose Fire Company (use curbed islands to create well-defined access points)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Improve pedestrian accommodations</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Install new concrete sidewalks in hamlet area (approx. 3,000 LF)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Construct shared use path between Route 40 and Melrose Valley Falls Road (approx. 600 LF)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improve safety of pedestrian crossings</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pavement markings and signs</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sidewalk curb ramps</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Colored/textured pavement</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Transit improvements: install bus stop and shelter in center of hamlet</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Gateway treatments / speed reduction / traffic calming / measures at north and south approaches to hamlet</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gateway signage/landscaping</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Roadway center island</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Speed feedback signs</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- High visibility zone warning signage</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Innovative traffic calming pavement markings</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Community enhancements</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Establish community gathering space in front of Methodist Church</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Redevelop abandoned gas station for community or commercial use</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Enhance appearance and function of area in front of Essiae Food &amp; Drug</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Street trees</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Expand municipal water system throughout hamlet to enable denser development</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Extend municipal sewer system throughout hamlet to enable denser development</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Federal Funding Sources:**
- STIP - Surface Transportation Program
- CMQI - Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program
- TAP - Transportation Enhancements Program
- COPS - Complete Streets Program
- STES - State Technical Assistance Services
- EBP - Bicycle/Pedestrian Network Safe Routes
- ICIS - Intermodal Connections, Urban Journeys & Rural Access Self-Analysis
- NHTS - National Household Travel Survey
- TCF - Transportation, Communities, and Systems Performance Program
- RWPP - Various Federal Renewable Funding Programs
- CDIB - Community Development Block Grant Program
- HSTP - Interstate Safety Program
- LMCP - Land and Water Conservation Fund Program

**State Funding Sources:**
- MCHP - Mainstream Program
- NYPI - New York State Street Program
- EPF - Environmental Protection Fund Grants Program
- UCR - Urban and Community Infrastructre Grants Program
- NYSCA - NYSCA Council on the Arts & Architecture, Planning and Design Program
- MTA - Metropolitan Transportation Authority
- IVF - Innovative Transportation Funding Program
- HPS - Historic Preservation State Grant Program
- PPTA - Public-Private Transportation Assistance Program

**Other Funding Sources:**
- SSI - Special State-Initiated Programs
- FIP - Infrastructure Initiatives

**Note:**
1. These improvements are beyond the scope of this study; therefore, cost estimations were not proposed.
### Table 5.2
**Implementation Matrix: Rural Segment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Improvement</th>
<th>Potential Funding Sources</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Planning Level Construction Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Increase width of shoulders on Route 40 to better accommodate bicyclists and farm equipment (approx. 3.3 miles)</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Relocate white edge line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Widened pavement to provide 9 shoulders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Improve rural intersection safety</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Route 40/Orchard Rd/Butternut Rd intersection: adjust profile of Route 40 and/or side roads, and/or cut back grade to reduce intersection sight distance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Route 60/Butternut Rd intersection: relocate closer to 900' of roadway away from Route 60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Traffic calming pavement markings on Route 40 to reduce mainline approach speeds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Address access management issues</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Donnelly's Service Station: use curved islands to create well-defined access points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Darrow Brothers Equipment Company: reduce roadway widths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Speed reduction / traffic calming measures at south approach to Village</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$200 / mph</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Institute a 40 MPH speed zone (approx. 1/2 mile long) to serve as a transition between the existing 55 and 35 MPH speed limits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Speed feedback signs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- High-visibility speed zone warning signage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Innovative traffic-calming pavement markings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reconfigure Route 40/Route 67/East Schaghticoke Rd intersection as a modern roundabout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.3
**Implementation Matrix: Village of Schaghticoke**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Improvement</th>
<th>Potential Funding Sources</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Planning Level Construction Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Replace/relocate Hoosic River crossing with an attractive bridge and approaches that calm traffic, better accommodate all roadway users, and are better integrated with the Village setting</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$16-$18 million</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Option 1: Curved crossing, forming a four-leg intersection at Lower Main Street / Second Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Option 2: Replace bridge on shifted curved alignment, just north of existing crossing. Introduce a sharp curve on Route 40, just north of bridge, and reconfigure intersection with Lower Main Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reconstruce Route 40 in the Village 1.3 miles with curb, median, raised cross section elements (i.e., consistent shoulder widths, curving, raised drainage, on street parking where appropriate)</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$3,900,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Replacement of the bridge carrying Route 40 over the Hoosic River is a Federal-aid project (PR 1335.18) included in the most recent Transportation Improvement Program (RTP) for construction in 2011-12.
2. Some of these improvements are in the vicinity of the Route 40/Hoosic River bridge, may be included in PR 1335.18 Item #1.
3. The work should be coordinated with the Village’s planned water system improvement project to minimize disruption to local residents.
### Table 5.3 - Continued

#### Implementation Matrix: Village of Schaghticoke

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Improvement</th>
<th>Potential Funding Sources</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Planning Level Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal (DOD, NASA, DOE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NYSDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suffolk County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stony Brook University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HUD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NYSF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NYSUFAI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USGS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improve intersection safety within the Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Route 40/Chestnut Street: adjust Route 40 profile south of intersection to improve intersection sight distance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Route 40/School Street: redefine profile closer to 90°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Route 40/Pleasant Avenue: redefine profile closer to 90°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Address existing drainage deficiencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase number of vents between School St and Peat St to eliminate sheet flow down roadway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Included in item #2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase number of vents between Peat St and shopping center to eliminate ponding within/adjacent to roadway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Included in item #2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Address access management issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Multi-gas station/convenience store: install curbed islands to create two well-defined driveways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Commercial properties (immediately north of Stewart’s): install curbed islands to create well-defined driveways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Improve pedestrian and bicyclist facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Install new concrete sidewalks along school/commercial area with rest of Village (approx. 2,700 LF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Replace or upscale existing sidewalks to achieve compliance with ADA (approx. 9,600 LF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$670,000</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Construct shared use path between Schaghticoke restaurant and Route 40/Route 67/CR 125 intersection (approx. 1,300 LF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Construct shared use path between Route 40 and School Street &amp; Fifth Street (approx. 180 LF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$26,000</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improve safety of pedestrian crossings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pavement markings and signs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sidewalk curb ramps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Curb and landscaped pavement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,000 - $5,000</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Transit/Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reconfigure park-and-ride lot to Hoosic Valley Shopping Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200 (signage only)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Install bus stops and shelters at relocated park-and-ride lot and in the Village core</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000 - $10,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Gateway improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Center pedestrian refuge island at northern entrance to residential/pedestrian district (near Stewart’s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000 - $15,000</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Roadway center island at southern entrance to residential/pedestrian district (south of Chestnut Street)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000 - $15,000</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gateway signage/landscaping near Route 40/Route 67/CR 125 intersection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000 - $10,000</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Speed feedback sign north of Route 40/Route 67/CR 125 intersection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- High-visibility speed zone warning signs north of Route 40/Route 67/CR 125 intersection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Innovative traffic calming pavement markings north of Route 40/Route 67/CR 125 intersection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reconfigure Route 40/Route 67/CR 125 intersection to a modern roundabout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Community enhancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improvements to picnic area in front of Village Hall, enhancements to area in front of adjacent church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000 - $20,000</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Creation of a scenic lookout area with parking, benches, and a possible trail down to the Hoosic River (can be implemented with funding #1, Option #2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000 - $75,000</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Community gathering spaces in front of Library and/or Chinatown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000 - $5,000</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bike racks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Undergrounding of existing overhead utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000,000/mile</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Some of these improvements, in the vicinity of the Route 40 Hoosic River bridge, may be included in PRR 1199.18 (Route #2).
2. This work should be coordinated with the Water Authority’s planned water system improvement project to minimize disruption to local residents.

**Funding Sources:**
- MCH: Mass Transit\Credit
- NYSF: New York State Focus
- NYSB: New York State Block Grant
- NYS: New York State
- NYC: New York City
- HUD: U.S. Housing and Urban Development
- EPA: Environmental Protection Agency
- DAJ: Department of Advanced Research
- EDA: Economic Development Administration
- NYSERDA: New York State Energy Research and Development Authority
- MTA: Metropolitan Transportation Authority

**Other Funding Sources:**
- MTA: Metropolitan Transportation Authority
- NYSF: New York State Focus
- NYSB: New York State Block Grant
- NYS: New York State
- NYC: New York City
- HUD: U.S. Housing and Urban Development
- EPA: Environmental Protection Agency
- DAJ: Department of Advanced Research
- EDA: Economic Development Administration
- NYSERDA: New York State Energy Research and Development Authority
- MTA: Metropolitan Transportation Authority

**McFarland Johnson | Project for Public Spaces**
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Community Workshop #1 Summary
December 6, 2008

Introduction

Project for Public Spaces (PPS) and McFarland-Johnson facilitated a community workshop on December 6, 2008, to assess and brainstorm improvement ideas for Route 40 in the Town and Village of Schaghticoke. Following a presentation on the qualities of great public spaces, the workshop attendees were broken into four groups that each focused on one of the following locations.

1. Route 40 & Route 67
2. Stewarts/Schag A Val
3. Route 40 & Lower Main Street (plus A.E. Diver Library)
4. Hamlet of Melrose

The groups evaluated their assigned site using the “Place Game.” The Place Game ignites a creative process about how to make a place vital and how to improve the experience of people in a place. This structured exercise asks participants to use common sense and intuition, along with structured observation and interview skills, to allow them to very quickly see the good and bad qualities of a place using the characteristics listed below under the following four attributes: comfort and image, access and linkages, uses and activities and sociability.

Comfort & Image
- Overall attractiveness
- Feeling of safety
- Cleanliness/quality of maintenance
- Comfort of places to sit

Access & Linkages
- Visibility from a distance
- Ease in walking to the place
- Transit access
- Clarity of information/signage

Uses & Activities
- Mix of stores/services
- Frequency of community events/activities
Overall busy-ness of area
- Economic vitality

Sociability
- Number of people in groups
- Evidence of volunteerism
- Sense of pride and ownership
- Presence of children and seniors

Once participants evaluated their site, they were then asked to formulate improvement recommendations and summarize their group’s ideas for:

- What they liked best about the site;
- Short-term improvements;
- Long-term vision; and
- Partnerships and local talent to help implement these ideas.

