

Wednesday, November 15, 2023  
Special Workshop meeting for Albany Avenue Projects - Public Workshop #3  
Van Buren Hall  
Minutes

Present: Mayor Mike Abrams	Trustees: Dorene Weir James Mark Browne Susan Patterson Quinn Murphy
<u>Participants</u> HVEA: Jack Gorton, Brendan Fitzgerald  <u>Attendees:</u> Tina Lang, Elizabeth Martin, Bill Murphy, Sabine Murphy, Michael Suzi, Sean Sawyer, Laurel Nicholson-Browne, Astrid Montagano, Sandra Tolosa, Malcolm Bird, Alexandra Andersen, Nicole Heeder, Frank Curran, Joe Wildermuth, Bill Mancini, Max Murphy, Paul ____, others	

Trustee Browne discussed housekeeping. Mayor Abrams opened the informational workshop meeting at 7:09 pm. Discussed purpose of meeting was to present a few options to be presented to NYS DOT and listen to resident feedback. Next step will be to incorporate resident feedback into next draft of preliminary design which will be voted upon by the board. Then official design to go to DOT for feedback in December. Once a response is received from DOT with their feedback on preliminary design, will then hold another meeting to show residents any updates, get feedback again, and vote on final design to be sent back to DOT for approval, likely holding vote in January.

Housekeeping items and history:

Mayor asked Kate Johnson to investigate history of Albany Ave. specifically when sidewalks were paved and thanked her for her time. The concrete sidewalks replaced the dirt walkways on either side of Albany Ave. in 1908, the first paved sidewalks installed in the Village of Kinderhook at that time. It was a pilot project that was funded by surplus \$2,000 in village coffers at end of 1907. The sidewalks were so well received that residents approved a bond to fund the laying of sidewalks in other parts of the village in 1910. Reports on 1910 projects approvals and preparation captured the flavor of the time. A reporter for the Hudson Register explained that “taxpayers of Kinderhook village voted to raise \$10,000 by sale of bonds for over ten years, payable \$1,000 in interest each year. This sum would be used to construct cement sidewalks and is estimated to cover nearly all the walks in the village. A strong sentiment for the improvement brought out nearly every voting taxpayer in the village. Among them a goodly number of women. Automobiles and carriages were used to convey voters to the polls. The result of the vote was 87 for and 18 against the proposition. The experimental blank cement walks on both sides of Albany Ave. two years ago has been so satisfactory that residents of other parts of the village insisted on the extension of an improvement which added so much to the comfort and the beauty of the place.” This from an article in Hudson Register 1910. Mayor noted regarding Kinderhook women voting on sidewalk bond, before winning full-fledged suffrage, sometimes women were allowed to vote in local and school board elections. Reminded all that female New Yorkers won the right to vote 1917 and with 19<sup>th</sup> amendment ratified nationally in 1920.

Mayor discussed planning process:

- 1) stay within Right of Way, outmost edge of sidewalk to outermost edge of other sidewalk, guidance was we didn't want to take or ask for land;
- 2) meet DOT regulations; and
- 3) make sure to show residents every option possible. Review/discuss/get feedback. Mayor didn't want to predetermine decisions or outcomes or resident's needs. Feels role of Mayor is to facilitate process. Has met with dozen or so Albany Ave residents, wants everyone to know they can always call the Mayor or Trustees to sit down and talk to them one on one.

Transportation Alternatives Program fund grant overview: (Mayor quoted from website)

Sen. Schumer visited 2 years ago and made announcement for bill he wanted to pass to provide tens of millions of dollars to rural communities to connect outdoor recreation to drive customers to small businesses in rural communities. Received this grant in large part because of AHET and the proximity to our downtown area. This grant provides funding to get this project done, replacing watermain and improving Albany Ave. Mentioned financials are on website. The grant enables us to drastically improve quality of life for residents Albany Ave. specifically to use sidewalks, making them ADA compliant. It improves greenspace, installing more greenspace, curbs, proper drainage, and properly paved roadway, with brand new watermain. Knows we can keep charm and historical relevancy. Albany Ave. is a special road, but must balance keeping charm with ADA compliance, proper drainage, and keeping road safe. Very similar to what happened in 1908. Challenges tonight are problems of abundance not scarcity.

