TOWN OF BELMONT
COMMUNITY PATH IMPLEMENTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES
November 22, 2016

Present: Russell Leino, Chair; Brian Burke, Sr.; Michael Cicalese; Heather Ivester; Vincent Stanton

Staff: Jeffrey Wheeler, Office of Community Development

4:35 p.m.   Meeting called to order

1. The Committee met with Pare to review the segment meetings and to prepare for the Hot Topics meeting. Discussion ensued regarding the expectations from the meeting. All agreed that 2 issues need to be discussed:

    a. What does the Path look like (e.g., width, amenities/features, landscaping)
    b. How should we process and analyze the segments?

    Pare noted that a typical cross section for the path needs to be defined. Ms. Archer stated that this will be based on the Hot Topics and this will be setting the baseline for the Path so that the cost analysis can be conducted. She added that the Path will be designed so that it can be mixed and matched with various design treatments depending on the input from the residents. As a result, there will be 2 or 3 versions for each section.

2. The Committee reviewed Pare's list of Hot Topics and provided comments. Amy Archer provided a summary of what has been discussed at the meetings and highlighted critical issues. All agreed that one size does not fit all and questioned where these design elements can occur. Pare noted that some elements will not be appropriate in all locations. Ms. Archer stated that Pare is trying to look at path as a whole and not just based on the specific areas. She stressed the need for a definition of path so that the route can be costed out. She noted that Pare needs better definition from the residents – what do they want? She also noted that segments are distinct and close to residential properties. Ms. Fasser noted that is important to know the context of the path so that it can be designed accordingly. Mr. Leino suggested that guidance from Pare on these issues would be helpful. Ms. Fasser noted that Pare provided recommendations to address path segments and will provide costs. She suggested that if it is too expensive than it may ultimately be deemed infeasible. She added that funding may come in phases and questioned breaking the path into phases as well. Mr. Cicalese wondered how much of the Path can accommodate everything and suggested costing out the Path from there. Ms. Fasser noted that details on treatments will be done at the 25% design phase.

3. Pare reviewed the matrix and noted that it will be used to try to get down to what is feasible.

Pare reviewed the components of that make up the matrix and provided an overview of how these came about. Mr. Leino stated that we also need to know the cost implications of these issues and reiterated that not one size will fit all. Mr. Stanton stated that he has 2 issues:

a. Economic – it is hard to debate that it will not enhance property values. He argued that there are hard facts to substantiate the positive economic impact as noted in real estate ads.
b. Noise/Privacy – this issue can be addressed through the design of the Path.

Pare provided an overview of potential 'Fatal Flaws' and noted that any segment with such a Flaw would fall out of further consideration for the final recommendation.

All agreed that Pare needs to know what the Path will look like in order to cost each segment. Pare noted that it will provide conservative cost estimates (i.e., most costly alternative). All agreed that need to know cost because if it is too expensive then it cannot be feasible.

Further discussion ensued about how to get to a final Path recommendation.

7:00 p.m.   Adjourn