Finally, each group reported back to all workshop participants, describing the issues and opportunities they identified for their specific area. These workshop outcomes are described in detail below.

**Site 1 – Route 40 & Route 67**

**Site Assessment**

Comfort & Image:
The intersection of Route 40 and Route 67 serves as a gateway into the Village of Schaghticoke. Its country-like atmosphere contributes to the small-town image of the Village. However, the lack of sidewalks and crosswalks, combined with heavy traffic in that area, creates feelings of unease and discomfort for pedestrians. Poor lighting and a lack of seating also contributes to a poor pedestrian environment in an area with a large amount of commercial activity. The fence around the fairgrounds also deteriorates the image of the Village and conveys a sense of exclusion. The shopping plaza is predominately asphalt and is used solely for parking. It is a monotonous hardscape that is unfriendly and unattractive.

Access & Linkages:
Pedestrian accessibility is a major concern for students and those walking from the shopping mall to Stewarts or the Schaghticoke Fairgrounds. The lack of crosswalks, poor signage and weak connections to other destinations discourage people from walking.
Uses & Activities:
The Hoosic Valley Center retail, the Hoosic Valley Central Schools and the Fairgrounds generate a busy area with a mix of stores and services. However, with very few non-retail activities or programmed community events, especially for students, the economic vitality of the area suffers. The infrequency of the Schaghticoke Fair contributes to this issue.

Sociability:
Despite a strong sense of pride and ownership amongst local stakeholders, pedestrian activity in general is minimal. Even with the High School so close, there’s a low level of social interaction because there are no amenities or activities that would encourage people to spend time outdoors.

**Opportunities for Improvement**

Short-term:
- Provide benches and movable seating, especially in front of the pizza store
- Create a community bulletin board
- Stripe crosswalks at the intersection
- Improve retail and wayfinding signage
- Create an opening in the fence between the schools and the shopping plaza
- Install temporary school art displays
- Create a stronger police presence or install security cameras
- Enhance landscaping in the parking lot
- Remove/replace fence around the Fairgrounds
- Create a "Park and Ride" area, perhaps locating it in the Shop N Save parking lot and creating a formal bus stop in this location

Long-term:
- Change the intersection to roundabout, rather than signalized, control
- Enhance a possible bus stop with lighting, informational signage and a shelter structure
- Enhance/improve street lighting to be pedestrian-scaled
- Build sidewalks and curbs
- Create an entrance/gateway that signals to motorists that they have entered a pedestrian area

**Partnership Ideas**

- Hoosic Valley Center
- Stop N Save
- Capital District Transportation Authority
- Schaghticoke Fairgrounds
- Hoosic Valley Central Schools – student involvement
- Community service groups

Site 2 – Stewarts/ Schag A Val

Site Assessment

Comfort & Image:
The area around Stewarts and Schag A Val offers a pleasant village feel with residential homes and a mature tree canopy. The outdoor seating provided by Stewarts is well utilized; however, the quality of storefront maintenance is poor and the Fairgrounds fence weakens the overall attractiveness of the place. The lack of sidewalks, crosswalks and curbs, in addition to speeding traffic, creates many pedestrian safety concerns.

Access & Linkages:
Northbound visibility is limited by a horizontal curve in Route 40 that obstructs the view of the southern driveway into Stewarts. The proximity of these two businesses makes it convenient for people to walk between them, but the lack of sidewalks and crosswalks makes this difficult. Snowmobiles actively use this area in the winter, and any proposed design changes should consider and accommodate these roadway users.

Uses & Activities:
The mix of uses and services provided by Stewarts and Schag A Val allows for a vibrant commercial node and the presence of people. As a result, economic vitality thrives and the area remains busy.

Sociability:
Popular commercial and food destinations attract people in groups. This is one of the site’s greatest assets and explains why there is a variety of people here, including seniors.

Opportunities for Improvement

Short-term:
- Replace the Fairgrounds fence or plant trees/shrubs in front of it
- Paint a crosswalk between the businesses
- Enhance retail signage
- Clean up litter outside Stewarts
- Provide picnic tables for motorcyclists and snowmobilers traveling through the area
- Improve landscaping
• Provide on-street truck parking

Long-term:
• Implement sidewalks and curbs, beginning with the east side of Route 40
• Improve highway drainage
• Install pedestrian-scaled lighting (energy-efficient lighting would save money on operations)
• Manage driveways to reduce vehicle-pedestrian conflicts
• Implement a 30 MPH speed limit and a speed indicator
• Change roadway design to slow traffic
• Gateway element to enhance entrance to the core of the Village

Partnership Ideas

• Hoosic Valley Central Schools
• New York State Department of Transportation
• Village of Schaghticoke
• Business community
• Rensselaer County
• Schaghticoke Fairgrounds
• Rotary Club
• American Legion
• Local churches
• Community groups

Site 3 – Route 40 & Lower Main Street (plus A.E. Diver Library)

Site Assessment

Comfort & Image:
The small town atmosphere and architecture add to the positive image and overall attractiveness of the Village of Schaghticoke. Traffic entering and exiting the Mobil station, however, creates conflicts between cars and pedestrians. The overall lack of wayfinding signage, pedestrian amenities and seating makes this area unwelcoming and uncomfortable. The roads are in poor condition and, without crosswalks, crossing them is dangerous because vehicles often speed through this area. The small park and the lawn in front of the library are well kept and aesthetically pleasing, but the little seating that is provided is oddly located.

Access & Linkages:
Despite being the historical and logical center of the Village, there is insufficient indication from a distance that motorists are entering the heart of the community. There is also poor signage
directing people to businesses on Lower Main Street, which was diminished as the village “core” when Route 40 was shifted to its current alignment. Further, the lack of a continuous sidewalk, crosswalks or traffic controls make walkability in this area difficult and unsafe, especially for children going to the library and people trying to cross between the Village Hall and the Post Office. The narrow sidewalks on the Hoosic River Bridge and its poor aesthetic quality are also deterrents to walking and biking between different parts of the Village and Town of Schaghticoke.

Uses & Activities:
A good selection of stores and services at the intersection creates a small community feel yet there is little evidence of community activities or events. The overall busyness of this site is generated by vehicular traffic, not pedestrians.

Sociability:
Some evidence of volunteerism and town pride can be seen in the well maintained pocket park. However, besides attractive landscaping and a sculpture, there is no reason to spend time in this public space. It appears underutilized, and no children, seniors or groups are present. There may be more activity in this location during the summer when Chrissy’s is open for business.

Opportunities for Improvement

Short-term:
- Locate crosswalks near pedestrian generators
- Create a unique gateway treatment
- Enhance traffic enforcement, potentially with radar
- Paint roadway markings the better delineate the Route 40/Lower Main Street intersection
- Provide Wi-Fi Internet access in the park
- Enhance park programming
- Install sidewalk benches
- Create signage that directs people to the businesses on Lower Main Street
- Create a community bulletin board in the park

Long-term:
- Provide sidewalks on both sides of the street
- Widen sidewalks
- Use traffic calming to slow traffic
- Create on-street parking spaces for the library
- Reconfigure the intersection of Main Street and School Street
- Manage access to the Mobil station
- Improve lighting
• Replace the Hoosic River Bridge as a pedestrian-friendly destination in the Village (look to South Glens Falls Bridge as a design model)
• Relocate the bridge to intersect Lower Main Street farther to the south (near the Legion Hall)
• Create an overlook area at the foot of the bridge for pedestrians and motorists
• Use the old bridge as a bicycle trail

Partnership Ideas

• Chrissy’s
• Presbyterian United Church
• Legion Hall
• Dave D’Ambrose
• Local children – Boy and Girl Scouts
• Hoosic Valley students – government class
• Hoosic Valley PTO

Site 4 – Hamlet of Melrose

Site Assessment

Comfort & Image:
Speeding vehicles approaching Melrose create an unsafe and uncomfortable pedestrian environment. The Esquire Food & Drug site and the Getty site in particular are in poor shape and not well maintained, and the Getty site creates an image of abandonment and lack of ownership. Commercial and institutional signage is generally poor and detracts from the aesthetics of the Hamlet. However, the green memorial park is well maintained and litter free.

Access & Linkages:
There is no sense of entrance into the Hamlet, and visibility from a distance is poor. The lack of sidewalks and crosswalks discourage pedestrian activity and accessibility to local destinations, such as the Post Office. Narrow shoulders do not accommodate bicyclists well. Esquire Food & Drug, located at the Route 40/Church Street intersection has poorly managed access and confusing parking patterns. Vehicles parked at Esquire limit sight distance at the Church Street intersection and create numerous potential conflict points. The geometry of the Route 40/ Melrose Valley Falls Road intersection also creates potential traffic safety issues.

Uses & Activities:
Despite the presence of a range of pedestrian generators, including Esquire, a gift shop, the Methodist church and a post office, there are no community events or activities that create a
busy, economically and socially thriving place. Poor visibility and the lack of synergy between these destinations and services contribute to this feeling of inactivity.

Sociability:
A lack of pedestrian amenities and community events limits group activity. However, the well maintained pocket park suggests evidence of volunteerism and community pride. The speed and noise of passing traffic, however, limit its attractiveness as a gathering place.

Opportunities for Improvement

Short-term:
- Lower the speed limit
- Provide benches outside the church and in public spaces
- Improve Esquire’s signage
- Talk to Esquire owner about improving the condition of the site
- Slow traffic at the blinking light at Church Street and Route 40
- Paint a crosswalk for pedestrians
- Create a formal bus stop

Long-term:
- Reconfigure the Melrose Valley Falls Road intersection
- Install a roundabout to slow traffic and address difficult intersection designs
- Change the blinking light to a regular stop light, which is controlled by detection sensors
- Make better use of Getty property for a bus stop, park space or intersection improvements
- Install sidewalks and curbing
- Provide formal on-street parking
- Improve drainage at the old railroad overpass
- Continue more extensive improvements of the Esquire site

Partnership Ideas

- Hoosic Valley Central Schools
- Community and neighborhood groups
- Fire House/Department
- Melrose Methodist Church
Community Workshop #2 Summary
October 8, 2009

Introduction

McFarland Johnson led a community workshop on October 8, 2009 to present and explain the transportation and land use recommendations that had been developed over the course of this study for the Route 40 corridor. It was noted that many of the recommendations originated from residents’ ideas generated at the December 6, 2008 Community Workshop, and that these ideas had been further developed and refined based on input received from the Study Advisory Committee.