HVEA's Brendan Fitzgerald (BF) characterized project:

TAP grant's primary purpose is to create or improve pedestrian and bicycle facilities for this project. The village applied for funding, demonstrated need for the money based on condition of sidewalks, lack of bicycle facilities, and location of trail which fit into the grant program objective. When we met the first time and posed options, we didn't yet have survey done or other features that control design, but now do and have refined design. Takeaways from initial meeting were that people wanted to see improvements, were concerned with major changes like widening of road, and HVEA's primary takeaway was fitting whatever we do not just in right of way but in roadway. These TAP grants are federally funded, come with strings, have to comply with certain regulations, under oversight of DOT, using DOT guidance and design criteria and regulations based on federal requirements. The sidewalk is there on both sides of road, the only addition was we looked to extend sidewalk from Railroad down to trail, the limit of the sidewalk is the same, we're making them ADA compliant, even with narrowest section, we can't fit 5 foot sidewalks everywhere and stay within constraints. There are some areas of 4 ft., refining as we go, but objective is to put 5 ft sidewalks where we can and where we can't it will be 4 ft. On the Route 9 end by commercial businesses, looking to get rid of step up, raise and adjust road, put standard curb there, curb ramps, remove railing and steps, which would be a significant improvement. With bike accommodations, the gold standard is having separate facilities off the roadway, a shared use path like the electric trail. To do on this road would have a significant impact, you would lose sidewalks on one side and parking, so this was not feasible alternative for this segment of road. From that we incrementally went down and looked at impacts to roadway. Our preliminary design submitted to DOT included a 13 ft. shared lane (the minimum DOT standard for shared lane). That created some other concerns regarding lane widths. There's another option which is similar, with 13 ft. and a 7 ft. parking lane, maintaining that for length we can but in some sections where we are not able to fit that parking in. In many locations there's telephone poles in pavement, when we put a curb line in there and formalize that utility strip, we'll lose some width of pavement. By formalizing road, putting in curbs, helps with drainage and safety of sidewalk, helps maintain formal integrity of parking, benefits. The area of biggest impact is 600 feet from Railroad Ave. where right of way constricts to less than 50 feet. What we can fit in there is the travel lanes and parking on one side of street but not parking on both sides. After a shared use path, the next step down is to have a dedicated bike lane. A standard bike lane is 5 ft. which would create an additional impact, additional loss of parking and more width of pavement. One step down from that would be to have a 4 ft. shoulder, in case of the alternate shown tonight on the table, a 13 ft. shared lane with 7 ft. parking. We also have an

alternate that is a 10 ft travel lane, 4 ft. shoulder, and a 7 ft. parking. One is 20 ft. width, the other is 21 ft. width, either 40 feet for full width of roadway or 42 feet for full width of roadway. Either scenario can fit within constraints we have in terms of right of way. In going from 13/7 to 10/4/7 we lose additional five parking spaces and some area with 4 ft. sidewalks would need to be extended because of wider section.

HVEA mentioned the great turnout and relayed the intention was to lay out two alternatives to plan and facilitate a roundtable discussion at the table. Will provide brief overview of plans, answer initial questions, get up look at plans and point to areas with questions and concerns. The plan's dark grey area is paved area as it exists today, in some areas lighter grey indicates some areas of slight widening, but primarily fit in existing footprint now. Concept of consistency was mentioned. A 5 ft. sidewalk everywhere is preferred, in terms of roadway cross section for vehicles and bicycles, having consistency in that section is important as could create safety hazard, DOT would certainly look for that section of roadway to be consistent. We have a segment of road, it's Rt. 9 and the trail, this section has logical termini? makes sense to be a consistent roadway section for users. In terms of bicycles, there are people who ride bikes on Albany Ave.

