

To: Mark Thomas
NYS Office of Parks, Recreation & Historic Preservation
Prospect Street & Old Falls Street
Niagara Falls, NY 14303
From: Mike Madigan, Chris Aronica and Ray Billica (Grand Island Town Board Members)
Subject: Grand Island West River Bike Path Option 4 – Details
Date: August 18, 2016

Dear NYS Representative: The following are supporting details related to the newly proposed Option 4 that was voted on and approved at the 15–August–2016 Grand Island Town Board Meeting.

Option 4:

Description: The plan would be as follows:

- The path would be located in close proximity to the low speed West River Parkway Service Road.
- The path would be as close as feasible to the town owned right-of-way which runs approximately 10 feet from the edge of the service road towards the river.
- The path would run the entire length of the service road
- The parking locations for the path would ideally use the existing parking lots and one new lot at South trailhead:
 - Eagle Point is the trail-head and should be expanded significantly to accommodate additional cars.
 - Whitehaven overlook: Expansion should be considered here and crosswalk with flashing lights.
 - Fix Road overlook: Expansion should be considered here and crosswalk with flashing lights.
 - Consideration of a fourth parking lot should be given in close proximity to the Southern trailhead located at Beaver Island Park or in close proximity to this location.

Basis for voting for Option 4 and rejecting Option 3:

Option 4: The following are the considerations that formed the basis for the Grand Island Board majority vote in favor:

- The assessment that Option four (4) is the safest option and is significantly safer than Option three (3) for both pedestrians and motorized vehicle traffic.
 - Option 4 reduces the current safety risks to pedestrians and property by moving pedestrians and bikes from the service road onto the bike path without increasing traffic on the residential street.
- The serious consideration that this option continued to provide close proximity views of the river for the elderly and disabled – both along the Parkway (driving) and at the expanded parking lots. Option 3 significantly reduced such access and views to the elderly and disabled.
- Feedback from those most impacted, living near the Parkway, expressed a strong desire for Option four (4) over Option three (3).
- The closer proximity to residential homes, providing easy access just off the shoulder of the slow speed road, increases likelihood that the path would be

used by local residents more frequently and therefore maximizing the return on investment.

The following is the basis for voting against option 3:

- The assessment that Option 3 was the least safe of all options presented. Option three (3) will result in an increased risk of vehicle-vehicle and or vehicle-pedestrian accidents due to diversion of all traffic onto the service road from the Parkway (an increase of as much as 1000-3000 cars per day).
 - The increase in traffic is mostly concentrated during the morning and evening rush hours which coincides with when children wait for and or get on and off school buses, play and with the times that most pedestrians will be on the service road (getting mail, crossing to go to bike path...etc.).
- The serious concern that Option three (3) eliminated and or significantly reduced access and close proximity viewing of the river (driving/parking), as currently provided, for the elderly and disabled.
- The unpopularity of Option 3 by a majority of residents – as subsequently confirmed by the recently provided State comments where approximately 60% opposed option three (3).
- The overwhelming feedback from those most impacted, living near the Parkway, who expressed their strong opposition to Option three (3).

Terrain Observations/considerations:

- Starting from the North end of the west River Parkway slow speed service road heading South the following observations were made regarding the terrain and conditions found at certain points along the proposed location of the Option 4 path.
 - Eagle Point: Recommend expanded parking lot here – no impact to any homes and this is the trailhead – ideal location. This could be a one of two primary parking areas for the option 4 trail.
 - First mile starting at South end of low speed service road – Zone is flat, well graded with no obstacles, ditches or trees. Good buffer zone (100') between proposed location and Parkway (PWY) – berm and ditch protect between proposed location and PWY
 - 1.2 Miles: First obstacle – a minimal shallow ditch – approximately 3' wide in 2' deep. Terrain prior and for next 0.4 miles remains flat, well graded and with good buffer, berm and ditch between “zone” and PWY
 - 1.6 Miles – there are trees but on PWY side of proposed zone – no impact. The zone remains flat, well graded and good buffer as above
 - 1.8 Miles –One dead ash-tree at approximate location of proposed path (no leaves – requires removal). Zone remains the same as above.
 - 1.9 miles – Buffer between zone and PWY becomes smaller with approximately 25' buffer. Terrain remains flat – well graded Note: Entire 1.9 miles is straight and flat/well graded.
 - 2 miles – Six Mile Creek Bridge – bridge provides surface for path – minimal edge and approximately 30' surface between PWY and Service rd: This is a pinch point that began at approximately 1.9 miles constricts further. PWY is flat, and straight as an arrow here so minimal risk –This has been parking place since PWY built so pedestrians frequently have used this zone for decades.

- 2.3 miles: 6 mile creek pinch point gone – buffer is back to > 75' w/berm and ditch on river side – zone is flat and obstacle free – mostly already graded
- Whitehaven rd: 2.5 miles: All obstacles are on PWY side of proposed path zone. A good buffer between path and PWY again with berm and ditch most of the way.
- 2.6 miles: Shallow ditch crosses path (2nd one since Eagle point) – Shallow and minor obstacle 2' deep and 3' wide – culvert would address.
- 2.8 Miles: Whitehaven rd overlook: >100' buffer – flat, well graded. Berm and ditch adds additional protection from PWY
- 2.9 miles – A tree obstacle that you may want to divert around – still ~100' buffer and berm
- 3.1 Miles: Bike rt sign here: >100' buffer, well graded, flat, straight, berm and ditch protecting –straight shot as the crow flies, no curves no grades or hills, all flat.
- 3.7 Miles: : >100' buffer well graded, flat, straight, berm and ditch protecting – entire stretch from Eagle to this point is straight shot with no curves, hills, all flat.
- 4.1 Miles: : >100' buffer well graded, flat, straight, berm and ditch protecting – entire stretch from Eagle to this point is fairly straight with no curves, hills, all flat.
- 5 Miles: Cluster of brush/young saplings would need to be cleared – weed trees so no issue: >100' buffer, well graded, flat, straight, berm and ditch protecting.
- 5.5 miles – Fix Road: >100' buffer, well graded, flat, straight, berm and ditch protecting
- 5.7 mile: Shallow ditch crosses path – Shallow and minor obstacle 2' deep and 3' wide – culvert would address. Safe buffer zone from PWY to proposed location
- 6.1 Miles: > 100' buffer between proposed location and PWY – berm and ditch near PWY protect path location
- 6.6 Miles: Narrows here some with buffer of about 60' from PWY with berm and ditch most of the way.
- 6.9 Miles: Narrows more – buffer is approximately 40" – still a good buffer zone away from PWY.
- 7.0 Miles: Bush Road: Large buffer of >100" from proposed location. There is a slight ditch here and a curve.
- 7.1 Miles: Large buffer of >100" from proposed location. There is a slight ditch here and a curve
- 7.4 Miles: Small shallow ditch, same as above, >100' buffer
- 7.6 Miles: West Oakfield Road: Narrows some – buffer at approximately 60" from proposed location.
- 7.7 miles: A stand of trees – path likely would run the shoulder of road (go with park proposed plan here)
- 8.2 Miles: Locate trailhead parking lot here for the new trail. This would be more of a park like setting and may be wooded area and could be located within Beaver Island Park or in close proximity to it.

We look forwards to meeting with you to further discuss the planning of this project and working with you to make this project a success.

Best regards;
Michael Madigan, Raymond Billica, Christopher Aronica
Grand Island Town Council Members

cc:

- Victor O'Brien (vobrien@cscos.com) – Project Manager/Engineering Consultant
- Angela Berti (Angela.berti@parks.ny.gov) – Public Relations NYS Parks
- Rose Harvey – Commissioner NYS Parks