The primary tool used to gather feedback from this workshop was a comprehensive “Resident Opinion Survey” that attendees were asked to complete, with the option of submitting the completed surveys before they left that evening, or returning them to McFarland Johnson by mail or email before October 22. Residents unable to attend the workshop were also offered an opportunity to complete the surveys based on their review of the draft report, copies of which were made available for viewing at the A.E. Diver Library and the Schaghticoke Town Hall. The completed surveys were used to compile a summary of the group’s general feelings regarding the corridor recommendations presented (i.e., “strongly in favor,” “somewhat in favor,” “neutral,” “somewhat oppose” and “strongly oppose”), but they also offered an opportunity to provide general or specific comments regarding transportation and land use issues along the Route 40 corridor. A total of 18 completed surveys were received from Town and Village residents; summaries of the surveys can be found at the end of this Appendix.

Summary of Survey Results

In general, the corridor recommendations presented were well received. Although most of the recommendations received some negative ratings (i.e., “somewhat oppose” or “strongly oppose”), in all cases those ratings were offset by a greater number of positive ratings (i.e., “strongly in favor” or “somewhat in favor”), and in most cases the positive ratings far outweighed the negative ratings. It should also be noted that non-responses were combined with ratings of “neutral,” so the actual percentage of positive ratings out of all responses received for a particular corridor recommendation was a little higher in many instances.

Recommended improvements that received an overwhelming positive response (i.e., greater than 80% positive ratings) are tabulated on the following page.
Table A.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Description of Recommended Improvement</th>
<th>% of Positive Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamlet of Melrose</td>
<td>Redevelop abandoned gas station for community or commercial use</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamlet of Melrose</td>
<td>Enhance appearance/usage of area in front of Esquire Food &amp; Drug</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamlet of Melrose</td>
<td>Address drainage issues</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Segment</td>
<td>Adjust roadway profile and/or cut back slopes to increase sight distance at Route 40 / Northline Rd / Gutbrodt Rd intersection</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Schaghticoke</td>
<td>Extend sidewalks from Stewarts to shopping plaza and schools</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Schaghticoke</td>
<td>Upgrade existing pedestrian facilities in the Village</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Schaghticoke</td>
<td>Reconstruct Route 40 in Village with context sensitive cross section elements (e.g., curbs, closed drainage, street trees, on-street parking)</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Schaghticoke</td>
<td>Gateway treatments / speed reduction / traffic calming measures at north approach to Village</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Schaghticoke</td>
<td>Adjust Route 40 profile to improve intersection sight distance at Chestnut Street</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One desired outcome of the survey was to determine community preferences regarding a new crossing location for the bridge carrying Route 40 over the Hoosic River, a structure that is scheduled to be replaced by NYSDOT in 2012. Residents were asked to choose between two possible crossing options – Crossing Option #1 involves a heavily curved bridge that creates a new, four-leg intersection at Lower Main Street and Second Street; while Crossing Option #2 would replace the bridge on a shifted/curved alignment just north of the existing crossing.

No clear community preference emerged as a result of the survey. Based on all surveys received, 41% preferred Crossing Option #1 compared to 59% for Option #2. Taking into account surveys completed by Village residents only, the results were split 50/50.

**Resident Comments**

The following is a compilation of written comments received during and after the second Community Workshop.

**Resident, Hamlet of Melrose**
- “The Melrose (Firemen?) are opposed to any move.” (hard to read; comment may be referencing the relocation of the veteran’s memorial located near the Route 40/Melrose Valley Falls Road)
Resident, Hamlet of Melrose

- “The town should acquire the former Getty gas station in Melrose. It is an eyesore that has had numerous spills reported over the years. If Getty refuses to give the property to the town, the town should sue Getty for natural resources damages. Once the town has the property, the intersection could be reconfigured, landscaped, and a bus stop gazebo constructed.”
- “The old abandoned post office in Melrose needs to be removed.”

Resident, Village of Schaghticoke

- “I feel that moving the bridge to the south (option #1) is a great idea.” (referencing the relocation of the Hoosic River crossing)
- “Should not allow parking in front of Esquire.” (referencing parking patterns in front of Esquire Food & Drug)
- “Put (roundabouts) at both intersections of 40 & 67.”
- “Excellent location for a roundabout.” (referencing northern Route 40 / Route 67 intersection)
- “Excellent – a lot of students walk this area.” (referencing recommended extension of sidewalks north of Stewarts to shopping plaza and schools)

Resident, Village of Schaghticoke

- “I’m not a proponent of roundabouts.”

Resident, Village of Schaghticoke

- “Oak Street?” (referencing recommendation to construct a shared use path between Route 40 and School Street, opposite of Fifth Street)

Resident, Village of Schaghticoke

- “Extend 45 MPH speed zone to Tomhannock Creek.” (referencing recommendation to implement a 45 MPH speed zone south of the Village)
- “45 MPH – Wiley Bros to 40/67 intersection.” (referencing recommended speed reduction measures at north approach to Village)
- “Community bulletin board.” (referencing recommended enhancements to area in front of Village Hall and adjacent church)

Resident, Village of Schaghticoke

- “Need wide lanes all along Route 40; no on-street parking.”
- “We need to accommodate the existing businesses and gathering sites, especially our churches. Parking and Church property must not be reduced but rather enlarged to accommodate the many uses of the church – religious gatherings, community dinners, concerts, quilt shows, etc.”
• “All electrical distribution/ communication lines should be buried.”
• “Move village water line out from under Route 40 / Main Street.”

Resident, Town of Schaghticoke
• “Bridge is most important issue. Group should be fully informed in all stages of replacement. DOT should be continually aware of the impact on the Village and flow of traffic on NY40.”
• “Village speed limit reduced to 30 mph.”
• “Improve law enforcement for traffic control.”
• “Provide weight limits for trucks.”

Resident, Town of Schaghticoke
• “I have three hopes/desires/wishes for the Village of Schaghticoke. First is to have a complete and usable sidewalk extending all the way to the intersection of Routes 40&67. Second is to have a community space in front of the library, along with improved fencing between Route 40 and the bank down to Electric Lake. Third is improving the bridge.”

Resident, another town (previous Town of Schaghticoke resident for 33 years)
• “Unfortunately, the study does not look at the entire Hamlet of Melrose. Melrose goes from Pinewoods Avenue in the north to Pineview Avenue in the south.”
• “Sidewalks should continue on the west side (of Route 40) to Avenue A.”
• “Cars speed up coming out of Grant Hollow, which is why they’re pushing 55 when they hit downtown Melrose. Traffic calming should start soon after Mineral Springs Road.”
• “The Town should look towards working with the Town of Brunswick and the City of Troy and study Route 40 between Melrose Valley Falls Road & NY 142, where the worst problems are.”
• “Won’t be able to see coming out of church.” (referencing recommendation to establish community gathering space in front of the Methodist Church in the Hamlet of Melrose)
• “(This would make it a) super highway! 4 to 6 feet sufficient.” (referencing recommendation to widen pavement between the Hamlet and the Village to provide 8-foot shoulders)
• “You wouldn’t know it was there going south until you came upon it.” (referencing recommendation to reconstruct the southern Route 40 / Route 67 intersection as a modern roundabout)
• “Destroys historic fabric, (would need to) widen Lower Main Street to fit traffic.” (referencing Hoosic River crossing location Option #1)
• “Preferred, maybe just replace on site with improved design.” (referencing Hoosic River crossing location Option #2)
# Resident Opinion Survey: Summary of Results

## Hamlet of Melrose

### Notes:
1. Bold numbers indicate most common choices.
2. Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H1 Reconstruct Route 40 in the hamlet area with context sensitive cross section elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Narrower travel lanes, curbs and closed drainage, street trees, on-street parking in front of Esquire Food &amp; Drug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly in favor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H2 Improve intersection safety within the Hamlet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Route 40/Maine Valley Falls Road: reconfigure intersection as a conventional “T” intersection (relocate memorial and pocket park)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Route 40/Maine Valley Falls Road: reconfigure intersection as a modern roundabout (relocate memorial and pocket park)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Route 40/Church Street: better defined corner radii, parking modifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly in favor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H3 Address existing drainage issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Hillside runoff problem south of Route 40/Melrose Valley Falls Road intersection; ponding problem in vicinity of old railroad bridge abutments (at north end of hamlet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly in favor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H4 Improve pedestrian accommodations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Install new concrete sidewalks, pedestrian crosswalks and ADA-compliant curb ramps in hamlet area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Construct shared use path between Route 40 and Melrose Valley Falls Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly in favor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H5 Transit improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Install bus stop and shelter in center of hamlet along CDTA Route 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly in favor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H6 Gateway treatments / speed reduction / traffic calming measures at north and south approaches to hamlet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Examples: gateway signage/landscaping, roadway center islands, radar speed feedback signs, speed zone warning signage, and special pavement markings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly in favor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H7 Community enhancements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Establish community gathering space in front of Methodist Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Redevelop abandoned gas station for community or commercial use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Enhance appearance/usage of area in front of Esquire Food &amp; Drug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Expand municipal water system throughout hamlet to enable denser development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Extend municipal sewer system to/throughout hamlet to enable denser development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Additional businesses along Route 40 in hamlet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* New street connection between Route 40 and Melrose Valley Falls Road (north of fire station) with additional residential development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly in favor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Resident Opinion Survey: Recommended Improvements