HVEA provided background, projects they've worked on, lots of pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, designed trails all over Hudson Valley, has good familiarity with them. Brendan has seen people bicycling on Albany Ave., the majority are village residents getting to the trail. On the plan the green indicates vegetative buffer area between sidewalk and curb line. The orange/red color is where it gets to width of 2ft or less but needed for utility or pole but narrows down. Typically, less than 2 ft. is harder to vegetate the area, sometimes hardscaped instead. When you see red on plan it doesn't mean hardscape, it can be grass but generally harder to maintain in smaller areas. On plan there are symbols showing cross section, and below symbols is the survey information, showing existing roadway, edges of pavement, sidewalks, etc. Each plan has actual survey data we've taken information off of. Whatever final scenario decided, there will be refinements, looking at to be plan, curb, sidewalk tie in, other engineering considerations to work our way through, when do all this work there could be changes. Plan also didn't eliminate crosswalks by trail and route 9 just didn't want to show it in tonight's plan.

#### Q. and A.s - Trustee Mark Browne asked public for questions.

Bill Murphy asked according to the TAP grant you have to improve pedestrian and bike facilities – expansion sidewalk improves those, and bike as well, so what is the minimum improvement of bike facilities needs to take place to fulfill TAP grant?

Brendan Fitzgerald (BF) replied what was presented to the DOT, a 13 ft. shared lane is minimum standard for having a bicycle accommodation.

Mayor clarified all that really means is moving white line over a couple feet, the width of the road remains the same, the parking remains pretty much the same. Mayor is a proponent of not having white line at all. Other municipalities don't, Lee, MA, Chatham, NY, have white lines, parking is outlined, and it looks beautiful.

Billy Murphy asked what's most the important factor regarding severity of injury to cyclists on road? Thinks speed is most important factor.

BF replied the most important factor is that they both have space. Speed is important yes, but it isn't the only factor.

Billy Murphy asked do these plans increase the width of road, does that increase speed of automobiles? BF answered not necessarily, there are many factors that go into that. You have a village street that has roadside parking, even with a shared lane, there would be the need for some pavement markings. A sharrow is a symbol that shows a bicycle with an arrow indicated shared space with cars.

Billy Murphy asked would that kind of thing meet minimum requires for DOT, TAP grant, that we've done something to improve safety enhancements to road, and indicate to drivers and cyclists this is a shared space?

BF reminded the minimum is 13 feet. Mayor replied or 10 feet with 4 ft. shoulders and 7 ft. parking. The 2 options, 13 ft lane with 7 ft. parking or another option is a 10 ft. lane, 4 ft. shoulder and 7 ft. parking another alternative that meets NYS DOT regulations. The first option keeps road exactly how it is, the 2nd option widens road.

Billy Murphy asked isn't that the same thing?

BF answered providing that width is a shoulder, intended to facilitate bicycle traffic. It would be the bicycle accommodation. When you look at DOT standards the preferred width of a shared lane is 15 ft. and the minimum standard is 13 ft. If you include a shoulder width to accommodate a bike the preferred width is 5 ft. the minimum standard is 4 ft. Taking other parameters into consideration, the character of Albany Ave. the current traffic speeds, the amount of vehicle traffic, expected bicycle traffic, I'm ok with recommending the minimum standard, putting those parameters together, that's what makes the most sense. The village is lowering the speed limit on Albany Ave. to 25 mph. We've talked traffic calming features, down at the trail, look to put crosswalk at Route 9, putting up small permanent radar speed signs, to calm traffic.

Billy Murphy asked HVEA if they're expert on DOT regulations? Are there stipulations (in DOT regulations) for this 13 ft. shared space when it comes to village street, not city, suburbia, and an historic setting as well?

