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February 23, 2005

Darlene L. Heller, AICP
City of Bethlehem
Planning and Zoning Office
10 East Church Street
Bethlehem, PA 18018

Re: South Bethlehem Greenway (SBG)
SJC # 04076.10

Dear Ms. Heller:

The following are minutes of the meeting that took place on 10 AM, February 14, 2005 at your offices.

Attending:

Darlene Heller   Director of Planning
Charles Brown    Director, Parks and Public Property
Tracy Samuelson Assistant Director, Planning
Jane Persa       Recreation Director, Parks and Public Property
Mike Alkhal      Director, Public Works
Larry Mika       Project Engineer, Public Works
Paul Swartz      USA Architects
Sarah Leeper     Simone Jaffe Collins (SJC)
William Collins  SJC
Peter Simone     SJC

1. The City has received two grants for the acquisition of the right of way: $100,000 from DCNR and $200,000 (Enhancements) from PennDOT.
2. The development of the South Bethlehem Greenway (SBG) is a recommendation of the 2012 Vision Plan.
3. The connections to the SBG will include the Sand Island recreation area to the northwest and eventually to Saucon Park to the East.
4. There was a parking study for the Five Points Area. Planning Dept. to provide copy to SJC.
5. Parking decks have been suggested by some for the commercial areas along the SBG.
6. There exists a subdivision plan for the Perkins Pancake lot. (Planning Dept. has provided copy to SJC).
7. The Rt. 412 project proposes a new ramp from 2nd Street to replace the 3rd Street ramp. Area of 3rd Street ramp becomes parkland. Planning Dept. to provide copy of plans to SJC.
8. Lehigh RiverPort, located just west of New Street, is a planned residential project with 178 units and parking garage. The structure is on the National Register of Historic Places and tax credits are being used for rehabilitation.
9. Active RR and levee adjacent to the river are not suitable for pedestrian bicycle activity at this time. The bridge near the Hill to Hill Bridge is active RR.
10. New commercial (ground floor) office (upper floors) building is under construction at 3rd and Polk by Ashley Development.
11. There are three “Tech Center” buildings located between New and Taylor along the river as business incubators.
12. Skatezone (indoor roller skating / blading is located east of Tech Center on river.
13. A goal of the Greenway project is to bring BethWorks visitors into the South Bethlehem neighborhoods.
14. BethWorks (180 acres) redevelopment is imminent. Property is owned by Perrucci. Plans will be made public shortly. The State is in the process of making a decision whether one of the two available gaming licenses will come to Bethlehem and BethWorks. Decision is at least 18 months away.
15. Student housing is significant in the area west of Brodhead Avenue.
16. Jeff Parks is the executive director of Arts Quest, which is located in the Banana Factory (an incubator for local artists and runs various shows and events). Jeff is a member of the greenway project committee.
17. Former “4-G’s” property (triangle on Third & Vine and on SBG) is owned by Bethlehem Economic Development Corp (BEDCO). Various offers have been made to the city for uses. City is waiting for SBG master plan to make decisions on use.
18. The existing Comfort Inn has some meeting rooms / conference facilities. Appears to be thriving.
19. The concept of considering the SBG, Parking Authority Parking Lots and Mechanic Street at “one” parcel was mentioned as a concept.
20. Some of the space in the Mechanic Street parking lot are leased on a monthly basis.
21. Twenty townhomes are proposed at Evans and Buchanan Streets that will front on the SBG.
22. Between 500 and 800 blocks (to Hayes) are an abundance of Latino owner-operated businesses.
23. Cantelmi is an existing hardware store at 4th and Pierce.
24. PP&L has investigated the potential for locating utilities within the Greenway R.O.W.
25. Existing parking lot at 4th and Pierce was designated at “green” plaza was recently purchased by adjacent church.
26. **Planning Dept. to supply SJC with Bus route Maps / Info** (there is some info on GIS).
27. “Discovery Center” building on 3rd at Pierce will be the new home of the Bethlehem branch of Northampton Community College. There are approximately 100 parking spaces that come with the building, but the college will require additional parking. The BethWorks developer owns the parking lots across the street, but to date, no commitment for use has been made.
28. As far as Public Works knows, there are no utilities that run in the SBG right-of-way. There are only utilities that cross the SBG right-of-way at the street crossings.
29. The Mechanic Street parking lots are filled during First Friday events.
30. Project area for the SBG is from Union Station to Lynn Avenue.
31. The City should contact NS regarding the option to retain some of the RR artifacts – including the RR crossing signs.
32. A potential phase 2 for the SBG would extend to Saucon Park.
33. Maintenance of the SBG will be an issue to be addressed in the master plan. City has had some success with “adopt-a-block” programs.
34. SJC requested any City of Bethlehem design standards for pedestrian crossings. **Planning Dept. / Public Works to provide a copy of standards to SJC.**
35. There are eleven grade crossings of the SBG within the project area.
36. Norfolk Southern will remove RR artifacts (signs, crossing signals, etc.) when they clear the rails and vacate the ROW.
37. There have been suggestions of including a trolley, tram or bus/van in the SBG, with service from BethWorks to the commercial center and perhaps later to Saucon Park.
38. Pedestrian and bicycle use in the SBG is a priority.
39. Ellen Larmer is director of the CACBD and is involved in outreach to the Spanish speaking community.
40. Delaware and Lehigh Corridor Commission is involved in the BethWorks project via Bill Mineo.
41. Ron DeBeers is the community liaison from BethWorks.
42. SJC requested data / maps to show City park and recreation facilities. **Planning Dept. / Public Works to provide a copy to SJC.**
43. Carl Bruno is the Park and Recreation Department South Side recreation coordinator.
44. The Bethlehem police do use bike patrols.
45. There is a Boys Club located at 4th & Taylor.
46. Darlene Heller supplied SJC with the following information and reports.
   - Bethlehem, Pennsylvania General Population and Housing Characteristics from the 2000 US Census, City of Bethlehem,
   - Trail guides to: Lehigh Canal & Towpath – Bethlehem to Allentown & Bethlehem to Freemansburg
   - City of Bethlehem, South Bethlehem Historic Conservation Commission Guidelines for Signage.
   - City of Bethlehem, South Bethlehem Historic Conservation Commission Design Guidelines.
   - Southside Vision 2012 Steering Committee, Open Space Committee, June 2004 – list of 15 objectives and comments.
   - Evans Street Townhomes, Subdivision and Land Development Plans, 4 sheets.
   - Lehigh River Port mixed use Land Development Plans, 5 sheets.
   - Subdivision plans for “Perkins Pancake House” lot, 2 sheets.
   - RR right-of-way maps, 22 sheets, dated 1916.
   - Zoning Map, City of Bethlehem. **SJC needs a copy of the Zoning Ordinance.**
   - CADD files, South Bethlehem Greenway right of way.
   - GIS files, City of Bethlehem.

The meeting concluded at approximately 11:30 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Simone Jaffe Collins
Landscape Architecture

[Signature]

Peter M. Simone, RLA, ASLA
Vice President

Cc: Paul Swartz
February 23, 2005

Darlene L. Heller, AICP
City of Bethlehem
Planning and Zoning Office
10 East Church Street
Bethlehem, PA 18018

Re: South Bethlehem Greenway
SJC # 04076.10

Dear Ms. Heller:

The following are minutes of the Southside Vision 2012 Open Space Committee meeting that took place on 3 PM, February 14, 2005.

Attending:

Darlene Heller Director of Planning and Zoning
Tony Corallo Lehigh University
Charles Brown Director Public Property & Parks
Roper Hudak Mayor’s Southside Task Forces
Thomas Kerr Wildlands Conservancy
Janet Ney Community Action Committee of the Lehigh Valley
David Shaffer Committee Chair, Just Born Inc.
Javier Toro South Bethlehem Neighborhood Center
Helene Whitaker Northampton County Community College
Ellen Larmer Community Action Development Corp of Bethlehem
Cheryl Weaver

1. The date and times for the first public meeting was discussed. The date that was agreed to (after the meeting concluded) was March 16. Two identical sessions will be held – from 3PM to 5PM and from 7PM to 9PM. Two locations to be arranged by the City / Committee.
2. Pete Simone suggested that the committee members attend one of the two meetings if possible.
3. The next committee meeting will take place on March 21 at 4pm at the same location as committee meeting #1.
4. The committee discussed the addition of several members to the committee for the South Bethlehem Greenway Master Plan. Darlene and other committee members to follow up on inviting others to be added to the committee. Potential new members included BethWorks, Police Department, D&L Corridor Commission, Northampton County, and others.
5. Pete Simone requested that the committee suggest persons for the key person interviews. Pete requested these names by the next committee meeting on March 21.

6. Tony Corallo requested a one-page synopsis of the project as a basis for a press release and involving students.

7. Peter Simone posturing the project as an economic development initiative.

8. Tony Corallo mentioned DCED as a possible funding source and that the University’s grant writer may be of assistance to the committee.

9. William Collins suggested seeking out funding partners early in the master plan process.

10. The Committee had a general consensus that the existing total parking in the project area should be maintained.

11. A list of goals, facts and concepts was developed for the Master Plan. These are attached to these minutes.

12. The meeting concluded at approximately 4:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted

Simone Jaffe Collins
Landscape Architecture

[Signature]

Peter M. Simone, RLA, ASLA
Vice President

Enc. list of cards from meeting
Goals, Facts and Concepts from the February 14, 2005 South Bethlehem Greenway Master Plan Committee Meeting. (page 1)

**GOALS**
- Master Plan
- Green Space
- Increase Property Values
- Support Business & Residences
- Transportation
- Keep Residences Here
- Maintenance Funding
- Business & Residence Support
- Model for Accessibility

**FACTS**
- Greenway – 1 mile, 11 acres
- Lynn Street to Union Station
- Existing Parking
- Variable Character
- Existing R.R. Right-of-Way
- Beth Works
- (11) Grade Crossings
- Little Existing Open Space
- Transient Student Population

**CONCEPTS**
- Involve Youth
- Sculpture
- Street Performance Space
- University Service Groups
- Parking – Public vs. Private
- Public Transportation
- Remote Lots
- Vehicular Free Area
- Study Surrounding Areas
- N. Bethlehem Railroad Connection
- Greenway Tram
- Greenway Linkages
- Funding Strategy
- Broad Vision of Greenway
- Add to Committee
- Outdoor Seating
- Handball
- Bocce
- Basketball
- Connection to River
- Add Commercial Space
- Bring Water to the Greenway
Goals, Facts and Concepts from the February 14, 2005 South Bethlehem Greenway Master Plan Committee Meeting. (page 2)

Open Air Market Space
Recreation for Residences
Skateboard
Tot Lot
Signage
Lighting
Outdoor Café
Public Participation
Key Person Interviews
Public Meetings (5)
Committee Meetings (5)
Nine (9) Month Schedule

Partners
D & L Corridor
DCED
DCNR
Parking Authority Lots
Project Partners
Lehigh University
Wildlands Conservancy

Northampton Community College
Arts Quest
Beth Works
Open Space Committee
South Bethlehem Neighborhood Center
Community Action Center for the Lehigh Valley
Community Action Development Corporation of Bethlehem
03.21.2005

South Bethlehem Greenway

SJC# 04076.10

PUBLIC MEETING #1 - MINUTES

Date/Time: 03.16.2005, 3 PM

Location: Banko Room, Banana Factory

In Attendance: See Attached Attendance Sheet

Notes:

1. Peter S. introduced the project with a fly-through. He stated the potential this project has to act as a catalyst for South Side Redevelopment. The project limits were reviewed, Peter S. pointed out that there are many different uses were along the Greenway such as: commercial, residential, mixed-use, and academic. He stated that the Greenway could at as a civic/public link connecting all these areas within South Bethlehem and in the future could extend on to form regional connections.

2. Peter S. reviewed the Goals, facts, partners, and concepts that had been collected to date and opened the meeting to public input.

3. There was an inquiry as to the width of the right-of-way and how SJC would address areas adjacent to the Greenway. Peter S. stated that on average, the Right-of-Way was sixty (60) feet wide and that in some areas where the City owns adjacent land such as the 4G’s property and the Mechanic Street Lots SJC will take a larger look at the whole area.

4. It was stated that both the Five Points area and the Hayes Street area were areas of high crime and that more policing was needed to insure the safety of Greenway users. In addition, the Greenway should be well lighted and vehicular access should be provided for emergency and service vehicles.