### Rural Segment

**Notes:**
1. Bold numbers indicate most common choices.
2. Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly in favor</th>
<th>somewhat in favor</th>
<th>neutral/didn't respond</th>
<th>somewhat oppose</th>
<th>strongly oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| R1 Increase Route 40 shoulder width to better accommodate bicyclists and farm equipment  
- Widen pavement to provide 8-foot shoulders | 56% | 11% | 22% | 11% |
| R2 Improve rural intersection safety  
- Route 40 / Northline Rd / Gutbrot Rd: adjust roadway profile and/or cut back slopes to increase intersection sight distance | 61% | 22% | 17% |
- Route 40 / Bracken Road: reconfigure intersection so roads intersect at closer to 90 degrees | 39% | 28% | 28% | 6% |
- Other intersections: special pavement markings on Route 40 to reduce mainline vehicle speeds | 39% | 39% | 22% |
| R3 Speed reduction / traffic calming measures at south approach to Village  
- Institute a 1/2-mile-long 45 MPH speed zone | 33% | 39% | 11% | 11% | 6% |
- Traffic calming measures such as radar speed feedback signs, speed zone warning signage, and special pavement markings | 39% | 39% | 11% | 11% |
- Reconstruct Route 40 / Route 67 intersection as a modern roundabout | 33% | 28% | 22% | 11% | 6% |
## Resident Opinion Survey: Summary of Results

### Village of Schaghticoke

**Notes:**
1. Bold numbers indicate most common choices.
2. Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>V1</strong> Replace/relocate Hoosic River crossing with an attractive bridge and approaches that calm traffic and better accommodate all roadway users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option #1:</strong> Curved crossing that forms a four-leg intersection at Lower Main Street and Second Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option #2:</strong> Replace bridge on shifted/curved alignment just north of existing crossing, with reconfigured Route 40 / Lower Main Street intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>V2</strong> Reconstruct Route 40 in the Village with context sensitive cross section elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curbs and closed drainage, street trees, on-street parking where space permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>V3</strong> Improve intersection safety within the Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route 40 / Chestnut Street: adjust Route 40 profile to improve intersection sight distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 40 / School Street (by church): reconfigure intersection so roads intersect at closer to 90 degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 40 / Pleasant Ave: reconfigure intersection so roads intersect at closer to 90 degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>V4</strong> Address existing drainage issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase number of inlets in hill section; increase number of inlets between Stewarts and Shop-n-Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>V5</strong> Improve pedestrian accommodations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extend sidewalks from Stewarts to shopping plaza and schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade existing pedestrian facilities in Village: replace deteriorated/missing sidewalks; install new pedestrian crosswalks and ADA-compliant curb ramps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct shared use path between Schaghticoke restaurant and Route 40 / Route 67 intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct shared use path between Route 40 and School Street (opposite Fifth St)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>V6</strong> Transit / ridesharing improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Install bus stop(s) and shelter(s) at one or two locations in Village along CDTA Route 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocate park-and-ride lot to shopping plaza or nearby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>V7</strong> Gateway treatments / speed reduction / traffic calming measures at north approach to Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examples: gateway signage/landscaping, radar speed feedback signs, speed zone warning signage, and special pavement markings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstruct Route 40 / Route 67 intersection as a modern roundabout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Resident Opinion Survey: Summary of Results

## Village of Schaghticoke

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V8 Gateway treatments / speed reduction / traffic calming measures at entrances to residential district</th>
<th>strongly in favor</th>
<th>somewhat in favor</th>
<th>neutral/didn’t respond</th>
<th>somewhat oppose</th>
<th>strongly oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Center island with crosswalk between Stewarts and Schag a Val</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Center island (without crosswalk) just south of Chestnut Street</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V9 Community enhancements</th>
<th>strongly in favor</th>
<th>somewhat in favor</th>
<th>neutral/didn’t respond</th>
<th>somewhat oppose</th>
<th>strongly oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Improvements to pocket park in front of Village Hall, enhancements to area in front of adjacent church</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Creation of a scenic lookout area along Hoosic River, next to church (in conjunction with Item V1, Option #1)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community gathering spaces in front of library and/or Chrissy’s</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# RESIDENT OPINION SURVEY: SUMMARY OF RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village of Schaghticoke ** Village Residents Only **</th>
<th>strongly in favor</th>
<th>somewhat in favor</th>
<th>neutral/didn't respond</th>
<th>somewhat oppose</th>
<th>strongly oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Bold numbers indicate most common choices.
2. Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

### V1 Replace/relocate Hoosic River crossing with an attractive bridge and approaches that calm traffic and better accommodate all roadway users
- Option #1: Curved crossing that forms a four-leg intersection at Lower Main Street and Second Street
  - 50% strongly in favor
  - 38% somewhat in favor
  - 13% neutral/didn't respond
- Option #2: Replace bridge on shifted/curved alignment just north of existing crossing, with reconfigured Route 40 / Lower Main Street intersection
  - 50% strongly in favor
  - 13% somewhat in favor
  - 38% neutral/didn't respond

### V2 Reconstruct Route 40 in the Village with context sensitive cross section elements
- Curbs and closed drainage, street trees, on-street parking where space permits
  - 50% strongly in favor
  - 38% somewhat in favor
  - 13% neutral/didn't respond

### V3 Improve intersection safety within the Village
- Route 40 / Chestnut Street: adjust Route 40 profile to improve intersection sight distance
  - 75% strongly in favor
  - 13% somewhat in favor
  - 13% neutral/didn't respond
- Route 40 / School Street (by church): reconfigure intersection so roads intersect at closer to 90 degrees
  - 50% strongly in favor
  - 13% somewhat in favor
  - 38% neutral/didn't respond
- Route 40 / Pleasant Ave: reconfigure intersection so roads intersect at closer to 90 degrees
  - 50% strongly in favor
  - 13% somewhat in favor
  - 25% neutral/didn't respond

### V4 Address existing drainage issues
- Increase number of inlets in hill section; increase number of inlets between Stewarts and Shop-n-Save
  - 38% strongly in favor
  - 50% somewhat in favor
  - 13% neutral/didn't respond

### V5 Improve pedestrian accommodations
- Extend sidewalks from Stewarts to shopping plaza and schools
  - 75% strongly in favor
  - 25% neutral/didn't respond
- Upgrade existing pedestrian facilities in Village: replace deteriorated/missing sidewalks; install new pedestrian crosswalks and ADA-compliant curb ramps
  - 63% strongly in favor
  - 13% somewhat in favor
  - 25% neutral/didn't respond
- Construct shared use path between Schaghticoke Val restaurant and Route 40 / Route 67 intersection
  - 50% strongly in favor
  - 13% somewhat in favor
  - 38% neutral/didn't respond
- Construct shared use path between Route 40 and School Street (opposite Fifth St)
  - 38% strongly in favor
  - 38% somewhat in favor
  - 13% neutral/didn't respond

### V6 Transit / ridesharing improvements
- Install bus stop(s) and shelter(s) at one or two locations in Village along CDTA Route 96
  - 38% strongly in favor
  - 25% somewhat in favor
  - 38% neutral/didn't respond
- Relocate park-and-ride lot to shopping plaza or nearby
  - 38% strongly in favor
  - 38% somewhat in favor
  - 25% neutral/didn't respond

### V7 Gateway treatments / speed reduction / traffic calming measures at north approach to Village
- Examples: gateway signage/landscaping, radar speed feedback signs, speed zone warning signage, and special pavement markings
  - 50% strongly in favor
  - 50% neutral/didn't respond
- Reconstruct Route 40 / Route 67 intersection as a modern roundabout
  - 38% strongly in favor
  - 13% somewhat in favor
  - 50% neutral/didn't respond
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## RESIDENT OPINION SURVEY: SUMMARY OF RESULTS

**Village of Schaghticoke  **  ** Village Residents Only **

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th align="left">V8 Gateway treatments / speed reduction / traffic calming measures at entrances to residential district</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td align="left">• Center island with crosswalk between Stewarts and Schag a Wal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| strongly  |
|-|-
| somewhat |
| neutral/|
| didn’t  |
| respond |
| oppose |
| oppose |

25% 25% 38% 13%

| • Center island (without crosswalk) just south of Chestnut Street  |

| strongly  |
|-|-
| somewhat |
| neutral/|
| didn’t  |
| respond |
| oppose |
| oppose |

25% 13% 25% 13% 25%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th align="left">V9 Community enhancements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td align="left">• Improvements to pocket park in front of Village Hall; enhancements to area in front of adjacent church</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| strongly  |
|-|-
| somewhat |
| neutral/|
| didn’t  |
| respond |
| oppose |
| oppose |

25% 25% 50%

| • Creation of a scenic lookout area along Hoosic River, next to church (in conjunction with Item V1, Option #1)  |

| strongly  |
|-|-
| somewhat |
| neutral/|
| didn’t  |
| respond |
| oppose |
| oppose |

13% 38% 38% 13%

| • Community gathering spaces in front of library and/or Chrisay’s  |

| strongly  |
|-|-
| somewhat |
| neutral/|
| didn’t  |
| respond |
| oppose |
| oppose |

25% 25% 50%
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Draft Access Management Guidelines

The benefits of good access management are well-documented. The National Highway Institute reports that an effective access management program can reduce crashes as much as 50 percent, increase roadway capacity by 23 to 45 percent, and reduce travel time and delay as much as 40 to 60 percent. The benefits of good access management affect all roadway users, however. The Transportation Research Board’s Access Management Manual describes many of these benefits, including:

- Motorists face fewer decision points and traffic conflicts, which simplifies driving and increases safety.
- Cyclists can choose alternative travel routes as supporting roadway systems are developed and face fewer conflicts with motorists which increases safety.
- Pedestrians face fewer and less frequent access points where motorists enter and exit the roadway making it safer to walk along major roadways.
- Transit riders experience reduced delay and travel times and more convenient access to transit stops as connectivity is improved.
- Business persons experience a more predictable development environment served by a more efficient roadway system that captures a broader market area.
- Communities have a safer transportation system with less need for road widening thereby avoiding displacement of existing businesses and residences.

The following guidelines\(^1\) are provided for managing access to land development while preserving the flow of traffic in terms of safety and capacity. These guidelines balance the rights of reasonable access to private property with the rights of all people to safe and efficient travel along the Route 40 corridor. In conjunction with the proposed transportation and land use recommendations included in the Route 40 Corridor Study, these guidelines will help the Town and Village of Schaghticoke advance their vision for the Route 40 corridor.