BF answered you're evaluating impacts. If you're widening the road 4 ft. to create space and that widening was impacting historic properties, we'd evaluate that impact. Here we're trying to reallocate space so its useful for all on road, not just vehicles or bicycles, that's the objective of project, staying within confines, not looking to expand.

Billy Murphy asked are there stipulations pertaining to village settings and historic village settings?

BF responded it depends on nature of what that impact is, eg. widening would be evaluate, there's scenarios where there's no bicycle impact at all.

Resident Paul \_\_\_ is sympathetic to village concerns about speed. Will there be more than just the speed table at Railroad, if you're having 14 ft scenario with a 10 ft lane, and Mike suggested white line at end of 10 ft., but potentially some colored pavements or dashes other than the sharrow to make it clear but essentially really just worried about speed. Is there any other ... markings?

BF responded we can put markings there, we're looking at road section, we could put markings in that 4 ft. section, the sharrows would be on the 13 ft. section, and we could put bicycle lane or other kinds of markings in that 4 ft. section if that was deemed appropriate.

Elizabeth Martin asked for renderings for what this might would look like?

BF states we didn't have time to do that for this presentation but if there's a need, although not a drastic change for cross sections of road.

Malcolm Bird questioned that one plans presented was 10 ft driving plus 3 ft bike lane, 7 ft parking?

BF replied it's not 10 ft. if it's 13 ft. it's a shared lane, if you put a white line in and define a safe place for bicyclists, then it would be a 4 ft. shoulder. 13 plus 7 or 10, 4, and 7, the difference is 1 foot.

Malcolm asked is that roadway going to be 42 ft. wide all way down or 40 ft.?

BF answered in the scenario where it's 10 ft. wide and a 4 ft. shoulder and a 7 ft. parking lane, where we have parking on both sides of road it would be 42 ft. In areas where that section will not fit in, we'd lose parking on one side, in that case 7 ft. would drop off.

Malcolm assumes its more than just narrowing and tapering of the road?

BF we'd adjust the curb line, taper in, run parallel to road.

Chris Ventura asked is 3 ft. lane as safe as 4 ft. lanes for bikes....?

BF said a 13 ft. shared lane is minimum for roadways with bike accommodations, the next step up would be to have a 4 ft. shoulder, then next step up would be 5 ft. shoulder.

Chris asked about next step and safety.

BF said it just creates more space, with roadside parking concerns with door, the more width, more comfort level for users, trying to weigh that.

Malcolm Bird said you speak on 10+3 as shared space, the other is 10 ft. plus 4 ft. shoulder, what's the difference between shared space and shoulder?

BF stated shared space, the bicycle is partly in travel lane of car, the car would have to slow down to maneuver around bicycle, depending on type of car, could do that in confines of yellow line, in other cases it might not, might wait for bicycle to get to location where it leaves roadway, or go around bicycle but there going to occupy same space. With the white line and 4 ft. shoulder, the 10 ft. lane accommodates vehicle entirely, the 4 ft. shoulder is intended for the bicycle. They wouldn't be in same space.

Sean Sawyer posed question about the red line area on plans. Would the curb be right against sidewalk or gravel between sidewalk and curb.

BF said there's no widening on road and explained the red area is just the buffer between the curb and the sidewalk, if more than 2 ft. shown as a vegetative buffer, it can be grass.

Sean Sawyer - that is widening the road because right now we have about 3 1/2 ft. of grass...?

BF will look at their house to see what's there, the curb takes up width (curb could be either granite or concrete the decision has not yet been made.)

Alex Anderson relayed, as current VP of Historical Society, they are concerned with changing historic nature of the village. Not hearing any aesthetic consistency with this project, are curbs granite? Also recommended consideration for residents of the village rather than tourist. Saw clever way to indicated bicycles on Nantucket. They extend bicycles along streets as symbol for bike lanes. No one stays in bike lanes, they ride on sidewalk, in streets etc. Thinks DOT is concerned with traffic but doesn't see DOT is concerned with residents who live in village. Begs every consideration is given to historic character of the village be maintained for safety and aesthetics.