5. It was stated that the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, Northampton County, Bethlehem School District, and the Bethlehem Downtown Business Association should be added as partners.

6. Peter S. suggested that all organizations should consider submitting an official wish list for what they would like to see for the Greenway.
7. It was stated that linear parks attract gangs and crime. Peter S. stated that he was not familiar with any studies that drew such a correlation but would review that information if provided. He stated that research he had seen showed that greenways and parks have a reduction in undesirable activities as there is an increase in park users.

8. It was stated that there should be adequate trash receptacles along the greenway and that restrooms should be considered. Peter S. stated that restrooms can become a maintenance issue however there might be an opportunity for the private business sector to help maintain a public restroom in the commercial section of the Greenway.

9. It was suggested that LANTA and the private bus lines should be added to the partners list.

10. It was stressed that the greenway should be made more accessible to the western residential neighborhoods.

11. It was stated that there were few if any public parks for small children on the Southside and that the Greenway should incorporate a play area. Surfacing should allow for stroller use.

12. It was stated that from Hayes Street to Steele Street there are erosion issues that will need to be addressed.

13. It was asked why the Greenway was stopping at Lynn Street. Peter S. stated that eventually the greenway could connect with Saucon Park and that this segment of the Greenway is Phase I of the project and a starting point for a larger greenway.

14. It was stated that adjacent property use should be addressed now so that they do not infringe on the vision of what the Greenway should be. Peter S. stated that this could be handled through zoning.

15. It was stated that in the design of the Greenway surfaces and amenities should be ADA accessible and should be low maintainable, durable, and resistant to vandalism, and that utilities to support public events should be included.

16. An inquiry was made as to how wide a path would be and how multiple users could safely use the path. Peter S. stated that the path may be from ten (10) to Fourteen (14) feet wide, that the choice in path surfacing could limit the types of user, and that multiple surfaces could be used to help separate traffic.

17. It was stated that there was not enough hourly parking in the South Bethlehem business area and that parking should be addressed if the Greenway is to be successful.

18. It was stated that the Greenway should incorporate a band shell or performance area for First Friday use. Littering should be addressed through the enforcement of existing laws.
19. It was stated that the Greenway should incorporate sculpture and art. Various art installation projects could involve local youth to help create a feeling of ownership.

20. It was stated that native low maintenance vegetation should be used and that signage could be used to create an educational experience. Peter S. stated that there is funding that could be sought to create the Greenway as an arboretum.

21. It was suggested that an “Adopt-A-Block” program could be started to help maintain the Greenway and create a feeling of ownership.

22. It was suggested that local Scout Groups could be involved in various projects along the greenway.

23. Charles B. stated that signage will be used to help inform the public on the Greenway progress and to get them involved in the early stages of the Greenway development.

24. It was stated that the corridor between Third and Fourth Streets should be considered as a whole in terms of circulation and parking needs, and that Beth Works should be involved in the discussion.

25. An inquiry was made if the Greenway would be limited to use between dawn and dusk. Peter S. stated that this had not been determined and that it might be appropriate to have different regulations in different areas of the Greenway depending on the surrounding land uses.

26. It was stated that studies have been done that find Greenways help to reduce crime, increase property values, and increase a sense of community.

27. Helene W. stated that both Northampton Community College and Lehigh University have student groups that are planning on being involved in the Greenway development.

28. It was stated that the city should help to encourage the use of bicycle and alternative transportation to reduce the need for parking. It was also suggested that remote parking should be considered and that the greenway should include a tram/trolley to bring users into the Southside business district.

29. It was stated that a majority of the City parks prohibit dogs and that the greenway should allow for dogs with appropriate use guidelines.

30. It was stated that there is an annual spring clean-up that takes place from Hayes to William Street that should include the Greenway Area and should be increased to twice a year.

31. It was suggested that the Greenway should include signage about the history of the corridor. It was stated that the D&L had a signage program that could be appropriate for the area. It was stated that major view sheds to important structures such as to the 5 blast furnishes should be preserved.
32. It was stated that pervious materials should be considered for the paving of the Greenway.

33. It was stated that with the high number of pedestrian crossings that pedestrian safety should be emphasized and that public education on the right-of-way of pedestrians may be necessary.

34. It was suggested that the Greenway should allow for Skate Boarders.

35. It was suggested that the Greenway should incorporate the elements of the Railroad so that the history of the Corridor is apparent in the design of the Greenway.

36. It was suggested that the Greenway should have drinking fountains. It was stated that such amenities should be focused at the ends of the Greenway.

Next Public Meeting: April 27th Locations TBA

Respectfully Submitted,
SIMONE JAFFE COLLINS, INC.
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

Sarah R. Leeper
03.21.2005

**South Bethlehem Greenway**

SJC# 04076.10

**PUBLIC MEETING #1 - MINUTES**

**Date/Time:** 03.16.2005, 3 PM

**Location:** Banko Room, Banana Factory

**In Attendance:** See Attached Attendance Sheet

**Notes:**

1. Peter S. introduced the project with a fly-through. He stated the potential this project has to act as a catalyst for South Side Redevelopment. The project limits were reviewed, Peter S. pointed out that there are many different uses were along the Greenway such as: commercial, residential, mixed-use, and academic. He stated that the Greenway could act as a civic/public link connecting all these areas within South Bethlehem and in the future could extend on to form regional connections.

2. Peter S. reviewed the Goals, facts, partners, and concepts that had been collected to date and opened the meeting to public input.

3. There was an inquiry as to the width of the right-of-way and how SJC would address areas adjacent to the Greenway. Peter S. stated that on average, the Right-of-Way was sixty (60) feet wide and that in some areas where the City owns adjacent land such as the 4G’s property and the Mechanic Street Lots SJC will take a larger look at the whole area.

4. It was stated that both the Five Points area and the Hayes Street area were areas of high crime and that more policing was needed to insure the safety of Greenway users. In addition, the Greenway should be well lighted and vehicular access should be provided for emergency and service vehicles.

5. It was stated that the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, Northampton County, Bethlehem School District, and the Bethlehem Downtown Business Association should be added as partners.

6. Peter S. suggested that all organizations should consider submitting an official wish list for what they would like to see for the Greenway.
7. It was stated that linear parks attract gangs and crime. Peter S. stated that he was not familiar with any studies that drew such a correlation but would review that information if provided. He stated that research he had seen showed that greenways and parks have a reduction in undesirable activities as there is an increase in park users.

8. It was stated that there should be adequate trash receptacles along the greenway and that restrooms should be considered. Peter S. stated that restrooms can become a maintenance issue however there might be an opportunity for the private business sector to help maintain a public restroom in the commercial section of the Greenway.

9. It was suggested that LANTA and the private bus lines should be added to the partners list.

10. It was stressed that the greenway should be made more accessible to the western residential neighborhoods.

11. It was stated that there were few if any public parks for small children on the Southside and that the Greenway should incorporate a play area. Surfacing should allow for stroller use.

12. It was stated that from Hayes Street to Steele Street there are erosion issues that will need to be addressed.

13. It was asked why the Greenway was stopping at Lynn Street. Peter S. stated that the eventually the greenway could connect with Saucon Park and that this segment of the Greenway is Phase I of the project and a starting point for a larger greenway.

14. It was stated that adjacent property use should be addressed now so that they do not infringe on the vision of what the Greenway should be. Peter S. stated that this could be handled through zoning.

15. It was stated that in the design of the Greenway surfaces and amenities should be ADA accessible and should be low maintainable, durable, and resistant to vandalism, and that utilities to support public events should be included.

16. An inquiry was made as to how wide a path would be and how multiple users could safely use the path. Peter S. stated that the path may be from ten (10) to Fourteen (14) feet wide, that the choice in path surfacing could limit the types of user, and that multiple surfaces could be used to help separate traffic.

17. It was stated that there was not enough hourly parking in the South Bethlehem business area and that parking should be addressed if the Greenway is to be successful.

18. It was stated that the Greenway should incorporate a band shell or performance area for First Friday use. Littering should be addressed through the enforcement of existing laws.
19. It was stated that the Greenway should incorporate sculpture and art. Various art installation projects could involve local youth to help create a feeling of ownership.

20. It was stated that native low maintenance vegetation should be used and that signage could be used to create an educational experience. Peter S. stated that there is funding that could be sought to create the Greenway as an arboretum.

21. It was suggested that an “Adopt-A-Block” program could be started to help maintain the Greenway and create a feeling of ownership.

22. It was suggested that local Scout Groups could be involved in various projects along the greenway.

23. Charles B. stated that signage will be used to help inform the public on the Greenway progress and to get them involved in the early stages of the Greenway development.

24. It was stated that the corridor between Third and Fourth Streets should be considered as a whole in terms of circulation and parking needs, and that Beth Works should be involved in the discussion.

25. An inquiry was made if the Greenway would be limited to use between dawn and dusk. Peter S. stated that this had not been determined and that it might be appropriate to have different regulations in different areas of the Greenway depending on the surrounding land uses.

26. It was stated that studies have been done that find Greenways help to reduce crime, increase property values, and increase a sense of community.

27. Helene W. stated that both Northampton Community College and Lehigh University have student groups that are planning on being involved in the Greenway development.

28. It was stated that the city should help to encourage the use of bicycle and alternative transportation to reduce the need for parking. It was also suggested that remote parking should be considered and that the greenway should include a tram/ trolley to bring users into the Southside business district.

29. It was stated that a majority of the City parks prohibit dogs and that the greenway should allow for dogs with appropriate use guidelines.

30. It was stated that there is an annual spring clean-up that takes place from Hayes to William Street that should include the Greenway Area and should be increased to twice a year.

31. It was suggested that the Greenway should include signage about the history of the corridor. It was stated that the D&L had a signage program that could be appropriate for the area. It was stated that major view sheds to important structures such as to the 5 blast furnishes should be preserved.
32. It was stated that pervious materials should be considered for the paving of the Greenway.

33. It was stated that with the high number of pedestrian crossings that pedestrian safety should be emphasized and that public education on the right-of-way of pedestrians may be necessary.

34. It was suggested that the Greenway should allow for Skate Boarders.

35. It was suggested that the Greenway should incorporate the elements of the Railroad so that the history of the Corridor is apparent in the design of the Greenway.

36. It was suggested that the Greenway should have drinking fountains. It was stated that such amenities should be focused at the ends of the Greenway.

Next Public Meeting: April 27th Locations TBA

Respectfully Submitted,
SIMONE JAFFE COLLINS, INC.
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

[Signature]

Sarah R. Leeper
03.21.2005

South Bethlehem Greenway

SJC# 04076.10

PUBLIC MEETING #2 - MINUTES

Date/Time: 03.16.2005, 7 PM
Location: Forte Building
In Attendance: See Attached Attendance Sheet

Notes:

1. Mayor John Callahan introduced the project noting the great potential this project has to connect the Southside neighborhoods and be a further catalyst for redevelopment.

2. Peter S. reviewed the project limits, pointing out that there are many different uses happening along the Greenway such as: commercial, residential, mixed-use, and academic. He stated that the Greenway could act as a civic/public link connecting all these areas within South Bethlehem and in the future could extend on to form regional connections.

3. Peter S. reviewed the goals, facts, partners, and concepts that had been collected to date and opened the meeting to public input.

4. It was suggested that the Greenway should include weather shelters, similar to bus stops, and safety call boxes.

5. It was stated that there were vacant lots in the Hayes Street Area that should be considered for parking for nearby commercial uses.

6. It was suggested that the western end of the Greenway could be developed as a civic gathering space with opportunities for bike rentals, a farmer’s market, and community gardens. It was stated that the Greenway should be well lit and that dogs should be permitted.

7. The planting of wildflowers along the New City High Line project was sited as a possible example/model for the stages of development along the Greenway.
8. It was suggested that the local schools should be involved as partners through science classes, environmental clubs, and ASPIRE programs. It was also suggested that flyers regarding the next public meeting should be distributed to the schools.

9. It was stated that St. Luke’s, South Bethlehem Historic Society and Friends of Steel should be added to the Partners list.

10. It was stated that community ownership would be key in maintaining the greenway and programs should be developed to encourage ownership from the start of the project.

11. It was stated that some of the rear yards along the Greenway create an undesirable atmosphere and that the city may want to consider instituting a program similar to the façade programs to help owners improve their rear yards.