With legal assistance these guidelines can be adopted into the Town and/or Village of Schaghticoke’s local laws.

\(^1\) Adapted from “Model Land Development & Subdivision Regulations That Support Access Management”, Florida Department of Transportation/University of South Florida Center for Urban Transportation Research; and “Access Management Model Ordinances for Pennsylvania Municipalities Handbook”, Pennsylvania Department of Transportation/US Department of Transportation.
A. Access Connection and Driveway Design

The New York State Department of Transportation requires driveways to adhere to minimum design standards in the design and location of access connections or other traffic control features. These standards are contained in the latest editions of the following technical documents:

- NYSDOT Highway Design Manual;
- Policy and Standards for the Design of Entrances to State Highways, commonly referred to as the “Driveway Design Policy” (NYSDOT Highway Design Manual Appendix 5A); and,
- National Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways (National MUTCD) and 17 NYCRR Chapter V (New York State Supplement)

The minimum standards for driveway design and location are as follows:

1. Driveway grades, widths and flares/radii should conform to the requirements contained in the NYSDOT’s Policy and Standards for the Design of Entrances to State Highways.

2. Driveway approaches must be designed and located to provide an exiting vehicle with safe sight distance for all permitted turning movements, in accordance with the requirements contained in the NYSDOT’s Policy and Standards for the Design of Entrances to State Highways.

3. The length of driveways or “throat length” should be designed in accordance with the anticipated storage length for entering and exiting vehicles to prevent vehicles from backing into the flow of traffic on the public street or causing unsafe conflicts with on-site circulation. General standards are provided below. Variation from these may be permitted for good cause upon approval of the Town or Village of Schaghticoke and NYSDOT.

   a. For minimum use commercial driveways (less than 25 vehicles/day), the throat length should be a minimum of 25 feet.
   b. For low volume driveways (25-750 vehicles/day), the throat length should be a minimum of 50 feet, or as determined by queuing analysis.
   c. For medium volume driveways (750-1,500 vehicles/day), the throat length should be a minimum of 125 feet, or as determined by queuing analysis.
   d. For high volume driveways (more than 1,500 vehicles/day), the throat length should be a minimum of 150 feet, or as determined by queuing analysis.
B. Number of Driveways

The number of driveway locations to be permitted to serve a property should be based on preserving the flow of traffic and highway safety along Route 40, while considering the amount and type of traffic the driveway is expected to serve, in addition to the location, type, and density of the development.

1. Only one access should be permitted for a property.

2. An additional access or accesses may be permitted if the applicant demonstrates that an additional access or additional accesses are necessary to accommodate traffic to and from the site and it can be achieved in a safe and efficient manner.

3. The Town or Village of Schaghticoke or NYSDOT may restrict access to right turn only ingress and egress, or to another state maintained road or local road if safe and efficient movements cannot be accommodated.

4. For a property that abuts one or more roadways in addition to Route 40, the Town or Village of Schaghticoke or NYSDOT may restrict access to only that roadway that can more safely and efficiently accommodate traffic.

C. Access Spacing

Driveway spacing standards limit the number of driveways on a roadway by mandating a minimum separation distance between driveways. Adequate driveway spacing facilitates smoother traffic flows, reduces the number of potential conflict points that must be monitored by motorists, and helps preserve the capacity of the roadway. It also reduces the number of conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians and bicycles.

1. Separation between access points on Route 40 will be based on the posted speed limit as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Posted Speed Limit</th>
<th>Driveway Spacing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 mph or less</td>
<td>125 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 mph</td>
<td>250 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 mph or greater</td>
<td>450 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Driveway spacing shall be measured from the closest edge of pavement to the next closest edge of pavement. The access spacing requirements may be reduced in situations where they prove impractical.
2. Driveways should be aligned with other driveways and roadways on the opposite side of Route 40 in order to meet spacing requirements.

3. If these access spacing guidelines cannot be achieved, then a system of joint use driveways and cross access easements may be required in accordance with subsequent sections.

D. Corner Clearance

Corner clearance is the distance from an intersection of a public or private road. The provision of adequate corner clearance minimizes driveway-intersection conflicts and affords a greater distance for vehicles to merge into through traffic.

1. Corner clearance for connections should meet or exceed the minimum access spacing requirements for that roadway. Driveway spacing shall be measured from the closest edge of pavement for the driveway to the next closest edge of pavement for the intersection.

2. New connections on Route 40 should not be permitted within the functional area of an intersection area (i.e., the area beyond the physical intersection that comprises decision and maneuver distance, plus any required vehicle storage length) unless:
   
   a) No other reasonable access to the property is available; and,
   
   b) The Planning Board and NYSDOT determine that the connection does not create a safety or operational problem upon review of a site-specific study of the proposed connection prepared by a registered engineer and submitted by the applicant.

3. Where no other alternatives exist, the Planning Board and NYSDOT may allow construction of an access connection along the property line farthest from the intersection. In such cases, directional connections (i.e. right in/out, right in only, or right out only) may be required.

4. In addition to the required minimum lot size, all corner lots should be of adequate size to provide for required front yard setbacks and corner clearance on street frontage.

E. Joint and Cross Access

Joint and cross access driveways reduce the number of driveways accessing the roadway, thus reducing the number of conflict areas along the roadway, as well as the number of conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians and bicycles. They are a safe and more efficient way to provide access to
two or more adjacent land uses because motorists do not have to exit one driveway, merge into traffic on the intersecting roadway, and then enter another driveway. These types of driveways allow municipalities and state transportation agencies to maintain driveway spacing standards along corridors that have several parcels with limited roadway frontage. For undeveloped parcels, the easements for joint and cross access should be implemented during the land development approval process.

1. Adjacent commercial or office properties should provide a cross access drive and pedestrian access to allow circulation between sites wherever feasible.

2. A system of joint use driveways and cross access easements should be established wherever feasible along Route 40 and should incorporate the following:
   a) A continuous service drive or cross access corridor extending the entire length of each block served to provide for driveway separation consistent with the access spacing standards.
   b) A design speed of 10 mph and sufficient width to accommodate two-way traffic, including the largest vehicle expected to regularly access the properties;
   c) Stub-outs and other design features to make it visually obvious that the abutting properties may be tied together to provide cross access via a service drive;
   d) A unified access and circulation system plan that includes coordinated or shared parking areas is encouraged wherever feasible; and,
   e) Sidewalks on one or both sides to increase pedestrian safety and access.

3. Shared parking areas are strongly encouraged and should facilitate a reduction in required number of parking spaces if peak demand periods for proposed land uses do not occur at the same time periods.

4. Pursuant to this section, property owners shall:
   a) Record an easement with the deed allowing cross access to and from other properties served by the joint use driveways and cross access or service drive;
b) Record an agreement with the deed that remaining access rights along the thoroughfare will be dedicated to the Town or Village of Schaghticoke and pre-existing driveways will be closed and eliminated after construction of the joint-use driveway; and,

c) Record a joint maintenance agreement with the deed defining maintenance responsibilities of property owners.

5. The Planning Board may reduce required separation distance of access points where they prove impractical, provided all of the following requirements are met:

   a) Joint access driveways and cross access easements are provided wherever feasible in accordance with this section.
   b) The site plan incorporates a unified access and circulation system in accordance with this section.
   c) The property owner enters into a written agreement with the Town or Village of Schaghticoke, recorded with the deed, that pre-existing connections on the site will be closed and eliminated after construction of each side of the joint use driveway.

6. The Planning Board may modify or waive the requirements of this section where the characteristics or layout of abutting properties would make development of a unified or shared access and circulation system impractical.

F. Requirements for Outparcels and Phased Development Plans

Outparcels are parcels of land, generally located on the perimeter of a larger parcel of commercial land, that are subordinate to the larger parcel for access, parking and drainage purposes. This section is intended to encourage driveway consolidation for outparcels and phased development plans by way of coordinated internal circulation. Adjacent properties under single ownership will be treated as one property unless the applicant can show the Town or Village of Schaghticoke and NYSDOT that the two properties should have separate access due to safety concerns. Marketing of the two properties is not a valid reason to have them treated as separate properties.

1. In the interest of promoting unified access and circulation systems, development sites under the same ownership or consolidated for the purposes of development and comprised of more than one building site should not be considered separate properties in relation to the access standards of these guidelines. The number of connections permitted should be the minimum number necessary to provide reasonable access to these properties, not the maximum available for that frontage. All necessary easements, agreements, and stipulations required under the Joint and Cross Access Section should be met. This should also apply to phased development plans. The owner and all lessees within the affected area are responsible for compliance with the requirements of this code and both should be cited for any violation.
2. All access to the outparcel must be internalized using the shared circulation system of the principal development or retail center. Access to outparcels should be designed to avoid excessive movement across parking aisles and queuing across surrounding parking and driving aisles.

3. Outparcels should have a minimum lineal frontage of 300 feet per outparcel, or greater where access spacing standards for that roadway require. This frontage requirement may be waived where access is internalized using the shared circulation system of the principal development or retail center. In such cases the right of direct access to the roadway should be dedicated to the Town or Village of Schaghticoke and recorded with the deed.

G. Reverse Frontage

Reverse frontage lots (also called “double frontage lots” and “through lots”) are lots with generally opposite ends that both abut streets. These standards are effective in reducing safety hazards and congestion caused by direct access to Route 40; they also serve to reduce the number of local trips using the state highway.

1. Access to reverse frontage lots should be required on the street with the lower functional classification.

2. When a residential subdivision is proposed that would abut Route 40, it should be designed to provide reverse frontage lots along Route 40 with access from a frontage road or interior local road. Access rights of these lots to Route 40 should be dedicated to the Village or Town of Schaghticoke and recorded with the deed. A berm or buffer yard may be required at the rear of reverse frontage lots to buffer residences from traffic on Route 40. The berm or buffer yard should not be located within the public right-of-way.