BF replied that responsibility lies with the village not DOT.

HVEA showed two renderings, public gathered to view. (50 mins)

Trustee Mark Browne reminded there will be additional meetings at the end of month regarding historic preservation. Also a signs workshop along the corridor, what signs we're keeping and replacing according to regulations. In December will hold meeting on putting in new water main. Noted the Mayor worked hard to get funding to do the road, still working on funding for water or will have to bond it.

Liz Martin thanked Trustee Browne for his work.

Sean Sawyer asked are there different possibilities for road markings, will there be a workshop on markings or will that be in final design?

BF responded those things can be done in final design, will be presented and comments will be allowed then.

Chris Ventura inquired as to the safest option for cyclists and which of these options is more safe? Is a 4 ft. lane safer for cyclists or does wider road offset, meet safety requirements?

In BF's professional opinion would be dedicated space is always somewhat safer, not asking bike to coexist with traffic. Some safety enhancements to the bicyclists in the 4 ft. lane as opposed to a shared lane. When talking about a 10 ft. lane, 4 ft. shoulder and 7 ft. parking lane, talking about a slight bit of widening, the other scenario 13 ft. lane and 7 ft. parking lane is reallocation of space already there.

Malcolm Bird asked 7 ft. parking and 3 ft. bike lane? Per BF, it's not a 3 ft. bike lane, it's either a 13 ft. shared lane with 7 ft. parking or a 10 ft. travel, 4 ft. shoulder and 7 ft. parking. The other scenario that came up is status quo of leaving roadway at current function now without additional or dedicated space for bicyclist.

Resident inquired is there a NHTS safety data width of road impact on, can you say definitively if one design would be safer than the other?

BF replied no but typically a narrow road has more accidents but less severe.

Billy Murphy referenced a group at Johns Hopkins heard on NPR.

BF was aware and said it was part of a larger podcast on narrowing roads to reduce speeds.

Bill Murphy asked in the scenario where the road's wider would be going against that?

BF replied there are a lot of other factors to include, not just width, can find just as many studies to say there's no difference. Essentially bicyclists in a travel lane are a traffic calming feature.

Billy Murphy stated, the engineering problem you're working with, it narrows as it goes away from village center, is there a role for, 4 ft. bike lanes that works here but not here, is there a hybrid that could be done, where it widens, getting dedicated bike lane there but here have something more organic cars/bikes share the roads, leave parked cars in place which are also traffic calming measures, safety measures for pedestrians and traffic calming for cyclists, you get the dual objective of this project.

BF mentioned the importance of consistency, the concept of logical termini, go from one place to another and not necessarily changing, if someone went from 4 ft. bike lane into travel lane and got hit by car, how do you defend that, it wouldn't make engineering sense to take a roadway and fit it in space like that.

Billy Murphy said that's the reality of what we're dealing with.

BF said not wanting bicycle accommodations, keeping roadway as is, a valid theme. You have to look at objectives of project and criteria. If not going to show accommodation for bicycle have to justify why we're not going to. One thing we haven't done is count bicycles, that could be done. HVEA has started the process of looking at 3 year history of accidents along Albany Ave. but not a high accident area.

Malcolm Bird asked in 13 ft. wide roadway is there any option for marking outside of 10 ft.?

BF replied yes, those markings would be sharrows in right side of travel lane at an interval. Looks like bicycle intended to alert motorist it's a shared roadway and calming traffic.

Sabine Murphy is not against bicycle safety or bike lanes, or bicyclists, just wondering if you could restate what you heard us say, make sure you know what our concerns are?

BF said yes, the roadway as exists today with the travel lane width and parking where it is desired by many of you. Sabine mentioned it's not just parking it's many other things, snow removal etc.

BF said in final design could work on adequate space for snow storage and things like that.

