



Dufresne Group
54 Main Street
PO Box B

Windsor, Vermont 05089

Tel: (802) 674-2904 Fax: (802) 674-2913

E-mail: info@dufresnegroup.com

Home Page: http://www.dufresnegroup.com

Memo

To: Meeting Attendees
From: Christina Haskins, PE
Date: August 18, 2015
Re: Proctor Bicycle and Pedestrian Scoping Study – Kickoff Meeting #2

On July 22, 2015, a follow-up kickoff meeting was held at the Proctor Town Office to discuss the proposed work. The following individuals attended:

<u>Individual</u>	<u>Representing</u>
Stan Wilbur	Town of Proctor, Town Manager
Dale Christie	Steering Committee Member
Steve Follett	Steering Committee Member
Susan Schreibman	Rutland Regional Planning Commission
Chrissy Haskins, PE	Dufresne Group

I have prepared the following summary of my notes taken at the meeting:

1. It was discussed that this follow-up kickoff meeting was being held to get feedback from steering committee members that could not attend the initial kickoff meeting. Chrissy suggested that the minutes from the initial kickoff meeting be reviewed and the group could add their comments and questions.
2. Existing Issues and Concerns: Chrissy reviewed comments made during the first meeting.
 - a. Cyclists use Route 3, West Proctor Road and Florence Road. Signage or markings should be added on these roads. Many cyclists are going through Proctor, not traveling within. A goal of this project should be to make it easier to cycle in and around Proctor.
 - b. Susan noted that cyclists will bike regardless of signage and markings. She added that these studies usually focus on families and children.
 - c. Stan noted that if nothing else is done, he would like to see increased safety on Route 3, on Main Street from Route 3 to the park and through the center of town. Stan highlighted that the bridge is a challenge and needs to be safer. It was noted that the railroad is also a pinch point.
 - d. Steve would like to see children biking to school and the library and people commuting on bicycles. He noted that bicycle friendly transportation was a priority.

- e. Susan noted that Proctor was in the Safe Routes to School program, but wasn't sure if they were still active. Steve noted that biking to the elementary school is tough as it is at the top of a hill.
3. Project Limits and Key Areas: Chrissy reviewed the list of key areas discussed during the first meeting.
- a. It was noted that there was a suggestion to use the rail bed as a bike path several years ago, which was met with significant resistance. If this is a desired alternative, the group should be aware of possible resistance; although property owners may have changed over the past several years.
 - b. The possible cross-country path from the church to the bridge is on private property. Stan noted that the Town has an easement to construct a water main, but not to install a pathway.
 - c. Chrissy noted that the cross-country path south of the bridge is in the flood plain, which may create permitting issues.
 - d. It was noted that Florence Road is steep.
 - e. There was a discussion on connecting the school and the pool as key points of interest. The route could extend south to Holden Ave and the back on Park Street.
 - f. The group discussed the concept of enjoyable versus functional. It was suggested that Florence Road would be enjoyable as it is more rural and scenic.
 - g. It was noted that if the path goes to the south end of Beaver Pond, people may want to continue to the north end.
 - h. There was a discussion on whether the beach on the north end of Beaver Pond would be brought back. Stan noted that the Selectboard would like to get the beach back in service with barbeque and other amenities.
 - i. It was noted that GMP needs to install a viewpoint on the west side of the river as per their permit. Signage should be included to advertise this viewpoint. There should also be canoe and creek access on the east side below the falls.
4. Types of Facilities: Chrissy reviewed the brief discussion of facilities from the first meeting. Chrissy added that it was decided that the Local Concerns Meeting presentation would include photo examples of different types of facilities to give the public an idea of what they look like.
- a. Shared lanes were discussed. The group would like to have a photo example of a shared lane as it may be necessary at the bridge.
 - b. Susan noted that the Rutland Creek Path would be a good example of a shared use path. Susan will send a photo.
 - c. Susan noted that there is a bike lane in West Rutland.
 - d. It was discussed that marble sidewalks are a safety issue.
 - e. It was discussed that a shared lane would be acceptable for cyclists on Route 3, but maybe not for families.
 - f. If a shared lane was used at the bridge and down into the center of Town, it may be necessary to include a dedicated bike lane in the eastbound direction (uphill). However, there may not be space for a bike lane.

- g. Dale discussed that road crossings will be needed to connect new and existing pedestrian and bicycle facilities.
 - h. There was a discussion that the type of facility will likely change throughout the project area based on the characteristics and what fits.
5. Local Concerns Meeting: Chrissy reviewed the discussion on the public meeting from the first meeting.
- a. Steve noted that he could stir up the biking community.
 - b. The public meeting will be advertised in the Proctor Page, which is will be published in August.
 - c. It was suggested that a survey be developed to gain feedback from the community. Steve volunteered to work on this. Susan noted that West Rutland did a survey that could be used as a starting point. The survey could be posted online (survey monkey) or provided as a paper handout.