3. Pedestrian easements can be utilized to connect pedestrian traffic from residential development to Route 40.
H. Flag Lot Standards

Flag lots are parcels of land shaped like a flag; the staff is a narrow strip of land providing vehicular and pedestrian access to a street, with the bulk of the property lying to the rear of the other lots. Where the narrow frontages for flag lots abut Route 40, they afford inadequate spacing between driveways and increase safety hazards from vehicles turning on and off Route 40.

1. Flag lots should not be permitted when their effect would be to increase the number of properties requiring direct and individual access connections to Route 40.

2. Flag lots may be permitted for residential development, when deemed necessary to achieve planning objectives, such as reducing direct access to thoroughfares, providing internal platted lots with access to a residential street, or preserving natural or historic resources, under the following conditions:
   a) Flag lot driveways should be separated by at least twice the minimum defined in the Access Spacing section.
   b) In no instance should flag lots constitute more than 10% of the total number of building sites in a recorded or unrecorded plat, or three lots or more, whichever is greater.
   c) The lot area occupied by the flag driveway should not be counted as part of the required minimum lot area of that zoning district.
   d) No more than one flag lot should be permitted per private right-of-way or access easement.

I. Lot Width-to-Depth Ratios

Minimum lot frontage and maximum lot width-to-depth ratios prevent the creation of long and narrow or irregularly shaped lots that can lead to access and circulation problems.

1. To provide for proper site design and prevent the creation of irregularly shaped parcels, the depth of any lot or parcel should not exceed 4 times its width.
J. Shared Access via New Local Streets

The provisions for shared access are intended to prevent a proliferation of driveways on Route 40. Provisions for shared access also promote land development patterns that are more compatible with the rural character of the Town and Village of Schaghticoke.

1. Subdivisions with frontage on Route 40 should be designed into shared access points to and from the highway. A maximum of two accesses should be allowed regardless of the number of lots or businesses served.

2. More than two accesses may be permitted if the applicant demonstrates that additional access(es) are necessary for proper site circulation and it can be achieved in a safe and efficient manner.

K. Connectivity

The provisions for connectivity are intended to encourage trips between adjoining developments and fewer trips on Route 40. This provision strives to maintain a balance between enhancing accessibility and limiting excessive through traffic in residential areas.

1. The street system of a proposed subdivision should be designed to coordinate with existing, proposed, and planned streets outside of the subdivision as provided in this Section.

2. Wherever a proposed development abuts unplatted land or a future development phase of the same development, street stubs should be provided as deemed necessary by the Village or Town of Schaghticoke to provide access to abutting properties or to logically extend the street system into the surrounding area. All street stubs should be provided with temporary turn-around or cul-de-sacs unless specifically exempted by the Town or Village of
Schaghticoke, and the restoration and extension of the street should be the responsibility of any future developer of the abutting land.

3. Collector streets should intersect with collector or arterial streets at safe and convenient locations.

4. Sub-collector and local residential access streets should connect with surrounding streets to permit the convenient movement of traffic between residential neighborhoods or facilitate emergency access and evacuation, but such connections should not be permitted where the effect would be to encourage the use of such streets by substantial through traffic.

L. Nonconforming Access Features

Nonconforming access features may continue in the same manner after adoption of land development regulations - a process known as “grandfathering.” This protects the substantial investment of property owners and recognizes the expense of bringing those properties into conformance. Opportunities to bring nonconforming features into compliance occur after specific events when the costs of required improvements may be amortized in the business loan or mortgage, thereby minimizing financial hardship.

1. Permitted access connections in place as of (date of adoption) that do not conform with the standards herein should be designated as nonconforming features and should be brought into compliance with applicable standards under one of the following conditions:

   a) When new access connection permits are requested;
   b) Substantial enlargements or improvements;
   c) Significant change in trip generation;
   d) Property ownership changes; or,
   e) As roadway improvements allow.

2. If the principal activity on a property with nonconforming access features is discontinued for a consecutive period of 365 days, or discontinued for any period of time without a present intention of resuming that activity, then that property must thereafter be brought into conformity with all applicable connection spacing and design requirements, unless otherwise exempted by the Planning Board.

3. For uses that are vacant or discontinued upon the effective date of this code, the 365 day period begins on the effective date of this code.
M. Site Plan Review Procedures

The subdivision and site plan review process provides the Town or Village of Schaghticoke with the most effective opportunity for addressing access considerations and preventing access problems before they occur. Effective coordination with the New York State Department of Transportation and other agencies is essential to ensure conformance with land division and access requirements.

1. Applicants should submit a preliminary site plan for review by the Town or Village of Schaghticoke and NYSDOT. At a minimum, the site plan should show:
   a) Location of access point(s) on both sides of the road where applicable;
   b) Distances to neighboring constructed access points, median openings, traffic signals, intersections, and other transportation features on both sides of the property;
   c) Number and direction of lanes to be constructed on the driveway plus striping plans;
   d) All planned transportation features (such as auxiliary lanes, signals, etc.);
   e) Trip generation data or appropriate traffic studies;
   f) Parking and internal circulation plans;
   g) Plat map showing property lines, right-of-way, and ownership of abutting properties; and,
   h) A detailed description of any requested variance and the reason the variance is requested.

2. Subdivision and site plan review should address the following access considerations:
   a) Is the road system designed to meet the projected traffic demand and does the road network consist of hierarchy of roads designed according to function?
   b) Does the road network provide an appropriate level of connectivity with the surrounding existing, proposed, and planned streets?
   c) Does the road network follow the natural topography and preserve natural features of the site as much as possible? Have alignments been planned so that grading requirements are minimized?
   d) Is access properly placed in relation to sight distance, driveway spacing, and other related considerations, including opportunities for joint and cross access? Are entry roads clearly visible from the major arterials?
   e) Outside of the Village and Hamlet, do units front on residential access streets rather than major roadways?
   f) Is automobile movement within the site provided without having to use the peripheral road network?
   g) Does the road system provide adequate access to buildings for residents, visitors, deliveries, emergency vehicles, and garbage collection?
h) Have the edges of the roadways been landscaped? If sidewalks are provided alongside the road, have they been set back sufficiently from the road, and has a landscaped planting strip between the road and the sidewalk been provided?

i) Does the pedestrian sidewalk system link buildings with parking areas, entrances to the development, open space, and recreational and other community facilities? Where the street layout makes walking distances to nearby destinations inconvenient and circuitous, are pedestrian connections provided?

3. The Town or Village of Schaghticoke and NYSDOT reserve the right to require traffic and safety analysis where safety is an issue or where significant problems already exist.

4. After 30 days from filing the application, the Town or Village of Schaghticoke and NYSDOT must notify applicants if any additional information is needed to complete the application.

5. Upon review of the access application, the Town or Village of Schaghticoke and NYSDOT may approve the access application, approve with conditions, or deny the application. This must be done within 90 days of receiving the complete application.

6. Any application that involves access to Route 40 must be reviewed by the New York State Department of Transportation. It should be noted that the recommended time frames in this section are local time frames and do not apply to the required NYSDOT review.

7. If the application is approved with conditions, the applicant should resubmit the plan with the conditional changes made. The plan, with submitted changes, will be reviewed within 10 working days and approved or rejected. Second applications may only be rejected if conditional changes are not made.

8. If the access permit is denied, the Town or Village of Schaghticoke or NYSDOT should provide an itemized letter detailing why the application has been rejected.

9. All applicants whose application is approved, or approved with conditions, have thirty days to accept the permit. Applicants whose permits are rejected or approved with conditions have 60 days to appeal.
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Draft Village/Hamlet Design Guidelines

Introduction

The following design guidelines are intended to direct new construction and renovations in accordance with existing development within the Village of Schaghticoke and Hamlet of Melrose.

These guidelines are intended to create walkable centers with engaging pedestrian environments; walking is beneficial to physical and mental health, saves money, encourages social interaction and is environmentally-friendly. The following guidance will also help preserve the unique visual aesthetics that make the Village and Hamlet special, which translate into both intangible and tangible benefits, like increased tourism revenue and property values.

Overall, application of these guidelines will prevent the type of unremarkable architecture and development that has become commonplace in cities across the US. Such mediocre, auto-oriented buildings have been built in recent decades in both the Village and Hamlet, but these can and should be avoided in the future so as not to dominate the area’s historic urban fabric.

In an effort to fulfill these goals, all new development should be perceived based upon applicability to the following goals:

1) **Encourage architecture and site planning practices that reflect historic development patterns and beautify the corridor**

   Design should reflect the proportions, roof forms, details and materials, as well as vegetation, of nearby buildings. Historic elements of a place are always preferred above other architecture. For the Village and Hamlet, these generally include one- to three-story wood or brick construction, front porches, pitched roofs, small building setbacks, and orientation towards the street.
2) **Encourage a mix of compatible land uses to enhance accessibility to goods and services**
Avoid large areas of single-use development to create gathering places near residences and allow people to access goods and services without driving long distances.

3) **Promote sustainability**
Development and design should prioritize environmental sustainability, particularly regarding water and energy conservation as well as utilization of renewable energy sources. Sprawling land use patterns should be avoided. Use of sustainable building materials is also preferred.

4) **Support a multi-modal transportation system**
The sidewalk environment should be complemented by building designs which results in a safe, convenient, and attractive setting for various modes of transportation, especially pedestrians, bicyclists and transit riders. Paving materials, landscape, lighting and site furnishings should contribute to the character and scale of the pedestrian environment without adding excessive cost, maintenance or security concerns.

5) **Diversify housing options and increase density where appropriate**
In an effort to diversify the Village/Hamlet’s housing options, multi-family and rental housing is encouraged. New development should occur in existing centers and strengthen connections to neighboring developments to encourage non-vehicular travel, conserve open space, enhance the viability of transit and preserve historic development patterns.
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Applicability

The following design guidelines shall apply to all new development within the Village of Schaghticoke and Hamlet of Melrose, heretofore referred to as Village/Hamlet. They are not intended to replace any existing zoning laws, but rather to work in conjunction with them in an effort to preserve the existing character and enhance the communities as new development occurs. Any new contract documents should meet the requirements of all other public agencies and all permits and bonds required by such agencies should be secured.

These guidelines are designed for the long-term protection of the architectural and historical assets of the Village/Hamlet.