Sean Sawyer stated with so many factors, it's very hard to be more integrated in discussion of what design is, to fully appreciate the impact, the different elements and how they relate to each other, you're just talking about road width without markings, without knowing where curbs are...

BF mentioned determining the cross section of road is important, it's like building blocks, can't design each scenario to the end because it takes considerable time and effort.

Sean Sawyer said you could show sharrow on one shared, then mark shoulder where white lines would be on other, would give more visual indication of how factors come together, right now there's a very abstract plan.

BF said we could offer some renderings to village to be able to share that. There are different ways to show intended space.

Discussion ensued while village showed pictures of Albany Ave. Mayor remarked in first option the physical footprint of road doesn't change, the white line is moved over to keep parking aligned and making wider so bicycles and cars can utilize lane at the same time. The second option, per DOT the space between the white line and where parking begins must be 4 ft. and parking has to be 7 ft. per DOT regulations. The second option proposes widening road by a foot on each side to get that. Could put no line, add white line later or just put sharrows instead of white line and mark where people can park.

Brendan Fitzgerald mentioned there's no room for parking in some areas.  
Resident mentioned speed challenges.

BF mentioned a toolbox of traffic calming things, alter path of vehicle so you have to do something. Has instituted medians, raised traversable medians, signs (residents don't want more signs), bumpouts, but they don't have much effect on a road like this.

Sabine Murphy recounted that one Saturday she counted 8 trucks in one hour which drove right down the middle. Cars were parked on right, left, and an oncoming car had to slow down, farm trucks have no intention of slowing down.

Sean Sawyer commented on marking options and sharrows.  
HVEA can show a couple renderings of what road section would look like using actual photos.

Trustee Susan Patterson asked for visual, near the Columbia Co. Museum, where the curb is too high. Confused about how they'll raise pavement and make it flush with Route 9.  
BF will show that with cross section there.

Sean Sawyer asked is there some kind of extra detection for light there?  
BF we will have to coordinate that with DOT.

Billy Murphy mentioned there's a reason Albany Ave. residents want preservation scenario...everybody has their own parking.

BF replied there's enough parking, it's just not in front of everyone's house.

Sabine Murphy mentioned parking at our end, Billy added there's some swells, majority of time we have to make adjustments, if all parking moved to one side, creates potential problems, discussed shoveling space and someone else is parking there. Absurd for a village.

BF grew up in small village, there's a lot of competition for parking especially on weekends, he widened his driveway.

Resident who lives at 32 Albany Ave. has lots of parking, doesn't need street parking, but parking on street is a community asset for the street and village, during events that's where people park, as well as informal trailhead on Albany Ave. Right now, parking removed in front of house, from his perspective parking is important. Prefers staying with existing scape, put sharrows on there for bikes, recommends polling residents, see unanimous support for leave alone option. He's not against bike safety, but that's one factor. Purpose is to replace water line and as a bonus get speed reduced. But spending a lot of time on something really no one wants.

Trustee Quinn Murphy mentioned the leave alone option may not meet DOT standards but that's ok as DOT allows for justifications to be made. Can get accident report, if shows 0 car and bicycle accidents, make a strong case to DOT to keep road the way is it. While presented as two options, they're not the only options, the road could stay same which many residents would want, giving justification to DOT.

Chris Ventura asked about bike lanes and ADA.

Sabine Murphy discussed bike safety was not a problem on Albany Ave. Raised her children there.

Trustee Quinn Murphy responded ADA 100%; we'll make sure we comply.

BF stated there's a process for justifying a non-standard feature. It's based on a lot of things, accidents, environmental impacts, property impacts, social and economic impacts. The DOT can not concur with it or they can. Some must come from here, the village and potentially county would have to show accommodations. You want sidewalks, road rebuilt, curbs, drainage, it is federal money and comes with strings attached. They are making a future investment and want return on investment. Every project has a null alternative which is to do nothing. There are hard decisions to be made, have to look at residents of Albany Ave. will take back concerns and incorporate and balance what we can.