12. It was stated that the zoning along the Greenway should be addressed to ensure that the vision of the greenway is preserved. Peter S. suggested that this might be accomplished by creating a Greenway Overlay zoning district.

13. It was stated that the gentrification of the South Bethlehem Neighborhoods should be avoided and that the City should consider programs to maintain and support small businesses and low income housing. Janet N. stated that CACLV is in the process of performing a study on neighborhood gentrification.

14. It was suggested that the Alliance for Building Communities (ABC) should be added to the partners list.

15. It was suggested that an area for Skate Boarders should be included along the Greenway and that a police substation should be included in the eastern end of the Greenway, and that mulch paths should be considered.

16. It was inquired how the Greenway would terminate at the eastern end (South Terrace neighborhood) of the Greenway. Peter S. stated that SJC would explore ways to connect the Greenway to the neighborhood so that there is not an abrupt ending to the Greenway.

17. It was suggested that the South Side churches and business should be added to the partners list along with Le Poco (Puerto Rican Coalition).

18. It was asked if County Open Space Funding would be sought as a source of funding and if so they should be added to the partners list. Peter S. stated that they would be a possible funding source.

19. It was stated that an outdoor area should be included for music festivals.

20. It was inquired if Growing Greener Two would be an appropriate funding source. It was stated that the Greenway should use recycled materials.

21. It was stated that seasonal programs should be developed to encourage people to use the greenway throughout the year.
22. It was stated that Southside lacks adequate parking in the area of the Greenway and that city should work with Beth Works to encourage the building of a parking deck at the Third and Pierce Street Lots that could serve both the south side businesses and Northampton Community College.

23. It was stated that the City should offer Trolley Service that connects remote parking to businesses and the Greenway.

24. It was stated that the city should plan for adequate trash and recycling receptacles and removal.

25. It was suggested that volunteer programs should be developed and signup sheets should be posted throughout the community.

26. It was suggested that street vendors should be permitted along the Greenway.

27. It was stated that Historic Signage should be incorporated along the Greenway and that it should tie into the proposed Beth Work’s Worker Museum.

28. It was suggested that the City should increase the sight triangles along the Greenway to at least twenty-five (25) feet to ensure the safety of bicyclist, and that the trail should include signage on trail rules and proper trail usage.

Next Public Meeting: April 27th Location TBA

Respectfully Submitted,
SIMONE JAFFE COLLINS, INC.
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

[Signature]

Sarah R. Leeper
South Bethlehem Greenway Master Plan  
Public Meetings #1 & #2  
Goals, Fact and Concepts generated by attendees.

### Goals
- Master Plan
- Green Space
- Increase Property Values
- Support Businesses & Residents
- Keep Residents Here
- Transportation
- Business & Resident Support
- Maintenance Funding
- Extend East to Saucon Park
- Keep Existing Residents
- Community “Ownership” of Greenway

### Facts
- Greenway 1.75 Miles, 11 Acres
- Lynn Street to Union Station
- Existing Parking
- Variable Character
- PennDOT to Build a Bike Route from Lynn Street to Park
- Existing R.R. Right-of-Way
- Beth Works
- (11) Grade Crossings

---

### Facts (continued)
- Little Existing Open Space
- Façade Improvement Loan Program to Focus on Backyards
- Difference in Percentage of Renters vs. Homeowners
- Site a Police Sub-Station
- Mechanic Street Bus Depot
- Parking
- Residential & Business Neighborhoods
- Crime Risk – Hay Street Steel, 5 Points
- Additional Police
- Width of R.O.W. ~ 60 ft.
- Hill to Hill Ramp
- Gang Activity?

---

### Concepts
- Public Participation
- Key Person Interviews
- Public Meetings (5)
- Committee Meetings (5)
- Nine (9) Month Schedule
- Next Public Meeting – April 27th
South Bethlehem Greenway Master Plan
Public Meetings #1 & #2
Goals, Fact and Concepts generated by attendees.

### Concepts (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open Farmers Market</td>
<td>Walking Historic Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Review to Ensure Greenway Protection</td>
<td>Workers Museum at Beth Works (Proposed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Artist Gallery</td>
<td>Look at Zoning Setbacks Next to Greenway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Small Businesses</td>
<td>Traffic Signals/Signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on Gentrification Issues</td>
<td>Outdoor Performance Area (Deck)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Crime Issues</td>
<td>Growing Greener Two funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate trail use by “Lanes”</td>
<td>Use Sustainable Design Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforce No Skateboarding</td>
<td>Make Greenway a Community Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Safety Issues</td>
<td>Public-Private Partnerships to Solve Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibit Bikes</td>
<td>Parking Needed 3rd – 4th Street “Core”, 5-800 Block of 4th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicate Area for Skateboarding</td>
<td>New Trolley Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locate Recycling Center</td>
<td>Divide Responsibility of Each Segment by Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dead End at Lynn Ave?</td>
<td>County Open Space Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Access</td>
<td>Greenway is “Backyard” of Many Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand Site Angles at Intersections</td>
<td>Uses? – Walk, Bicycle, A.D.A. Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlist Community Volunteers</td>
<td>Shelters for Inclement Weather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling Programs</td>
<td>Call Boxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court System for Community Service</td>
<td>Security Video Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Vendors</td>
<td>Well Lighted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Signage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tie Back into Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
South Bethlehem Greenway Master Plan
Public Meetings #1 & #2
Goals, Fact and Concepts generated by attendees.

**Concepts (continued)**

New St. 3\(^{rd}\) – 4\(^{th}\) Bike Rentals
Empty Lots Near Hayes Bike Parking
Large Garden – Interim, Ultimate
Incorporate Fitness Trail
Community Vegetable Garden
Structural Improvements? Retaining Walls
378 Crossing – Non-Motorized
Why Lynn Ave. Terminus?
Trolley Within R.O.W.?
Infringe on “People Place”
Zoning Revisions from Plan?
Adequate Lighting
ADA
Appropriate Construction Materials
Low Maintenance
Public Event Areas with Utilities
More Partners
Physical “Training” Stations
Design for Surveillance & Defensibility
Rest Rooms, Trash Cans
Use Materials to Segregate Users
Accessibility to Brighton Avenue Etc.

Recreation for Small Children
Performance Area / Bandshell
Parking – Daily, Events
3\(^{rd}\) to New Street – 1-way Street with Parallel Parking
Involve Children in Greenway Development
Outdoor Sculpture
Enforce Anti-Litter
Walkway “Right-of-Way” at Local Intersections
Maintain Safe Sight Lines for Intersections
Retain Elements of R.R.
Skateboarding Use
Reuse R.R. Materials (Ties, Signals)
Incorporate I-Beam Benches
Water Fountains
Vendor Cart Zoning
Focus Services on “Trailheads”
Day-Long Use
Dog-Owner Responsibility in Greenway
Parking Deck in 5 Points Area
### Concepts (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East 3rd Street Area Lot Bought by Developers – Possible Parking Deck</td>
<td>Hours of Operation for Greenway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Spring Clean-up – Lehigh University – Increase to 2/year</td>
<td>Other Uses – Mechanic Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Interpretation &amp; Signage</td>
<td>(2) Colleges to be Active in Greenway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Impervious Surfaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D&amp;L Signage System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create “Ownership” in Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt a Block</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Native Plants &amp; Identify (Arboretum)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Greenway Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Volunteer Labor (Scouts). Create “Buy-In”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Works Parking Areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public-Private Partnerships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Flyers for Users</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redirect Traffic Thru 2nd Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need More Daily/Hourly Parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote Parking for Events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial “Endowment” for Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who will Maintain?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramp to Displace Existing Billboards?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project Partners

- D& L Corridor
- DCED
- DCNR
- CACLV
- CADCB
- Parking Authority
- Schools – (3) on South Side + High School
- Historic Groups (3)
- Bethlehem Composting Works
- Project Partners
- Lehigh University
- Wildlands Conservancy
- Northampton Community College
- Arts Quest
- Beth Works
- Open Space Committee
- South Bethlehem Neighborhood
Project Partners (continued)

P.C.C. – Puerto Rican Cultural Coalition

PennDOT

School District

Northampton County

Downtown Business Association

A.B.C. – Alliance for Building Communities

Bethlehem Housing Authority

Churches

South Side Businesses

Moravian College

Transit Companies

Contact Bethlehem Transmission

St. Luke’s

South Bethlehem Historic Society

Friends of Steel
03.22.2005

South Bethlehem Greenway

SJC# 04076.10

TASK FORCE MEETING #2 - MINUTES

Date/Time: 03.22.2005, 4 PM

Location: Forte Building

In Attendance:

Charlie Brown – Open Space Committee (OSC)
Tony Corallo – OSC
Rob DeBeer – Beth Works
Darlene Heller – OSC
Gordon Heller – Northampton County
Roger Hudak – OSC
Dale Kochand – Lehigh University
Ellen Larmer – OSC
Sarah Leeper – Simone Jaffe Collins (SJC)
Brian Nagle – OSC
Janet Ney – OSC
Jeff Parks – OSC
Rene Schnabel – D&L
David Shaffer – OSC
Peter Simone – SJC
Javier Toro - OSC

Notes:

1. Peter S. presented the major trends from the public meetings. He stated that the overall public sentiment for the Greenway was positive and supportive, that the public felt the Greenway should be a green space within the city, that parking was a key concern in both the business and residential areas, that safety was a concern, that there was a strong support in early projects to develop interest in the Greenway, and that there was a good understanding of the importance of partners and community support for the Greenway to be successful. Peter S. asked if the committee had anything to add to the list, they did not.

2. Peter S. asked that the committee review the Key Person Interview list and suggest if anyone should be added to the list. Janet N. suggested that Mike Topping of CACLV, David Lelp of CADCB, Joe Craft of Lehigh County, and Carl Bruno along with local teenagers should all be added to the list.
3. Peter S. suggested that the City setup a page on their web site for the Greenway project so that the public could have access to meeting minutes and updates on the Greenway project development. Darlene H. said that this could be done and asked that SJC send all the current meeting minutes in electronic forms for posting. Charlie B. suggested that the Parks and Public Property could post information on their web site. Janet N. stated that CACLV would also like to post information on their web site. **Darlene H. agreed to forward information to both for posting on their web sites.**

4. Peter S. asked the committee what they felt should be translated into Spanish and posted on the web site. It was agreed that *Public Meetings #1 & #2 Goals, Fact and Concepts generated by attendees* should be translated into Spanish with a brief introduction explaining how they where generated. It was also suggested that project description, *South Bethlehem Greenway, March 16, 2005* should also be translated into Spanish.

5. It was agreed that Darlene H. would act as the Greenway Task Force contact and that SJC would email her meeting minutes to be distributed to the Task Force. **Peter S. asked that Darlene H. update the Task Force List for SJC.**

6. It was asked if flyers had been sent out through the schools to announce the public meetings. Javier T. stated that he was able to get it approved and handed out at one of the three public elementary schools, but had not had enough time to have it approved by the other schools. It was suggested that for the next meeting the flyer should be approved by the superintendent’s office. It was also suggested that Holy Infancy and local High Schools should be added to the distribution list. It was inquired if flyers had been place in key commercial areas; it was stated that they had. Peter S. suggested that the newspapers should be given a press release prior to the next public meeting.

7. Peter S. reviewed a list of funding source sighting Federal, State, and Local funding sources. He suggested that the committee start to consider funding sources to avoid conflicts with other funding goals for the city. David S. suggested that local businesses and corporations be considered for sources of funding. It was stated that private donations could help to fund capital improvements, maintenance, and programs along the Greenway. It was stated that CACLV or CACDB could serve as a vehicle to engage the private sector for funding or the formation of a Greenway Development Authority might be appropriate. St. Luke’s, the Ryder Pool Foundation, Rodeo, and Eastern Hospital were all stated as possible sources of funding through healthy communities initiatives. Charlie Brown stated that the City is submitting an application to DCED for a Comprehensive Parks and Open Space Plan for the City. Short discussion about the possibility of the City submitted a DCNR application (April 15) for additional planning for phase 1 of the greenway construction that that there might be funding in place for these soft costs – positioning an October 2005 Enhancements/ Home Town Streets application for success.