They are intended for both commercial and residential buildings, unless specifically noted.
Section I: Site Layout

A. Uses

Objective: New and infill mixed-use development is encouraged to increase density, activate the streetscape, and enhance walkability and housing affordability.

Guidelines:

- Adaptive reuse of historic structures is encouraged.
- New construction should feature mixed-use development (residential above commercial) in urban areas.
- Auto-oriented uses, such as gas stations and auto repair shops, are strongly discouraged in Village/Hamlet cores.
- Heavy manufacturing is undesirable in predominately residential areas.
B. **Block Size**

*Traditional block size in the Village of Schaghticoke is approximately 150’x200’-400’.*

Objective: Blocks should be small and varied to improve connectivity and improve the pedestrian experience.

Guidelines:
- Street grid connections should be established where absent.
- Blocks of 200’ x 400’ or less are ideal for walkability, but the predominant pattern of the Village/Hamlet should be followed where this is not possible.
- If street connections are not possible on long blocks, pedestrian pathways should be created.

C. **Set Backs**

*Consistent building setbacks create a sense of order and unity.*

Objective: Buildings should form a consistent, distinct edge, spatially delineating the public street through uniform building setbacks.
Guidelines:

- The appropriate setback should be determined by consistency with adjacent properties.
- If infill development occurs between inconsistent adjacent setbacks, the new development’s setback shall be determined by following the typical pattern of the block.
- If the appropriate road setback is uncertain, the general guideline is to keep buildings close to the road, as is typical of traditional Village and Hamlet development.
- Emphasis should be given to appropriate proximity to the street in an effort to enhance the quality and character of the streetscape.

D. Lot Coverage, and Spacing

Objective: Building size and placement should be consistent throughout the block.

Guidelines:

- Primary physical structures are limited to 35% of total lot coverage. If lots are less than 20,000 sf, primary structures may cover up to 45%.
- Secondary structures such as a shed or guest house are not to exceed 5% of lot coverage.
- Residential buildings should be centrally located within lot and feature side-yards which fall within the established range of the block in order to create equal spacing. Side-driveways are considered a portion of the side-yard.
E. Density, Mass and Scale

Objective: New construction should complement the density and character of the Village/Hamlet and increase density in urban centers to enable open space preservation, walkability and affordability.

Guidelines:

- **Density by area:**
  - Minimum: two dwellings units per acre
  - Desirable: four dwellings units per acre*
  - Maximum (multi-family dwellings): 20 dwelling units per acre*
    * Density may be limited if necessary utilities are not available. It is recommended that new systems are explored and constructed to expand development density.

- **Buildings should not exceed three stories without a variation permit.**

- **Mass and scale should mimic historic styles in that:**
  - A variety of building forms is encouraged
  - Side/Rear additions should step down in scale
  - Buildings abutting historic properties should step down to emphasize the historic structure

- **In an effort to enhance the pedestrian experience, building widths are limited to 40’. Larger buildings are permitted if façade variation occurs at least at every 25’ using the following techniques:**
  - Building step-backs and articulation
  - Variation in façade materials
  - Windows
  - Separate entrances and entry treatments

Variations in building mass and scale create visual interest.
F. Entrances

Objective: Buildings should have a clear orientation to the street to create a safe and engaging public realm. Designs should be consistent in scale and style with surrounding buildings.

Guidelines:
- Primary entrances shall face the street, be easily identifiable, and incorporate lighting and variations in mass, surface or finish for emphasis with the primary structure.
- Where rear parking is provided, buildings should feature aesthetically pleasing rear entrances and facades.
- Buildings located on a street corner should engage both streets by featuring entrances, large windows, porches, and other treatments on each street.
- Loading and service entrances should be located on secondary streets. Where secondary street placement is not possible, visual impact must be minimized through architectural consistency with the rest of the building.

G. Driveways, Parking, and Garages

A detached garage behind the primary building is ideal.
Objective: Driveways, off-street parking, and garages should be designed and positioned to minimize visibility from the public realm.

Guidelines:
- On-street parking is encouraged to calm traffic and service local businesses.
- Surface parking should be located behind buildings. If site constraints prohibit a rear location, parking may be located to the side of the building.
- Where parking lots front onto streets, screening is required.
- If attached to a primary structure, garages must be set back from the build to line.
- Private driveways shall be a maximum of 12 feet wide. Commercial drives shall be a maximum of 24 feet wide.
- Shared or joint use driveways are encouraged to minimize vehicular intrusions into the pedestrian realm.
- Sidewalk treatments, such as pavement variation, should be maintained across driveways.

H. Sidewalks

With appropriate enhancements, sidewalks can become community gathering places.
Objective: Continuous sidewalks must be located in front of all buildings to provide safe, wheelchair and stroller accessible and continuous pedestrian connections throughout the Village/Hamlet.

Guidelines:
- When a redevelopment project disrupts existing streetscape elements, those items must be replaced with approved streetscape elements.
- Sidewalks shall be a minimum of five-feet wide and extend continuously along the entire length of the frontage.
- Sidewalks must be fully accessible for people with disabilities, which includes the provision of curb ramps at all intersections. ADA compliance also improves access for strollers and walkers.
• Where space permits, a three-foot landscaped or textured pavement strip shall be provided between the street and the sidewalk.
• Sidewalk material shall extend across driveways or alleys.
• Usage of materials such as bricks, concrete pavers, stamped concrete, and stone are encouraged to add character.

I. Trash, Service, and Utility Equipment Screening

Objective: Residential and commercial utility equipment should be positioned to minimize visual impact while maintaining convenience and function.

Guidelines:
• Trash receptacles, recycling receptacles, HVAC units, loading docks, utility equipment and other similar service items should be located in the rear of buildings and should be screened to minimize sound and visibility.
• Screening should be architecturally compatible with the primary structure’s architecture.
• Wooden fencing and landscaping are encouraged means of screening.
Section II: Architectural Style

A. Roof Types

Objective: Roofs should complement and accentuate the architectural character of buildings.

Guidelines:

- Roofs should be made of long-lasting materials and consistent with traditional styles of the Village/Hamlet.
- Residential roofs should be pitched and articulated with dormers, chimneys, gables, cupolas, fascias, and other embellishments.
- Structures of at least two stories are permitted to have flat roofs (slightly sloped to drain) where appropriate. Parapets and cornices are encouraged for visual effect.
B. Windows

Objective: Commercial buildings should contribute to the pedestrian experience with large transparent windows. Residential windows should protect privacy while avoiding blank walls and maintaining “eyes on the street.”

Guidelines:
- Windows should be vertically aligned and regularly spaced. Decorative molding, cornices, and other architectural enhancements are encouraged.
- A minimum of 40% of the ground level façade and sides of commercial buildings adjacent to public right of ways shall be transparent (windows and doors). A minimum of 15% of the building's rear façade facing a public right of way, parking area or open space shall be transparent. Reflective or glass tinted more than 40% is not allowed.

C. Awnings

Objective: Awnings are encouraged on commercial buildings to enhance the human scale of the Village/Hamlet while providing protection for the elements, and signage opportunities for businesses.

Guidelines:
- Awnings should correspond with window and door openings beneath.
• They should be constructed of durable, water repellant material, such as canvas, and complement the color scheme and style of their buildings.
• Awnings must project a minimum of 36”-48” from the building.

D. Porches, Stoops, and Decks:

Objective: Porches are strongly encouraged to define entrances, provide a sense of scale to building fronts and create street life.

Guidelines:
• Porches and stoops are permitted to encroach 5’ beyond the primary build to line.
• Open porches are preferred, but enclosed porches may be considered if enclosure is justifiable.
• Decks (uncovered) and patios should be located at the rear or side of a building. Design should be compatible with the primary structure.
• Landscaping surrounding both porches and decks is encouraged.

E. Fencing

Fences should be discouraged for residential sites. Where fences are strongly desired, they should be architecturally compatible, low in height, and partly transparent.
Objective: Fencing that fronts public right of ways should be considered an important architectural feature, not merely an afterthought to preserve community aesthetics.

Guidelines:
- Fencing should be a maximum of 4ft tall. Concrete block walls and chain link fences are prohibited, and treatments that match the architectural palette of adjacent buildings are recommended.
- Fences are not desirable in the front yard area of residential sites; shrubs and hedges are recommended. If fences are unavoidable, an open-style fence in combination with landscaping is encouraged. Front yard fences should not be higher than 4 feet.

F. Architectural Treatments

Wood and brick should continue to be used as a primary building material in order to maintain the character of the Village/Hamlet.

Hollow concrete block construction is not consistent with traditional architectural treatments.

Chain link fences and fences taller than 4’ detract from the pedestrian experience.
Objective: Material choice can help new development complement historic buildings and reflect the character of the Village.

Guidelines:
- Traditional materials including brick, stone and wood should be used as the primary building materials.
- Materials should be long-lasting.
- Infill development should reflect surrounding architectural detailing including window and entryway shape, cornice lines and brick work.
- Building renovation and alterations should restore architectural details of cornices, brickwork, transom, display windows and bulkheads.
- The following materials are not allowed on the façades or sides of buildings adjacent to public right of ways:
  - Concrete block or brick larger than 4" in height, 12" in length
  - Aluminum, vinyl or fiberglass siding or roofing materials
  - Concrete masonry units
  - Materials that attempt to mimic traditional materials. An example would be fiberglass panels that are molded to look like brick
- Buildings should be of varied but complimentary colors. Bright colors may only be used as accents.

G. Franchise Architecture

Objective: To preserve the unique village character of Schaghticoke, franchise corporations must conform to local architectural styles.

This McDonald’s restaurant in Freeport, Maine was forced by local regulations to conform to local architectural styles.
Guidelines:

- Franchise architecture (building design that is trademarked or identified with a particular chain or corporation and is generic in nature) is not allowed.
- Drive-through businesses, such as banks, pharmacies and fast food restaurants, are strongly discouraged. Where these are unavoidable, driveways should be minimized, located on side streets, if possible, and follow the driveway design guidance outlined above.

H. Lighting

Objective: Lighting should enhance the safety and aesthetics of the Village/Hamlet.