Liz Martin asked do you intend to present, plan to propose something for this historic village that's unique, the best alternative, using justifications you were talking about?

BF replied you have to decide this in conjunction with the village and with your officials.

Mayor reminded this will be at village hall for the next several weeks, put on website, continue to talk to everyone, will set a date in December to decide what to send up for next draft of preliminary design, then hear back from DOT. HVEA to add renderings and graphics so they're at village hall.

Paul \_\_\_ asked for rendering including missing trees and moved utility as an option? Trying to get visual impression particularly a southbound perspective.

BF replied utilities poles are slight shifts, just moving them over for consistency. The vast amount of trees are cut back, some not in great health, some property owners wanted them down, some are utility nuisance, understand mitigation areas.

BF will take a look at photography to see if we can show corridor view, it's not a consistent canopy.

Billy Murphy said we used to, and has pictures that show literally a canopy with tunnel.

Malcolm Bird mentioned where the ROW narrows to 49 ft., in those areas the road will be right against the curb/buffer which are right against the sidewalk. About how much of whole stretch will be like that? BF responded it's constricted into an area of a couple 100 feet, the narrowest area that presents problem is about 600 ft. of roadway south of Railroad Ave.

Sabine Murphy questioned where would poles go? Other side?

BF replied we try to stay within utility buffer, just doing slight pole shifts, always looking to keep poles between sidewalk and curb line.

Joe Wildermuth commented the 13 ft. travel lane and shoulder is great design, but disingenuous to say that you can keep things the way they are now and accommodate bicyclists. Mentioned the condition of sidewalks now. Stated people aren't looking at this holistically, a 10 ft. lane on each side is not safer than 13 ft. lane. DOT roads 12 ft. wide, don't have road that goes down to 10 ft. then to bridge 8 ft. wide, then back to 12 ft., none of us could drive that. There must be consistency. Mark did wonderful job to put together an option that works for everybody. Also believes after it's done residents will love it, look at it with intent it was granted, bicycle and pedestrian improvements, look at this holistically. Notion you'll lose parking? Yes, but in village no one else has parking on street. Hudson and Church have some but most don't have that. To say, "I own that area in front of my house is incorrect."

Sabine Murphy mentioned she never said that. Never complained about parking in front of driveway... space for people who want to visit... very happy with work you guys do to work together to come up with holistic plan, for village, to make sidewalks safer. It doesn't mean she has to give up living in a historic village, have no parking in front of house because somebody got money....in this little section.... We do



not have to accept this but can really work as team together to come up with a plan to please Historical Society, Village and residents who live on the street.

Resident mentioned safety is concern for all of us. But for 22 years was unaware of any accident involving pedestrian or bicyclist. Suggests the continuation of Albany Ave. as it is now presents no danger. Obviously could use upgrades, new sidewalks, all improvement infrastructure we need, but would like to preserve street's historic character by keeping to current configuration. May run into DOT or ADA issue but we're on a national registry, we should upgrade and improve the road as it is, in his view is the best and surest way of preserving historic character of street.

Chris Ventura doesn't see how preserving parking on street preserves historic character of village. This is enhancing access to cyclists/pedestrians which have more right to street space. Asks instead of investing in DOT approved traffic calming measures would rather park cars?  
Mayor clarified that road isn't being widened. Just moving placement of white line. The actual footprint of road is exactly the same with some adjustments. Not expanding road.  
Resident said the illusion is the road is wider.

Paul \_\_\_ grateful for fact original design keeps existing sidewalks, outer edge to outer edge the way it is now, but the road has been adequately safe, not sure we need to widen car lanes that much. The bicyclist would benefit from wider lanes but the tradeoff is speed.  
Mayor said predominantly we agree things should remain the same regarding width, but we have more work to do on traffic calming.  
Alex Anderson asked what about the speed limit?  
Mayor we're working on getting that down.

Mayor thanked everyone for attending. Special meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

Meeting notes submitted by Sue Pulver.