8. Gordon Heller of Northampton County gave SJC the grant guidelines for the county “Green Futures” grant program that has been established, but not fully authorized to date.
9. Peter S. asked that Darlene H. provide SJC with contact information for the
designers of the 2nd Street ramp project. He suggested that Penn Dot should
be contacted and asked to consider how the ramp will interact with the
Greenway. Jeff P. asked if the 3rd street ramp was to be demolished.
Darlene H. stated that this had not been determined however the historic
features associated with the 3rd street ramp could be moved to the new ramp.

Darlene H. stated that this was still being determined. It was suggested that
there were key locations at the eastern end at which the Greenway could
connect to the residential neighborhoods, however this would require
separation of the Greenway from the active rail lines.

11. Roger H. stated that the Penn Dot Route 412 improvements plans
incorporate a bike line to Saucon Park. He also stated that the city owns land
between the rail lines and residential properties that could be used to connect
to Saucon Park.

12. Dale K. stated that the Lehigh Dean of Students felt there would be a strong
interest within the student population concerning the Greenway, and suggests
that contact be made soon to insure interest and support when students
return in the fall.

13. Roger H. stated that Beth Works is very supportive of the Greenway, that a
main goal of their development is to join into the existing neighborhoods, and
that they see the greenway as a key opportunity to accomplish this goal. He
also stated that Beth Works is planning on constructing a Farmers Market.

Next Task Force Meeting: April 21st 4 PM, Forte Building

Next Public Meeting: April 27th 3-5 PM, Location TBA and 7-9 PM, Forte Building

Task Force Meeting #4: May 11th 4 PM, Forte Building

Public Meeting #3: June 22, Location and Time TBA

Respectfully Submitted,
SIMONE JAFFE COLLINS, INC.
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

Sarah R. Leeper
04.25.2005

South Bethlehem Greenway

SJC# 04076.10

TASK FORCE MEETING #3 - MINUTES

Date/Time: 04.21.2005, 4 PM

Location: Forte Building

In Attendance:
Charlie Brown – Open Space Committee (OSC)
Carl Bruno – OSC
William Collins - Simone Jaffe Collins (SJC)
Rob DeBeer – Beth Works
Darlene Heller – OSC
Roger Hudak – OSC
Dale Kochand – Lehigh University
Sarah Leeper – SJC
Janet Ney – OSC
David Shaffer – OSC
Peter Simone – SJC
Javier Toro - OSC

Notes:

1. Peter S. started the meeting by reviewing the project to date. He reviewed the Land Ownership surrounding the greenway, identifying possible parcels that might be considered for acquisition. He presented the three segments of the Greenway that SJC had reviewing the characteristics of each.

2. Bill C. reviewed the site analysis for the East Greenway Segment. He pointed out the existing bus stop at Fourth St. and Steel St. adjacent to the PennDot parcel suggesting that this would be a natural area to develop an activity node for the greenway.

3. Points at which pedestrian connections from surrounding neighborhoods could be made where identified. A typical plan and section of how a connection could be made where reviewed. Charley B. stated that the existing walls and embankments along Railroad St and Daly Ave. should be addressed. Bill C. stated that improvements plans are being developed for Daly Ave. to provide for entrances into Beth Works development. He suggested that in exchange for helping to construct a portion of the Greenway...
the City might provide Beth Works with the necessary linear footage for road improvements from the Greenway right-of-way.

4. Darleen H. inquired how this could be done if the Greenway was purchased using DCNR of Federal funds. Peter S. suggested that in acquiring the railroad right-of-way the city should separate out certain areas for purchase with funds other than State of Federal.

5. Bill C. addressed the separation of the eastern end of the Greenway from existing active railroad tracks. He suggested that the Fourth Street bridge underpass and abutments could be used as a gated controlled point. It was pointed out that this would prohibit an immediate greenway connection to neighborhoods east of the Lynn Street Bridge.

6. Bill C. stated that the underpass could also be developed as a skate park. Charley B. stated that he was in the process of applying for a $135,000 grant to develop a skate park. He stated that he had a location chosen but not finalized.

7. Charley B. stated that the City should be looking into the acquisition of railroad right-of-way to Saucon Park. Darleen H. stated that Norfolk Southern (NFS) would be open to negotiations for the part of the right-of-way east of the rail yard; however the rail yard may be too profitable a parcel to NFS for the city to negotiate with NFS. Peter S. stated that the city might negotiate an easement with NFS along the southern edge of the yard, or that the city considers using an “Official Map” showing the Greenway in the desired location to reserve the Greenway alignment.

8. Peter S. reviewed the analysis of the Central Greenway Segment, addressing the unique character of the multiple crossings along the Greenway along this segment.

9. He stated that each crossing could be “celebrated” by displaying unique art or railroad artifacts.

10. Bill C. addressed the area of the municipal parking lots and the bus terminal. He suggested that the city should relocate the bus terminal to a more public area; keeping in mind that it should be close to the university campus and along the regional bus routes.

11. Peter S. presented the concept of a structured parking deck with first floor commercial along the Greenway in the area of the municipal parking lots between Adams and Webster. He stated that during the first public meeting parking seemed to be a major concern. The income generated from the commercial development could help to pay for Greenway improvements. It was pointed out that by creating a structured parking deck the adjacent municipal parking lots could become part of the Greenway.

12. Peter S. presented the site analysis for the Western Greenway Segment, pointing out the impact of the proposed 2nd Street Ramp on the circulation of the area.

13. Bill C. reviewed SJC’s analysis of the proposed second street ramp stating. He stated that both the entrances to the Perkins and Union Station need
refinement to maintain access to these sites. He suggested that the area between the two ramps would become a natural bowl with poor street visibility.

14. Bill C. reviewed SJC’s proposed Ramp Schematic which explores the idea of relocating the tank storage facility into the natural bowl between the ramps, where it would be less visible. This would open up its present location along the Greenway for a public plaza. He presented the idea of the historic rail yard round house acting as the driving theme for the public plaza.

15. Pete S. inquired if the committee would like SJC to present all the ideas at the April 27th public meeting.

16. Janet N. stated that we might overload the public meeting with the vehicular circulation concerns. It was agreed upon to state that the intersection of Third Street and Daly Avenue needs additional study.

17. David S. stated that he felt the public should see the entire presentation so that they are allowed to react to it. Pete S. stated that SJC would create a brief survey to hand out at the meeting to gage the public reaction.

Task Force Meeting #4: May 11th 3 PM, Forte Building

Public Meeting #3: June 22, Location and Time TBA

Respectfully Submitted,
SIMONE JAFFE COLLINS, INC.
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

Sarah R. Leeper
South Bethlehem Greenway
SJC# 04076.10

PUBLIC MEETING #3 - MINUTES

Date/Time: 04.27.2005, 3 PM
Location: Sayre Hall, Church of the Nativity
In Attendance: See Attached Attendance Sheet

Notes:

1. Peter S. asked the public to review the handout of the Goals, Facts & Concepts generated at the first and second public meeting. He also asked the attendees to complete the public opinion survey provided at the meeting.

2. Peter S. presented the project site analysis and concepts. He stated that this meeting would focus on the bigger concepts surrounding the greenway such as: parking, neighborhood connections, public transit and public plaza. He stressed that the trail amenities are not being overlooked.

3. William C. suggested that the city consider a permanent location for the long distance bus terminal that is centrally located and easily assessable to students and the LANTA bus routes.

4. It was asked how much additional parking would be needed along the greenway and how parking in the Greenway would not conflict recreation activities.

5. Peter S. stated that a parking study was beyond the scope of this project, however the lack of parking was a major concern brought up at the first and second public meeting. He suggested that parking issue be dealt with in stages the first being on street parking; the next small surface lots at trail heads along the greenway; and last a structured parking development. He suggested that the need for a parking structure is 6-8 years down the road.

6. It was stated that the greenway plan should allow for future Passenger Rail lines to be reestablished in the corridor. And that it is necessary to insure that the City preserves a connection to the south. Peter S. stated that the City is reviewing options for making a connection to Saucon Park.

7. It was stated that the currently McNamara Park is underused.

8. It was stated that the multiply connections into the eastern Southside neighborhood was a great idea. It was suggested that ramps should be
considered for some of the connections. Peter S. stated that where possible ramps would be provided.

9. It was stressed that the Greenway will increase the need for a program to educate drivers and Greenway users on proper street crossing rules.

10. It was stated that the parking Garage was a good idea due to the growth within the Souhtside and that a structure of 300 spaces is currently needed.

11. It was inquired what the surface of the trail would be and suggested that the design consider the use of multiply surfaces such as grass, gravel, and asphalt to separate uses types. Peter S. stated that at a minimum the trail would be 12' wide asphalt.

12. It was stated that the greenway could be used to incorporate alternative modes of transportation in the Southside. Peter S. suggested that this could take on many forms one idea could be a community bike program.

13. It was stated that a pedestrian crossing along West Third Street would add to the current congestion. It was suggested that a below grade crossing be considered. William C. stated that the amount of space needed to create the approaches for a below grade crossing would take away from valuable Greenway areas. He also stated that below grade crossings are not always the safest solutions.

14. It was stated that the City should look into linking bile routes in a regional context.

15. It was inquired how long and how high the wall improvements along Daly Ave. would be. Peter S. stated that in some areas there may be enough room to remove walls and reestablish a gentle slope. He went on to state that a structural engineer would need to look at the wall to provide that most accurate answer, and that for the purpose of the master plan a lump sum cost had been incorporated into the estimate for the design and construction of a new wall.

16. It was stated that in considering a new location for the long distance bus terminal that both college students and residences in the senior housing developments be considered. It was suggested that the Litzenburger House may be a good central location.

17. It was stated that there is too strong of a focus being put on parking and that more attention should be put on what activities should happen in the Greenway.

18. It was suggested that a Skate Park be incorporated into the plan.

19. It was stated that a new location should be found for the tank storage facility.

Next Public Meeting: June 22nd Location TBA

Respectfully Submitted,
SIMONE JAFFE COLLINS, INC.
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

[Signature]

Sarah R. Leeper
South Bethlehem Greenway
SJC# 04076.10

PUBLIC MEETING #4 - MINUTES

Date/Time: 04.27.2005, 7 PM
Location: Forte Building
In Attendance: See Attached Attendance Sheet

Notes:

1. Peter S. asked the public to review the handout of the Goals, Facts & Concepts generated at the first and second public meeting. He also asked the attendees to complete the public opinion survey provided at the meeting.

2. Peter S. presented the project site analysis and concepts. He stated that this meeting would focus on the bigger concepts surrounding the greenway such as: parking, neighborhood connections, public transit and public plaza. He stressed that the trail amenities are not being overlooked.

3. It was asked why the City was not acquiring the R.O.W all the way to Saucon Park at this time. Peter S. stated that the city is planning for this connection but that at this time Norfolk Southern is only willing to negotiate to the existing rail yard. Peter S. suggested that the City may consider developing an official map as a tool to insure that a future connection to Saucon Park can be made.

4. It was asked what types of recreational activities would be offered in the Greenway; would there be basketball courts. Peter S. responded that specific activities have not been located at this point and that the size of the R.O.W would put limitations on what activities that could exist. For example a regulation basketball court would not fit however a half court would. He stated that as the project progressed the city and public should work together to decide what activities should be offered in the Greenway.

5. It was suggested that the public be encouraged to get involved in early implementations projects such as: trash clean-up, tree plantings, and flower plantings. It was stated that these early projects could help to foster public ownership of the Greenway.

6. It was suggested that each block of the Greenway could reflect the names of the Presidents that are used for the North/ South Streets.
7. Concerns were stressed regarding the off-campus housing of university students in the South Bethlehem neighborhoods. Peter S. stated that this was an issue that should be directed towards the City. In regards to the Greenway he suggested that there is the potential for its development to strengthen the Southside community.

8. It was asked how the City would maintain the Greenway when they already have issues with maintaining some of their parks. Peter S. stated that the maintenance should be considered now and that one of the best things the City could do is start to foster partnerships with the public and private entities to help with the maintenance of the Greenway.

9. It was stated that a new funding source the Lehigh Valley Greenway Initiative should be considered as a funding source for the Greenway.

Next Public Meeting: June 22nd Location TBA

Respectfully Submitted,
SIMONE JAFFE COLLINS, INC.
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

[Signature]

Sarah R. Leeper
Greenway plans envision moving business, police
Would also relocate bus station, make 3 streets one-way.