Guidelines:

- Pedestrian-scaled street lighting (12 to 14’ in height) should be added to streets, especially on corners, be placed next to benches, and below tree canopies.
- Lighting fixtures can be attached to cobra head light poles, introduced as stand alone fixtures, and added to building facades, canopies, and awnings, to both illuminate store entrances and the street.
- Halogen light bulbs, rather than high pressure sodium bulbs, should be used, as they cast fewer shadows and are perceived to provide superior illumination.
- Light sources (light bulbs) should be obscured and directed by using shielded or full-cut style fixtures to eliminate glare and light pollution.
- Building and signage lighting should be indirect.
- Commercial lighting should illuminate signage rather than entire storefronts.
I. Street Furniture and Amenities

**Objective:** Benches, fountains, café seating, bike racks, planters, bus stop shelters, community bulletin boards, and other similar amenities are encouraged to enhance the comfort and image of the streetscape.

**Guidelines:**
- Urban areas should feature public, accessible seating at least every 500’.
- New developments should provide street furniture and amenities.
- Matching funding should be made available for existing businesses to upgrade and/or install street furniture.

J. Signage

**Objective:** Signs should be appropriately scaled to provide adequate business identification without creating distractions for drivers and pedestrians. Design should complement architectural style and not obscure important architectural features.

**Guidelines:**
- Perpendicular projecting signs are encouraged. They should not exceed 12 square feet and must provide at least 8 feet of clearance between the sidewalk and lowest point of the sign.
• Permanently painted window signs and neon window signs are permitted but may not take up more than a 1/3 of the window.
• Exterior neon signs and internally illuminated signs are prohibited.
• Signage should have the capability of being lit in the evening, although the source of light must not be visible to motorists or pedestrians.
• Signs constructed of natural materials such as metal or wood are preferred.
• Buildings with multiple storefronts should coordinate signage throughout the building.

K. Landscaping

Objective: Sustainable landscaping should be used to enhance the pedestrian experience, complement architectural features and screen service areas.

Guidelines:
• The setback area between street and building should be landscaped to provide character and visual enhancement.
• The use of flower boxes, planters and hanging flower baskets is encouraged.
• Native and xeric species are encouraged.
• Landscaping should be used in parking lots to soften the hardscape and enhance the pedestrian environment.
• Existing street trees should be maintained. Street trees must be planted in conjunction with new construction.
Route 40 Corridor Study

Appendix D

Transit/Ridesharing Survey and Summary of Results
This page intentionally left blank.
The Capital District Transportation Committee (CDTC) and the Capital District Transportation Authority (CDTA) conducted a survey of commuters from mid-February through April 2009 in the greater Schaghticoke area in northern Rensselaer and southern Washington Counties. The intent of the survey was to inform the Town, Village, CDTC and CDTA about the market for alternative transportation options and the feasibility of a park and ride lot. The park and ride lot might be in the vicinity of the Route 40 and 67 intersection (at Schaghticoke Fairgrounds) and could be served by transit, carpool or vanpool. The survey was available on the CDTC website through Survey Monkey and was available in paper form at the Town and Village Halls.

The survey questionnaire (see Figure 1) was 26 questions long and 33 individuals responded. Some of the key findings from the survey are as follows (note the number in parentheses represents the number of respondents):

1) 39% (13) commute to the City of Albany on a daily basis. 12% (4) commute to the City of Troy.
2) 58% (19) are scheduled to arrive at work between 8 and 9 AM.
3) 60% (20) are scheduled to leave work between 5 and 6 PM.
4) 81% (27) indicated at least some flexibility in their work hours.
5) 67% (20) currently drive alone, 10% (3) carpool and another 20% (6) drive alone sometimes and use other modes like transit and carpool at other times.
6) 70% (21) indicated they would consider some form of carpooling, ridesharing or vanpooling to work.
7) 57% (17) of those driving to work have free parking.
8) 6.7% (2) currently ride the CDTA route that serves Route 40.
9) 73% (21) use their personal vehicle during the workday occasionally or once or twice a week.
10) 79% (24) indicated they would or would be willing to consider vanpooling to work.
11) 37% (11) indicated they would participate in a vanpool pilot project.
12) 76% (23) spend more than $25 per week on transportation to work (over $100 per month on gas alone).
13) 50% (15) indicated that $10-$20 per week would be reasonable to pay for a weekly bus pass.

These results indicate that there is interest in using alternative forms of transportation in the Schaghticoke area but for any of them to be feasible, a park and ride lot would need to be either created or formalized in the Village. The similar hours of the respondents and the fact that most commute to Albany or Troy indicates that there is a potential market for a vanpool and carpool. Additional marketing of transit and carpooling would be necessary. The Town and Village can promote [www.ipool2.org](http://www.ipool2.org).
This page intentionally left blank.
The Capital District Transportation Committee, in partnership with the Town and Village of Schaghticoke, is exploring the feasibility of a park and ride lot in the vicinity of the Route 40 and 67 intersection (near Schaghticoke Fairgrounds) in the Village of Schaghticoke. This effort is being undertaken as part of the Schaghticoke Route 40 Corridor Study. This survey will inform us about the market for alternative transportation options in the greater Schaghticoke area and therefore the need for the park and ride lot. The park and ride lot could be served by transit, carpools or vanpools. This survey should only take 10 minutes of your time. Residents from throughout northern Rensselaer County and southern Washington County are encouraged to participate. Thank you for your time and your responses will be completely anonymous.

In order to progress through this survey, please use the following navigation links:

- Click the “Next” button to continue to the next page.
- Click the “Previous” button to return to the previous page.
- Click the “Exit” button if you need to exit the survey.
- Click the “Submit” button to submit your survey.

Questions marked with asterisk (*) require an answer.

If you have any questions, please email Sandy Misiewicz smisiewicz@CDTCMPO.org

Thank you for taking our survey!

**Questions about your work:**

**1. Do you work outside your home?**
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

**2. What company do you work for?**

**3. What city/town/village is your place of work located in?**
(Note: If your answer is not on the list, please type in your answer in the text box below)

**4. What time do you usually arrive at work?**
(select from drop-down menu)

**5. What time do you usually leave work?**
(select from drop-down menu)

**6. How flexible are your hours of work?**
- [ ] Not flexible at all
- [ ] Somewhat flexible
- [ ] Flexible
- [ ] Very flexible

**7. What days do you typically work?**
- [ ] Sunday
- [ ] Monday
- [ ] Tuesday
- [ ] Wednesday
- [ ] Thursday
- [ ] Friday
- [ ] Saturday
Rural Transit in Schaghticoke

* 8. Does your company offer alternative work schedules (example: compressed work week)?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Not Sure

Questions about your commute:

* 1. What is your usual commute mode?
   - Drive Alone
   - Bus
   - Carpool
   - Bicycle
   - Walk
   - Telecommute
   - Combination of modes (please specify)

* 2. Would you consider using some form of ridesharing, such as carpooling or vanpooling for your commute?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Not Sure
   - Maybe. It would depend on

* 3. If you drive or carpool to work, do you pay for parking?
   - Yes
   - No, my employer provides free parking
   - Partially, my employer subsidizes my parking
   - I don't drive or carpool
   - Other (please specify)

* 4. Are you aware of existing transit service in your area (CDTA Route 96)?
   - Yes
   - No
Rural Transit in Schaghticoke

* 5. How often do you currently ride CDTA Route 96?
   - Never
   - Occasionally
   - 1-2 times per week
   - 3-4 times per week
   - Everyday
   - Other (please specify)

* 6. How often do you use your car for personal or work business during the workday?
   - Never
   - Occasionally
   - 1-2 times per week
   - 3-4 times per week
   - Everyday

* 7. Would you consider commuting by (check all that apply):
   - [ ] Carpooling
   - [ ] Vanpooling
   - [ ] Bicycling
   - [ ] Walking
   - [ ] Taking a bus
   - [ ] None of the above
   - [ ] Other (please specify)

www.iPool2.org - The First Stop for Commuter Information for people who live or work in the Capital District
Rural Transit in Schaghticoke

* 8. Are you aware of the regional commuter information website www.ipool2.org?
   - Yes
   - No

* 9. Are you currently registered with ipool2?
   - Yes
   - No

* 10. Vanpooling is a type of ridesharing that usually uses rented vans. Most vanpools are self-supporting - operating costs are divided among members.

Would you be interested in participating in a vanpool pilot project if it was available?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Not Sure
   - Other (please specify)

* 11. What would influence your decision to take a bus?
   (check all that apply):
   - Park and Ride lot available
   - No transfers (one-seat ride)
   - Schedule and frequency
   - Length of the trip
   - “Affordable” fare
   - No car available
   - None of the above
   - Other (please specify)
12. If CDTA were able to provide a service that fit your definition of "convenient", how often do you think you would use it?

- Daily (5 days/week)
- 2-3 times per week
- 1-2 times per week
- 2-3 times per month
- Rarely
- Never

13. Please estimate how much you currently spend on transportation to work in a typical week.

- $25 or less
- $25-$40
- $40-$50
- More than $50
- Don't know/refused

14. Would you be willing to pre-purchase a monthly or multi-ride debit pass to use transit service?

- Yes
- No
- Maybe. It depends on

15. What do you think a reasonable cost for a weekly bus pass that would provide transportation for your commute to work would be?

- No opinion
- $10 or less
- $10 to $20
- $20 to $30
- $30 to $40
- It depends (please specify)
16. What is the best way to get schedule and other information regarding transit, carpools, vanpools and park and ride lots to you? (Check only one)

- Website
- Direct mailing
- Road signs
- Community bulletin boards
- At place of work/through employer
- Other (please specify) 

Additional information:

1. What city/town/village do you live in?
   
   (Note: If your answer is not on the list, please type in your answer in the text box below)

2. Please, provide any additional information about your commute preferences:

3. If you would like to be placed on a mailing list to receive future information about public transit and ride-matching services in the area please provide your name and address.

Name: 
Company: 
Address: 
Address 2: 
City/Town: 
State: 
ZIP/Postal Code: 
Country: 
Email Address: 
Phone Number: 

Website
Direct mailing
Road signs
Community bulletin boards
At place of work/through employer
Other (please specify)