



Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee

Wednesday, February 26, 2025

At 3:30 PM

Via ZOOM

MINUTES

Members Present: Ian Golding (Chair), RJ Turcotte (Vice Chair), Edwin Claflin, Joseph Topham

Members Absent: Laura Walters, Michel Kremer, John Mynttinen

Staff Present: Mike Burns

Others Present: None

1. Administrative Items

- a) Call to order
 - The Chair called the meeting to order at 3:38PM
- b) Establishment of a Quorum
 - The Chair declared a quorum present
- c) Approval of Agenda
 - There was unanimous approval of the agenda
- d) Approval of Minutes – December 18, 2024
 - Not available for the meeting.

2. Action and Discussion

- a) Tom Nevers Bike Path alignment alternatives
 - Mike B presented the alignment options for a path along the east side of Tom Nevers Road, which was divided into two separate areas along the road: Options 1, 2, and 3 between Milestone Rd to Old Tom Nevers Rd and Options A bike lanes and Option B bike path for the section between Old Tom Nevers Rd to the end of the road. Options were developed by the project engineer, Weston and Sampson, and incorporated feedback received from abutters during summer 2024. The summary included benefits and challenges for each option, including property impacts, utility impacts, safety considerations, and cost.
 - RJ T suggested a berm for the bike lanes in Option A.
 - Ian G suggested the design include some delineation or signage to alert users of driveways.

- Joe T suggested Belgium block be used as a rumble strip to delineate driveways at path crossings and recommends the safest option and design standards be used.
- Edwin C noted that bike lanes typically are used as parking lanes and Option A is not the safest option for users.
- There was general discussion of a 1 foot buffered bike lane instead of a berm curb or single white line for the bike lanes in Option A and whether the path in Option 2 should be implemented for safety of users.
- Ian G noted that there was consensus to use Option B – bike path for the area between Old Tom Nevers Rd and the end of the road.
- There was general discussion of Options 1, 2, and 3 for the section between Milestone Rd and Old Tom Nevers Rd. Option 1 included a 10 foot wide path next to the road that narrowed at utility pole locations, Option 2 included a 10 foot wide path behind utility poles with about a 6 foot buffer, and Option 3 that included a 10 foot wide path with a 4 foot buffer and curved behind utility poles.
- Ian G noted that there was consensus to implement Option 3 with a 4 foot buffer.
- Mike B confirmed that the recommendation to the NP&EDC is to use Options 3 and B for the project.

b) Continue discussion of path stop sign removals

- Ian G noted he still needs to take more pictures for other bike paths so that a recommendation can be made to the Select Board.
- There was discussion of whether the Committee should provide a recommendation through the NP&EDC rather than directly to the Select Board.
- Mike B presented an option for replacing the bike path stop signs with a smaller 18-inch intersection caution sign (W2-1).
- Edwin C noted that if too much signage is an issue, perhaps a pavement marking should be used instead of signage. Also noting that the caution sign may not slow or stop bicyclists.
- Mike B responded that this caution sign is not a typical design standard used in federal or state design guidelines and is only a suggestion to consider based on the local bylaw.
- Joe T suggested Belgium block aprons be added to driveways to improve safety of path users and warn vehicles to observe path users.
- Ian G noted that this discussion should continue to next month.

c) Pleasant Street on-way pilot

- Ian G noted that he has heard that the one-way pilot is not popular with the community.
- Joe T also mentioned that he has not heard a lot of support for the pilot.
- RJ T disagreed with some feedback he has received that the pilot was unsafe and noted the community concern is mostly a convenience issue for driving and it was safer for biking.
- There was general discussion of impacts of the pilot on residents, the condition of the temporary pavement, and survey responses received during the pilot.

3. Other Business

a) Committee Comment

- Joe T shared a new bike path sign he developed with the DPW with rules of the road and best practices for path users. There are some small changes to be made to the prototype before implementation.

b) Public Comment

- No public comments.

4. Adjourn

- Motion by RJ T seconded by Joe T to adjourn. Vote to approve was unanimous.
- The Chair declared the meeting adjourned at 5:05PM

Submitted by:

Mike Burns