Thursday, April 28, 2005
By KURT BRESSWEIN
The Express-Times

BETHLEHEM -- Moving an industrial business, bus station and police substation and making three streets one way emerged Wednesday as concepts in creating the greenway linear park through South Side.

Planning consultants to the city from Simone Jaffe Collins Landscape Architecture pitched ideas for the multi-purpose trail during afternoon and evening meetings.

"These are first-gasp ideas," landscape architect Peter Simone told the afternoon meeting in Sayre Hall at the Cathedral Church of the Nativity. "We fully anticipate that through the next couple of months, we'll be changing ideas, refining them."

Planners have divided the proposed greenway into three segments. The eastern segment, Lynn Avenue to Hayes Street, is proposed to have playground or other activity centers. The middle section is seen as having the best opportunities to tie into South Side restaurants, offices and apartments.

The greenway's western section, running west from New Street, is being eyed for a public events area. Simone said the greatest potential for a greenway public plaza involves relocating the Weldship Corp. gas cylinder industry from 225 W. Second St.

Mayor John Callahan said the company has invested a lot of money in the equipment it uses to test the cylinders. An employer of more than 50 people, the business also predates the Banana Factory and other adaptive re-uses of neighboring buildings, Callahan said. A compromise may be to store the tanks elsewhere, the mayor said.

"Whatever happens, we want to make sure they're accommodated," he said.

The greenway architects also propose relocating the bus station and police substation from Mechanic Street between Third and Fourth streets. The railroad bed runs through this area.

City Councilwoman Magdalene Szabo said it would be difficult to find a better, more central location for the bus station. Michelle Lawson, a Democratic candidate for council in the May 17 election, said keeping the police on the greenway would improve safety and reduce fears of greenway crime.

Other citizens at the afternoon session also cited crime concerns.

"This plan is very utopian," Fourth Street resident Mary Pongracz said. "It also is a master plan for a drug haven."

Eddie Rodriguez, who has been vocal in concerns that the park would run through heavy crime areas, questioned a proposal to build steps linking the greenway to Hobart Street.

Simone said the steps are meant to increase users, as are plans to provide parking. He said 90 on-street spaces could be created by changing Webster, Fillmore and Buchanan streets from two way to one way. One-way streets are also safer to cross, Simone said.

Simone cited more parking potential on Mechanic Street between Adams and Webster streets. This area is big enough for a parking garage with a 30,000-square-foot footprint. The first floor could house stores. Developing stores on this and adjacent sites would help pay for the greenway, he said.

Cost estimates for the project are expected at the next greenway meeting. The city is using $85,000 in grants for project planning and has a $200,000 federal grant for acquisition of the railroad right-of-way. Callahan said the acquisition money should be enough.

Reporter Kurt Bresswein can be reached at 610-867-5000 or by e-mail at kbresswein@express-times.com.
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Architects: Greenway needs parking

They suggest city build 300-space garage, or at least set aside land.

By Chuck Ayers
Of The Morning Call

April 28, 2005

Just as cities need parking to accommodate development, they also need it to accommodate parks, planners of a south Bethlehem greenway told residents Wednesday.

At public hearings, the architects of the proposed 1.75-mile greenway on a Norfolk Southern right of way that snakes through the South Side unveiled their first draft of what the narrow recreation area might look like.

They also suggested the city at some point should build a 300-space garage to go along with the park — or at least set aside space to build one.

To add more immediate parking for the 60-foot swath of land that runs from the former railroad tracks near Third Street at Union Station to Lynn Street, the planners recommended changing the direction of some one-way streets and making other one-way streets into two-way streets. That would create 90 angled parking spaces, enhance traffic flow and make the area more pedestrian-friendly.

Peter Simone, vice president of the architecture firm Simone Jaffe Collins of Chester County, proposed the 30,000-square-foot garage on Mechanic Street, between Adams and Webster streets.

While the garage probably would take six to 10 years to develop, Simone said many of amenities of the greenway could be paid for by expanding the tax base by establishing nearby retail. And the retail would be made possible by the garage that would front on the winding park.

"The idea would be to have the first floor of this parking structure to have retail space," Simone said. "Retail can help fund the greenway."

Even if a garage isn't built soon, Simone suggested land near the greenway be set aside for one.

"If you don't consider it now, you may lose the opportunity," he said.

Before about 30 residents, elected officials and local leaders, Simone and partner William Collins laid out their rough draft after two consultations with residents and a steering committee at two prior meetings.

It was the third of five public meetings to be held before the final draft is unveiled in October.

Their proposal divides the walking, riding and recreation area into three districts: East, Central and West.

The planners suggested that the far eastern and western parts contain an activity area with basketball courts, playgrounds, an amphitheater, restrooms, a market and skate parks.

The 11 street crossings that intersect the proposed greenway should be dedicated to public art and artifacts.

"It's a way to make motorists slow down if there is something interesting to look at," Simone said.

The plan proposes moving the Weldship Co. gas tanks near the west end of the greenway to an area near the Perkins Restaurant.

When the Second Street ramp to the Hill-to-Hill bridge is built, it would shield the unsightly tanks from view.

There was minimal negative feedback from the public and questionnaires filled out by those in attendance, though South Side resident Mar Pongrace called the draft "a master plan for a drug haven."

Democratic mayoral candidate Anthony Rybak suggested at a second public meeting in the Forte Building that the parking be buttressed against residential properties where tomfoolery can be more easily monitored.

"Let's face it, green space and park benches can attract the wrong kind of element," Rybak said.

Callahan acknowledged that open space can attract delinquent activity but no more so than the abandoned tracks that are there now.

"It's important to discuss all of these things," Callahan said. "It's going to have a transforming impact on south Bethlehem."
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Citizen Preference Survey

Please take a few minutes to circle one response to each statement that most closely corresponds to your opinion.

1. I am in favor of creating two activity areas (i.e. playground, parking area, skate park) in the eastern greenway segment at the intersections of Daly Avenue and Third Street, and Steel Avenue and Fourth Street.
   Agree       no opinion       disagree

2. I am in favor of creating several small (10 + car) on-street parking areas at various locations along the greenway in order to increase the availability of on-street parking.
   Agree       no opinion       disagree

3. I am in favor of relocating the bus depot and police substation off of the greenway to a nearby Southside location.
   Agree       no opinion       disagree

4. I am in favor of changing the directions of Webster, Fillmore, and Buchanan streets from two-way to one-way between Packer/ Fifth Street and Third Street in order to clarify the street direction patterns, make greenway / street intersections safer and to create approximately 90 new on street parking spaces.
   Agree       no opinion       disagree

5. I am in favor of using a portion of the Central Segment of the greenway for the creation of a parking structure with first floor commercial uses. This use will be an economic development project, create needed parking and help pay for other greenway improvements.
   Agree       no opinion       disagree

6. I am in favor of relocating the tank storage area from its present location to the adjacent site, in the center of proposed 2nd street ramp in order to keep with industry in South Bethlehem while creating an area for a greenway public plaza.
   Agree       no opinion       disagree

7. I am in favor of creating a public plaza at the western terminus of the greenway (near the Banana Factory) as a cultural plaza, and civic / public events venue.
   Agree       no opinion       disagree

Please leave your completed survey in the survey response box or fax it to Simone Jaffe Collins at 610 889 7521

Please feel free to add additional comments on the back of this page.

Thank you.
1. I am in favor of creating two activity areas (i.e. playground, parking area, skate park) in the eastern greenway segment at the intersections of Daly Avenue and Third Street, and Steel Avenue and Fourth Street.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. I am in favor of creating several small (10+ car) on-street parking areas at various locations along the greenway in order to increase the availability of on-street parking.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. I am in favor of relocating the bus depot and police substation off of the greenway to a nearby Southside location.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. I am in favor of changing the directions of Webster, Fillmore, and Buchanan streets from two-way to one-way between Packer/ Fifth Street and Third Street in order to clarify the street direction patterns, make greenway/street intersections safer and to create approximately 90 new on street parking spaces.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. I am in favor of using a portion of the central segment of the greenway for the creation of a parking structure with first floor commercial uses. This use will be an economic development project, create needed parking and help pay for other greenway improvements.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. I am in favor of relocating the tank storage area from its present location to the location site, in the center of proposed 2nd street ramp in order to keep with industry in South Bethlehem while creating an area for a greenway public plaza.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. I am in favor of creating a public plaza at the western terminus of the greenway (near the Banana Factory) as a cultural plaza, and civic/public events venue.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Citizen Preference Survey – Comments

1. The ownership of the Norfolk Southern rail center is shrouded in complexity. The inability to solve the ownership problem has hindered plans for the Bethlehem Area School District to build a middle school on that site. One-way streets are difficult to maneuver – specifically because of the influx of college students into the area. They do no/will not read directional signs on Taylor Street and Pierce Street. A word of wisdom – parking places never meet the needs!

2. I am in favor of preservation of an unimpeded right-of-way for future passenger rail service to/from points south.

3. Overall I am happy to see these plans! You are very parking happy – no other options? How about parking at each end of the Greenway and bus/trolley service running the length with many stops. Shoppers and seniors would love this!

4. (in response to question #3) Buses are used by senior citizens and students from the immediate area. Others use public buses to reach it. Bus stops are on 3rd and 4th Streets right on New Street.
   (in response to question #4) Webster – No. It’s a major roadway both ways to and from Lehigh which puts some relief on other streets.
   (in response to question #5) Parking needed by 3rd and 4th commercial sections.
   (in response to question #6) Good Luck! Petrucci’s land is for sale (see sign on 3rd St. ramp).
   (in response to question #7) Will hold my opinion until I see plans.

5. (in response to question #2) It’s a greenway, not a parking lot, but limited parking would be o.k.
   (in response to question #3) What alternative location?
   (in response to question #6) Move the entire business into Bethlehem Commerce Center.
   Let’s use some common sense while approaching this. Constructing Permanent buildings/garages, etc. on this location will prevent any Possible future return of rail service. How much additional parking would Be created by going to a one-way street grid north/south? Maybe the need to use the greenway for parking is motivated(?) with additional 90+ parking spots on the streets. Creation of eastern activity zone would duplicate McNamara Park which is already under-utilized. Education, enforcement and calming measures are needed in this city in general to protect pedestrians. Crossing areas could use the system already in use in London, England so that motorists yield/respect pedestrians as they cross. Will parking be timed? It should be. Has anyone discussed these ideas with Parking?
6. Have you had any conversations with the Collective for Appropriate Transportation (CHT)? They are a great bicycle safety organization in Bethlehem.

7. Terrific presentation!

8. (in response to question #5) But needs to be economically viable and some time off. Parking with spaces, street

9. (in response to question #2) Only if necessary. Prefer more green space and other options to parking.

10. One ways are a thing of the past. NO WAY! They don’t add to the quality of life for people there. The move these days is reversing the one-way streets back to two-way.

11. Comments from Bob Thompson:
   (response to question #3) Stay close to or on greenway. The overriding goal of the South Side Greenway should be to reduce on the South Side, our reliance on internal combustion engines and their by-products. We’ll probably need a larger South Side garage at least later on, but meanwhile we can maximize reliance on small garage parking, concentrating the cars under one roof to encourage walking. (that is, low-rise facility. Don’t block sight lines to churches and other architectural landmarks with bricks and mortar barriers to the South Side sight lines.) Transportation is obviously a political and economic problem as well so effort should be made to discourage Lehigh University’s permitting their freshman and sophomores from parking in Bethlehem and on campus.
South Bethlehem Greenway

SJC# 04076.10

TASK FORCE MEETING #4 - MINUTES

Date/Time: 05.11.2005, 4 PM
Location: Forte Building
In Attendance:
Carl Bruno – OSC
William Collins - Simone Jaffe Collins (SJC)
Darlene Heller – OSC
Tom Kerr – Wildlands Conservancy
Dale Kochand – Lehigh University
Janet Ney – OSC
Jeff Parks – Banana Factory
Rayne Schabel – D & L
David Shaffer – OSC
Peter Simone – SJC
Javier Toro – OSC.
Helene Whitaker – Northampton College

Notes:

1. Javier mentioned that the issue of safety on the greenway was one that the public was concerned about. He offered several reprints of articles / web stories that discussed the issues surrounding safety of greenways and trails.
2. David S. mentioned the upcoming Southside Film Festival on June 16-19. He suggested conducting a survey of attendees about attitudes about Southside.
3. It was reported that 6 to 8 signs are being fabricated by Charlie Brown’s staff for posting in the Greenway to show City pride of “ownership” These will be installed with small plantings.
4. The fact of the Lehigh RiverPort development was mentioned, along with the fact that the redevelopment included a large parking garage.
5. The need for safe access to the small “park” area (site of current 3rd Street Ramp) that may be created when the ramp is built was discussed.
6. Jeff Parks discussed the potential to stage art & crafts shows in a new cultural plaza at the western terminus of the greenway adjacent to the Banana Factory.
7. The idea of a new parking facility between 3rd and 4th and Brodhead and the Banana Factory was discussed. This facility could include first floor retail and a bus facility.
8. The various concepts for a greenway shuttle were discussed. SJC agreed that the design of the greenway / trail should not preclude the use of it for some type of wheeled shuttle; however, this was a service that was some years in the future.

9. The concept of narrowing the eastern end of the greenway (Hayes street east along Daly Ave) to accommodate a wider Daly Ave. to benefit BethWorks Now was discussed. The task force agreed that this could be an acceptable compromise if construction concessions were made in the process.

10. Jeff Parks stressed that the South Bank of the Lehigh River needs public accessibility. This is really a separate project for the greenway, but all agreed that it is an improvement that is needed.

Respectfully Submitted,
SIMONE JAFFE COLLINS, INC.
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

Peter M. Simone, RLA, ASLA
Vice President
South Bethlehem Greenway
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MEETING WITH PENNDOT DISTRICT 5-0 - MINUTES

Date/Time: 05.31.2005, 2 PM

Location: PennDOT District 5-0, Allentown, PA

In Attendance: Tony Hanna – City of Bethlehem
Darlene Heller – City of Bethlehem
Mike Alkhal – Director, Public Works
Jay McGee – PennDOT District 5-0
Stan Poplowski – PennDOT District 5-0
William Collins – Simone Jaffe Collins
Peter Simone – Simone Jaffe Collins

Notes:

1. Peter S. and William C. gave an overview of the trail / greenway project to PennDOT. They stressed that the planned 2nd Street ramp project will have a major impact in Southside in general and on the proposed greenway in particular. The eastern terminus of the greenway will also function as one of the cultural centers of Southside.

2. PennDOT noted that the earlier concept design will be undergoing major revision in the next phase of design. The “underpass” that was shown as a part of the 2nd street ramp was most likely not to be included in the project, due to value engineering.

3. PennDOT has retained KCI engineers to design the project. They will hopefully begin work in September 05 and their work will have a 24 month duration. KCI is designing both the ramp area and the Rt. 412 / Daly Avenue improvements as well.

4. During this 24-month period, there should be a decision made as to whether the City will obtain one of the state gaming licenses. This may have a significant impact on the capacity planning for the ramp and associated roads in the 2nd Street ramp area.

5. SJC discussed the idea of developing a transportation center / parking structure with first floor retail in the block between second and third Brodhead Ave and the Banana Factory. Much of this area is presently occupied by the tank storage facility and a proposed development of this type would be contingent on the future relocation of the storage facility.

6. PennDOT will actively involve the City in ongoing reviews of the project as the work progresses. Mike Alkhal will be PennDOT’s primary contact with the City.
7. The PennDOT Rt. 412 widening project (at the west end of the greenway) will extend to Daly Street. It was discussed that the BethWorks Now development would like to extend this widening further east to Hayes Street. One method of accomplishing this would be to utilize a limited width of the Greenway right-of-way for roadway widening. The potential of BethWorks Now acquiring this section of the greenway right-of-way was discussed. All agreed that this approach could be considered.

8. At the conclusion of the meeting, it was agreed that PennDOT and the City will stay in contact as the design of the Second Street Ramp and Rt. 412 widening project moves forward.

Respectfully Submitted,
SIMONE JAFFE COLLINS, INC.
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

Peter Simone
Vice President
South Bethlehem Greenway

SJC# 04076.10

CITY STAFF MEETING #2

Date/Time: 06.07.05, 11:30 AM

Location: City Hall

In Attendance: Mayor John Callahan
Tony Hanna – City of Bethlehem
Darlene Heller – City of Bethlehem
Mike Alkhal – Director, Public Works
Charlie Brown – Dept of Public Works and Parks
Frank Barron – Traffic Coordinator, City of Bethlehem
William Collins – Simone Jaffe Collins
Peter Simone – Simone Jaffe Collins

Notes:

1. Peter Simone and William Collins reviewed the progress of the master plan for the Mayor and staff. All aspects of the plan were briefly reviewed.
2. The May 31 meeting with PennDOT was reviewed. The city will continue to closely monitor the progress of the new 2nd Street ramp design and the Rt. 412 widening project.
3. The concept of BethWorks Now assisting with the widening of Rt 412 from Daley to Hayes was discussed.
4. The concepts for the redevelopment of the Weldship Corporation tank farm was discussed. The Mayor and Mr. Hanna stressed that the site could not be developed until and if the company decided to relocate the tank storage facility. In the short term, a high quality fence should be installed between the greenway and the storage area.
5. The ongoing discussions for the acquisition of the RR right of way with Norfolk Southern were discussed at length. It was agreed that the acquisition is a priority and that City staff should work toward this goal. The Mayor stressed this point.

Respectfully Submitted,
SIMONE JAFFE COLLINS, INC.
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

[Signature]

Peter Simone
Vice President
07.05.2005

South Bethlehem Greenway
SJC# 04076.10

PUBLIC MEETING #5 - MINUTES

Date/Time: 06.22.2005, 3 PM
Location: Sayre Hall, Church of the Nativity
In Attendance: See Attached Attendance Sheet

Notes:

1. Peter S. started the meeting by reviewing the project schedule, pointing out that there will be a public review period of the draft plan for one month. He stressed how important it is for the public to review the draft report and respond with their comments and criticisms. It was stated that the report would be available for review on Monday, June 27 at City Hall, the City Library, and on the City web site: www.bethlehem-pa.gov.

2. Peter S. reviewed the project area and described the characteristics of the three segments: Eastern – Linear Corridor, Central – Commercial / Residential Area, and Western – Public Events Area.

3. Peter S. presented the Greenway Master Plan, focusing on the major improvements such as the trail, skate park, neighborhood connections, trail heads, surface parking, multiuse plaza, and structured parking.

4. He concluded the presentation pointing out that the next step for the City is to secure funding; stating that the final master plan meeting would focus more on the grants that are available for funding. He stated that during the next couple of months the public should contact their elected officials to let them know how important the Greenway Project is to the City of Bethlehem and the Southside Community. The meeting was opened to the public’s comments and questions.

5. It was stated that the medical offices at Fourth and Taylor currently need more parking and better access for their patients. It was stressed that by creating a parking structure in the Webster / Taylor block along Mechanic Street and allowing the existing parking authority lots to become part of the greenway would force their patients to walk even farther to park their cars.
6. Peter S. stated that the Mechanic Street site is an alternate location for a parking structure, and that most likely there would be no change to the Mechanic Street lots. However he pointed out that it is important for the City and landowners along the Greenway to communicate with one another to work out final details for the Greenway plans.

7. It was stated that the over all “greening” of the Greenway was great – however some consideration should be giving to preserving existing vistas along the corridor. It was also stated that the western site for the parking structure was a good location.

8. Peter S. acknowledged that the preservation of vistas had been one of the ideas brought up at the first public meeting. He asked that the concerned parties submit a list of the vistas they want preserved as part of the draft plan comments.

9. It was stated that the proposal of steps coming down from Railroad Street to the Greenway was good. What would be done concerning the deteriorating wall in this area?

10. Peter S. stated that there was an allowance of $100,000 to repair the wall in the cost estimate, however there may be less expensive options where there are opportunities to remove the walls and create gently graded slopes leading down to the Greenway.

11. Question. Was SJC recommending the planting of native plants? Funding is available for the planting of native plants.

12. Peter S. responded that a plant palette had not been developed as part of the master plan; however the City would want to consider the use of native plants within the Greenway.

13. Question. Does the cost estimate show a detailed breakdown of the improvements?

14. Peter S. stated that the cost estimate is broken down by block and intersections listing separately all the capital improvements.

15. Question. What will the trail surface be and what uses are anticipated?

16. Peter S. stated that at a minimum the path would be a 12’ wide asphalt surface. This would allow for bikers, rollerblades, skateboarders, runners, and strollers. He stated that the wider the path the lesser the likelihood of a user conflict. He stated that asphalt, nonporous or porous, would be the best material when it comes to maintaining the Greenway.

17. It was also stated that asphalt would be the best material to assure that the Greenway meets ADA standards.

18. Question. Will alternative transportation modes be incorporated into the Greenway?
19. Peter S. stated that SJC had interviewed Steve Schmidt concerning alternate transportation options. It was thought that there is a future potential for a shuttle running from Hayes Street going east out to Saucon Park and the Rt. 412 interchange with I-78.

20. Question. How will Northampton Community College impact the parking needs of the Southside and does the college have plans for a parking structure?

21. Peter S. stated that they would have a major influence on the parking situation on the Southside and that they may become a partner in the building of a parking structure.

Next Public Meeting: October (Date and Locations TBD)

Respectfully Submitted,
SIMONE JAFFE COLLINS, INC.
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

Sarah R. Leeper
07.05.2005

South Bethlehem Greenway
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PUBLIC MEETING #6 - MINUTES

Date/Time: 06.22.2005, 3 PM

Location: Forte Building

In Attendance: See Attached Attendance Sheet

Notes:

1. Peter S. started the meeting by reviewing the project schedule, pointing out that there will be a public review period of the draft plan for one month. He stressed how important it is for the public to review the draft report and respond with their comments and criticisms. It was stated that the report would be available for review on Monday, June 27 at City Hall, the City Library, and on the City web site: www.bethlehem-pa.gov.

2. Peter S. reviewed the project area and described the characteristics of the three segments: Eastern – Linear Corridor, Central – Commercial / Residential Area, and Western – Public Events Area.

3. Peter S. presented the Greenway Master Plan, focusing on the major improvements such as the trail, skate park, neighborhood connections, trail heads, surface parking, multiuse plaza, and structured parking.

4. He concluded the presentation pointing out that the next step for the City is to secure funding; stating that the final master plan meeting would focus more on the grants that are available for funding. He stated that during the next couple of months the public should contact their elected officials to let them know how important the Greenway Project is to the City of Bethlehem and the Southside Community. The meeting was opened to the public’s comments and questions.

5. Question. How wide will the trail be?

6. Peter S. stated that at a minimum the path would be a 12’ wide asphalt surface. He suggested that with multiple user types such as: bikers, rollerblades, skateboarders, runners, and strollers a trail might be wider, 14 to
16 feet. He stated that the wider the path the lesser the likelihood of a user conflict.

7. Question. How will the Rt. 412 widening project affect the Greenway?

8. Peter S. stated that the widening of Rt. 412 from the Minsi Trail Bridge to Founder’s Way would be a good opportunity for a Partnership between BethWorks and the City that would benefit the Greenway. He stated that allowing 12’ of the ROW to be used for the road widening would still leave enough room for a gracious Greenway.

9. It was stated that the Greenway did not meet the needs for active recreation in the Southside Community.

10. Peter S. stated that the Greenway was not large enough to fit most regulation sports fields; however in planning the trail alignment, SJC kept the trail to one side of the ROW. This will allow for open lawn spaces were spontaneous active recreation could take place such as tossing a frisbee or throwing a football.

11. Question. Could the Third Street Ramp be reused for pedestrians once the new ramp is completed?

12. Peter S. stated that the ramp would most likely be preserved for pedestrian use and that it could be considered as an alternative location for the skate park.

13. It was requested that copies of the report also be placed for review at the Southside Library Branch.

14. Question. To whom should comments on the draft report be directed?

15. Darlene H. stated that there where forms on the City’s web site that could be filled out and submitted to the City, or comments could be sent to the City Office.

16. Question. Was the replacement project of the Lynn Ave Bridge considered in the planning of the Greenway?

17. Peter S. stated that it had been and that the key issue to consider in the new design of the bridge would be adequate sidewalks to allow for good access to the Greenway.

18. Question. When would the Greenway be useable to the public?

19. Peter S. stated that it was the vision of the City to make the Greenway useable as quickly as possible. He suggested that once the ROW is acquired basic grading and seeding could take place to create a useable green space for the community.

20. Question. What would happen to existing trees and mature vegetation in the Greenway?
21. Peter S. stated that in some areas existing vegetation might be removed to make room for improvements such as in the widening of Daly Avenue. He also stated that some vegetation may appear to be an asset when in fact it may be an undesirable invasive plant species.

22. It was suggested that an inventory of the existing vegetation should be done to ensure that there are no rare plant materials within the proposed Greenway. It was also stated that there is a large deer population around the Southside community and that deer resistant plantings should be considered.

23. Question. Would the former pedestrian bridge over Daly Avenue at the Minsi Trail Bridge be replaced?

24. Peter Simone stated that there were no plans to replace the pedestrian bridge.

25. It was requested that the final report stress the positive effects that Greenways have on communities and neighborhoods; in specific helping to create a safer environment.

26. Question. How long would it be until construction on the Greenway is started?

27. Peter S. stated that once the ROW is acquired by the City the next step will be for the City to secure funding for the construction of the Greenway. Once the funding is secured time will be spent on the design, engineering, and documentation of the Greenway. In all it could be expected that construction on major improvements would start in 2 to 2 ½ years.

Next Public Meeting: October (Date and Locations TBD)

Respectfully Submitted,
SIMONE JAFFE COLLINS, INC.
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

Sarah R. Leeper
Draft greenway plan has $5.2 million price

Bethlehem consultant calls for skate park and event plaza along trail.

By Josh Drobnyk
Of The Morning Call

June 23, 2005

Anchoring south Bethlehem’s planned greenway with a skate park, adding a cultural plaza and dozens of parking spaces to South Side streets are ideas on the table for a proposed $5.2 million renovation of former Norfolk Southern railroad.

The city’s design consultant unveiled draft plans for the 1.75-mile stretch of former railroad in two sets of meetings with residents Wednesday. They were the last community meetings before the plans get final revisions.

The 60-foot wide greenway, which has been in the works for years and is still without funding for its construction, would snake along Third Street from near the Hill-to-Hill Bridge to Lynn Avenue, close to Saucon Park.

The greenway would feature a mix of open spaces for activities, park benches, trees and crosswalks. A 12-foot-wide asphalt path would line the entire greenway.

Peter Simone, vice president of the architectural firm Simone Jaffe Collins of Chester County, which is working with the city on the project, proposed adding a public events plaza at the western end of the greenway, across the street from the Banana Factory.

“This could be a place for arts shows or flea markets or small musical performances,” Simone told a group of about 15 people during the afternoon meeting at the Cathedral Church of the Nativity in south Bethlehem. "It could be a really exciting space. You could have lots of things going on in that plaza."

On the opposite end of the greenway, a few hundred feet from Lynn Avenue, he suggested putting a skate park beneath the Fourth Street Bridge.

Simone’s proposal also includes adding nearly 180 much-needed parking spaces to the South Side by building a few small parking lots and changing some two-way streets, which cross the greenway, to one-way streets.

Bethlehem resident Christine Murray, who attended the evening meeting with about 15 other residents at the Forte Building in south Bethlehem, described the plans as “phenomenal.”

"It is a short little trail that has the opportunity to bring an immense return," said Murray.

With the initial planning for the project all but complete, the city will soon begin the tough task of winning millions of dollars in funding to pay for the improvements.

Simone estimated the proposed renovations would cost about $5.2 million, but noted the project would have to be done in phases and would take years to finish.

Darlene Heller, the city’s planning director, said the city will probably have to go after a mix of state, federal and private funding, given the steep price tag. She added that the city is expecting to get $1 million from Northampton County’s new $40 million open space program.

Heller said the earliest the city could get started on the project — the city still needs to iron out a lease agreement for the land with Norfolk Southern — is next spring. City Council is expected to review the plans in the fall.

Greenway plans will be available for residents to review beginning next week at the city’s planning office at City Hall, the Church Street and Fourth Street libraries and on the city’s Web site, http://www.bethlehem-pa.gov .

josh.drobnyk@mcall.com

610-861-3619

Copyright © 2005, The Morning Call
Youth Greenway

Thoughts

1. Small building: For arts/painting/activity room with arcade game including a fee
2. Ability to ride bike
3. Swimming Pool with Sand Beach Area — water slide — Water Park
4. Stone walking path with lights
5. Trees
6. Benches, Tables, area to have a picnic —äll for — contract — 5/24/15
7. Grass
8. Swing set - not just for young kids
9. Have Summer Carnivals on it (include rides)
10. Small stage for Outdoor Music, Arts, Dancer including seats
11. Bathrooms —
12. Trolley — that has a (fifty cent fee) money to be used for the greenway maintenance
   One day pass— or by the hr./ monthly pass
13. Handball, basketball court
14. Dog shows- include youth judges
15. Vending machines at various location throughout the greenway
16. Information center in the middle section of the greenway
17. Rules posted (time, ect…)
18. Gates to close off certain areas
19. Graffiti free paint- Yet a section on the greenway that is devoted for tagging
   (Student artist – can be changed weekly or monthly the displayed art show casing
   the talent of student artist — All art is to be approved prior to going up
20. A location for high school teams to use for fundraisers
21. Trash Clean-up group
22. —

This is just (As far as our imagination goes)
Bethlehem Southside Greenway - Key Person Interview Notes

1. Maggie Szabo  
City Councilwoman  
3114 East Boulevard  
Bethlehem, PA  18017  
610-866-3326

Interview: Driving Tour of South Bethlehem— 10 AM, March 21, 2005

The consultant team met with Maggie Szabo, a city counsel member and resident of the Southside. A driving tour through the Southside was taken in which Maggie pointed out many of the cultural, historical, and social amenities within the Southside. She stated that there is a need for recreational activities throughout the Southside Community.

2. Olga Negron  
Southside resident, Puerto Rican Cultural Society  
610-437-7698  
Negron@allentowncity.org

Interview at City Hall - 8 AM, April 11, 2005

The project was discussed in general regarding scope and development possibilities.

Olga spoke about the need for neighborhood access to the east end of the greenway corridor. The Bethlehem Housing Authority owns the family housing neighborhood that Olga identified as one area where teenagers might seek recreation opportunities. Access to the greenway trail from this neighborhood was considered very important. (A tot lot currently is the only existing recreation resource in this area of town.) Olga also stated that there was a police substation located in this area.

Another location with potential access to the greenway includes a PennDOT-owned lot that abuts the corridor at the corner of Fourth and William Streets. This parcel is currently paved for parking and would require minor grading for ADA-access to the elevation of the greenway trail below. This parking lot appears to be rarely used and according to Olga is generally un-maintained and strewn with litter.

Olga identified the block along Fourth Street between Webster and Adams Streets as a cluster of education, cultural, religious and recreation uses that are adjacent to the greenway corridor. Olga emphasized the need to link to the greenway in this location.

Regarding maintenance and observation of the greenway, Olga suggested that the Greenway might be divided into segments that various neighborhood
organizations would be interested in assuming stewardship responsibilities. The idea was to promote neighborhood “ownerships” of the greenway segments – possibly even following the PennDOT model for signage with the names of the stewards of each segment.

The idea of **varying the width of the greenway / trail** was discussed to meet the specific transportation, access, and recreation demands for different segments of the corridor. Specifically, three segments were discussed from (west to east):

- Segment 1 - between the Banana Factory (on 3rd St.) and Brodhead Avenue
- Segment 2 - between Hayes Street and the 3rd Street crossing
- Segment 3 - between Lynn Avenue Bridge and Hayes Street.

An idea was discussed about trading area of the RR corridor right of way to improve the **new ramp to the Hill to Hill Bridge** and local road under the Hill to Hill Bridge. The goal would be to keep enough R.O.W. width between Riverside Road and the St. Luke’s Station Building, and relocate the local road into the R.O.W, to allow the new ramp to also move toward the river and ultimately take less land away from the Perkins Restaurant site for the highway improvements. This scenario was discussed because it appeared that engineering diagram for the **new ramp appears to significantly impact vehicular traffic into and out of the Perkins site**.

The **impacts of abandoning the old Third Street Ramp** were also discussed – including: how pedestrian movements might still move up third street and how the abandoned area or features of the existing ramp into the small public “triangle” sitting park that is created by the existing ramp at the corner of Third and Wyandotte.

The parcel adjacent the RR R.O.W directly west of the Banana Factory (between Third and Second Streets is currently used by The Weldship Corporation as a **storage yard for large gas cylinders on semi trailers**. Olga understood that this use is important to the business, but expressed a desire for the storage yard to be relocated. Olga favored the idea of making the existing yard part of public congregation area that would expand from the Banana Factory west to Brodhead Factory. It was acknowledged that an appropriate alternative yard site would need to be found to make the idea of a public square work in this location.

Ideas for **how the Greenway will cross Third Street** were discussed. The existing skewed RR crossing is not the preferred alignment for a pedestrian crossing. The idea was discussed to move the greenway crossing closer to the Banana Factory driveway and the art-decorated bus shelter and create a perpendicular crossing of Third St. - approximately mid-block between New Street and Brodhead Avenue. The idea was discussed that this crossing could be incorporated as part of the new PennDOT ramp project.

**The existing bus station** located at Mechanic and Fourth Streets was discussed. The idea of relocating the bus station to another central location was
discussed as a way to increase parking spaces on Mechanic Street and to improve visibility of the bus terminal.

3. John Saraceno  
Saraceno Design  
26 E. Third Street  
Bethlehem, PA  18015  
610-866-4422  
john@saracenodesign.com

Interview at Saraceno Design office - 9 AM, April 11, 2005

The project was discussed in general regarding scope and development possibilities.

John mentioned that he was a founder of the Southside Merchant’s Association. He stated that the Greenway was a good idea, and that the key to it’s success is in creating a **sustainable maintenance and security plan** for the new public infrastructure.

Regarding **maintenance and observation** of the greenway, John recommended that if neighborhood organizations are to take care of segments of the greenway, that there be a central organization to coordinate this volunteer work.

He suggested that the new **Greenway would help move people through the Southside**, but should not be expected to serve as an alternative to the need for remote parking with shuttle. Regarding **parking**, John suggested that there was sufficient parking in the central business area for average daily demand, and that it was during first Friday and Festival days that the peak demands exceed supply. For these days, he recommended developing a remote parking system with shuttle to bring visitors in and out of the business center.

John said that the Greenway could help **re-orient businesses and residences toward the corridor** and create additional business opportunities. John believes that the Southside business climate is growing.

The concept was discussed for **three Greenway segments** – each with a unique character.

- Segment 1 - between the Banana Factory (on 3rd St.) and Brodhead Avenue  
- Segment 2 - between Hayes Street and the 3rd Street crossing  
- Segment 3 - between Linn Avenue Bridge and Hayes Street.

The idea of creating a **public “plaza” space west of the Banana Factory** was discussed. John explained that the industrial operation that is using the storage yard for cylinder tank trailers (Weldship Corporation) has subterranean facilities across Second Street to refurbish pressure containers for gases. This is apparently a relatively limited service – and the possibility of relocating this industrial operation would probably be quite expensive.
John recommended relocating the **long distance bus station and adjacent police substation** to more visible public location. He suggested that the operation will inhibit the Greenway development in the most central part of the business district and that it might be incorporated with other traveler services such as adjacent food and other commercial services.

John was open to the idea of divesting specific areas of the greenway corridor where an optimum trail cross section could be maintained and the balance of the right of way could be divested to create income for other greenway purposes – such as acquisition, development, or a dedicated maintenance endowment.

The **impacts of abandoning the old Third Street Ramp** were also discussed – including: how pedestrian movements might still move up third street and how the abandoned area or features of the existing ramp into the small public “triangle” sitting park that is created by the existing ramp at the corner of Third and Wyandotte Street

4. **Jeff Parks**
   Arts Quest  
   25 W. 3rd Street  
   Bethlehem, PA  18015  
   610-861-0678  
   jparks@fest.org

   Interview at office – 9:30 AM, April 11, 2005

Jeff Parks offered his expertise as a public events expert and public space advocate. His work at Arts Quest includes promoting music and arts events in Bethlehem. Jeff recommended that music venues on the Southside Greenway are limited due to noise. He suggested that a large plaza might not work as a public space on the block that is currently west of the Banana Factory. He suggested that a **smaller public venue on the Greenway block between Third and New Streets** might be more appropriate. Jeff thought that a symbiosis of public and private investment in that block could be the genesis of a cultural Greenway development that would expand block by block to the east along Mechanic Street. He envisioned a periodic open-air arts market that could be populated by artist/vendors, residents and visitors during the warmer months of the year. He suggested that the buildings in the Third to New Street block would be conducive to orienting to a smaller civic plaza on the Greenway that could support small public or commercial music venues.

Jeff recommended that a cloverleaf that might be created by a new Hill-to-Hill Bridge ramp to Second Street was not appropriate as a music venue amphitheater due to noise.

**He supported the idea of a skateboard facility** within the central Southside area, including one potential location on the Third Street ramp to the Hill-to-Hill Bridge if it should be replaced by a new Second Street ramp.
Jeff explained that Arts Quest had plans to create **several arts venues within the BethWorks Now property** in partnership with the developer.

Jeff was more **supportive of creating a new parking structure** along the greenway in the block west of the Banana Factory (Third Street to Brodhead Avenue) than of an alternative location along the Mechanic Street corridor. He favored the concept of integrating the bus/transit functions in a mixed-use structure within the block currently used for tank storage by Weldship Corporation.

Jeff offered strong suggestions that the Greenway should **feature the displays of modern art** and not serve solely as a museum for industrial artifacts. This integration could incorporate sculpture and a sophisticated sense of space through “place making” within various blocks of the Greenway. Jeff suggested that the treatment of public infrastructure was as important as the new technologies that are emerging.

5. **Jane Greenwood**  
Kostow Greenwood  
Architect for BethWorks Now  
560 Broadway  
New York, NY  10012  
212-334-0116  
jane@kostowgreenwood.com

**Interview at Banana Factory – 10 AM April 11, 2005**

The project was discussed in broad terms with Jane Greenwood as the **architect for the BethWorks Now project**. Also in attendance was a landscape architect sub-consultant.

Jane brought a preliminary site plan for the BethWorks Now development and spoke about the plans for initial and long-term development on the site. The intention of the owner is to **create pedestrian and vehicular connections from the BethWorks Now site to the local system of streets on the south side of Third Street**. The site plan displayed multiple pedestrian connections planned from the BethWorks Now site to the Southside Greenway.

Jane offered the idea that BethWorks Now owns many **industrial artifacts** that may be shared with the City to exhibit along the Greenway. Jane acknowledged that several parcels of BethWorks Now properties were under development as residential units – primarily along Third Street. Other early commercial ventures on the BethWorks Now site may include a multiplex cinema near Third and Hayes Streets.

**A future BethWorks Now casino** development was discussed in general. The planned entry was acknowledged to be under the large gantry crane north of Daly Avenue – east of the Minsi Trail Bridge. The PennDOT plans for **improving the Route 412** corridor in this location was discussed including the possibility of Daly Avenue needing improvements west of the Minsi Trail Bridge –
especially if the BethWorks Now casino or other development requires roadway improvements on Route 412. The idea was discussed about the possibility of the BethWorks Now developer funding a portion of the Greenway in this area in exchange for area to expand the Route 412 roadway slightly into the R.O.W. of the Greenway – still keeping plenty of area for a Greenway “through” trail and greenery.

6. Charlie Brown, Director
City of Bethlehem Parks Department
610-865-7079

Carl Bruno
Youth Development Director
City of Bethlehem

Interview at City Hall – 1 PM, April 11, 2005

Charlie Brown and Carl Bruno both represented the City interests of recreation and youth development services. Both were supportive of the Greenway concept and will ultimately take on responsibilities involving the development, operation and maintenance of the new public infrastructure. Charlie suggested that “greening” the R.O.W. in the first phase and subsequent mowing maintenance is within existing capabilities of his department. He also suggested that a simple new signage system could be effected within the Greenway to identify the corridor and educate people about its development.

Charlie spoke about the need for partnerships to develop the transportation and recreation aspects of the Greenway. He suggested that the community organizations could make good Greenway partners with the City. He agreed with the concept that public parking could be created at strategic locations within the Greenway, such as along Steel Avenue and other strategic blocks.

Charlie supported the concept of acquiring an unused PennDOT-owned parcel at the corner of Fourth and William Streets for creating a neighborhood “gateway” and “trailhead” for the Greenway.

Both Charlie and Carl supported the concept of a new skate park along the Greenway. They expressed concern about the structural stability of the existing retaining wall along the grade “cut” portion of the R.O.W. parallel to Daly Avenue. Carl expressed the desire to involve the Southside youth groups in the process of the greenway development.

Charlie was supportive of the possibility of converting the City-owned “pocket park” on Third Street to build an “infill” structure that will support economic development linked to the Greenway block across Third Street from the Banana Factory.
7. **Steve Schmidt**  
Coalition for Appropriate Transportation (CAT)  
60 W Broad Street, Suite 97  
Bethlehem, 18018  
610-954-5744  
cat@car-free.org

Interview at CAT office – 2 PM, April 11, 2005

Steve Schmidt represented the non-profit sector that works with the city and region to implement improvements that **foster alternative transportation** in and around Bethlehem.

Steve recommended that the City should **seek remote parking sites** on either side of the City and seek to develop a transit system that would reduce the amount of automobiles that are used to enter the Southside – for daily work trips and for special events.

**Safety and maintenance were stressed** as important aspects of the Southside Greenway. Steve specifically cited the need for citizens’ involvement to accomplish these tasks – by using the bus station area near the CAT office as example of the negative elements of society that tend to gather in public areas that are not well-maintained and under regular surveillance and enforcement.

Steve was in favor of the Greenway as a trail, but recognized it’s local character and service by the limited distance (approximately 1.75 miles within Southside. He recommended **specific trail construction details** from his experience in trail development, as well as the need for linking bicycle safety programs to the Greenway development.

Steve is extremely knowledgeable about **federal funding programs** for greenway / trail and alternative transportation development, and can be considered a resource for the City in its funding development for Greenway implementation.

8. **Hector Nemes**, Director  
Parking Authority  
85 W. North Street  
Bethlehem, PA  18018  
610-865-7123  
hector@bethpark.org

Interview at Parking Authority Offices – 8 am, May 5, 2005

Hector Nemes provided extensive information about the City’s public parking operation and offered ideas how the agency could develop a partnership with the City’s Greenway development. Hector explained how the City had just leased two of the three **municipal parking lots on Mechanic Street** to a new mixed-use commercial/residential building that was recently constructed at Third and Polk Streets. About 110 spaces will be taken for this use. Additional spaces will
be needed. Of approximately the 70 spaces that remain, in the three Mechanic Street lots, 36 are student, 19 are businesses, 9 are residents, 5 are ministries, (18 are metered.)

Hector stated that the Southside needs additional parking for out-of-town travelers who use the **long distance bus station** located on Mechanic Street between South New and Adams Street. He explained that the station was sited in that location not as permanent facility, but until a better location could be found and developed. He explained that people liked the general central location of the bus station / police substation, but not necessarily the exact location. He said that the stations were temporary structures but required full utility services that would need to be duplicated at new location. The LANTA bus staging area is located on Main Street in North Bethlehem and routes run bus along Third and Fourth Streets on the Southside.

Hector explained how the Parking Authority is involved in the **Riverport development** near the Fahy Street Bridge. The redevelopment of that industrial building includes 172 condominiums, a restaurant/bar, and a health club. Structured parking inside and parking outside is developed in partnership with a private builder, and owned by the Parking Authority. Of the total 468 new spaces to be created, 412 will be inside and 56 will be outside. Half the spaces will be leased by permit, and the other half will be metered. Hector estimated that the cost to create structured parking was approximately $13,000 per space.

Hector explained that if the City developed parking in conjunction with the Greenway that the **Parking authority would build, maintain, and collect the revenue from the metered spaces**. He also mentioned that there had been ideas previously discussed to run some type of hybrid transit bus within the Greenway R.O.W. with the trail.

9. **Paul Pierpoint**, Dean of South Campus  
   Northamton County Community College  
   511 East Third Street  
   Bethlehem, PA  18020  
   610-861-5532  
   ppierpoint@northampton.edu  

   **Interview at Bethlehem Campus NCCC – 1:30 PM, May 5, 2005**  

   The project was discussed in general regarding scope and development possibilities.

   Paul was enthusiastic about the possibilities that the Southside Greenway could create for residents and students at NCCC in Bethlehem. Paul acknowledged the **limited parking** situation at the Bethlehem Campus and spoke about the **potential for a transit** system that might carry students and residents through the Southside from remote parking lots, probably located near the I-78 interchange with Route 412.
The location of the Southside NCCC campus is between the Greenway and the BethWorks Now site. There will eventually be 4000 students enrolled in the NCCC Southside campus – with 400 to 500 present on any day. He suggested that 12,000 parking spaces are projected to be needed at the BethWorks Now site (9,000 total for jobs with 5,000 estimated for the casino/hotel, and 4,000 for retail and food preparation.) Clearly the issue is not just the parking spaces, but the traffic congestion caused by the new workers – if an alternative, remote transit/shuttle is not developed with remote parking.

The potential appears to exist to create a comprehensive transit (and parking) system that would benefit students, faculty and workers on the Southside. Paul suggested that the shuttle be free – paid for by parking fees, and Hellertown as a potential location for remote parking.

Paul spoke about the KIZ (Keystone Innovation Zone) that was designated by the Commonwealth in Southside, Bethlehem. The goal of NCCC and Lehigh University is to fashion curriculum that relates to the high-tech business sector and to establish a pool of trained graduates for the new businesses that seek to locate in South Bethlehem. One example given is to create the education system for high tech workers who will possess the skills to service the types of electronic gambling systems that may be installed at the BethWorks Now site in the future.

Paul clearly stated the goal of his institution to recruit students from the Bethlehem area with the intention of training them for well-paying jobs that will be available in Bethlehem and allow graduates to remain in the region, instead of being forced to relocate to find work.

Paul suggested that the City consider the idea to discourage automobile parking in Southside during the day and encourage it at night, perhaps by offering free parking after 5 or 6 pm. He suggested that the Greenway alone will not serve as an alternative transportation system, but will need to be linked to alternative modes of transit.

10. Sue Bergman, Director
South Bethlehem Neighborhood Center
700 Evans Street
Bethlehem, PA  18015
610-865-2791

Interview at SBNC Office – 3 pm, May 5, 2005

The South Bethlehem Neighborhood Center is a non-profit corporation that assists local residents of Southside Bethlehem with social services and support from 5 locations. The Center is funded 50% through the United Way and through other fundraising.

People primarily walk to the Center office and the Greenway would be a walking route to the Evans Street office. Sue asked if the Greenway would
have space for youth recreation. Whatever the final design, she suggested that the Greenway spaces would need to be well lighted.

Sue was in favor of the idea of community groups adopting sections of the Greenway for maintenance. She recommended that police should be involved in the Greenway development to help ensure safety by keeping the Greenway well patrolled. She mentioned that there is a police substation nearby on Fourth Street near Buchanan Street.

11. Steve L. Melnick, Director
Keystone Innovation Zone
PO Box 21750
Lehigh Valley, PA 18002
610 266 7535
smelnick@lehighvalley.org

The consultant team met with Steve Melnick and Francis Barron, the City Traffic Coordinator at the Department of Public Works to discuss the broad concepts of the Southside Greenway project. The issues of changing traffic direction on several of the local “president” side streets was generally well received with the proviso that the concept would ultimately require an engineering traffic study.

The KIZ was discussed, including the potential for integrating new technologies for transit within and related to the new Greenway development. The KIZ was recognized as a logical partner with the City Greenway development, and ideas about integrating future transit with sections of the Greenway were discussed.

12. Doug Kelly, Third Street Property Owner

Doug Kelly is a property owner on Third Street between Brodhead Avenue and New Street. Doug called to express his interest in working as a private partner with the city to negotiate a plan mixed-use development for the Greenway block between Third and New Streets that will feature new commercial and infill uses with public trail, parking and amenities. This idea is in alignment with concepts proposed for this block during the Greenway study process.
## Opinion of Probable Development Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Hill to Hill Bridge to Brodhead Avenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Preparation</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenway Signage</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Improvements</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
<td>$54,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5’ Wide Asphalt Path</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$6,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting Fixture</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Service</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Conduit</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$3,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees (whips)</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$8,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$15,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrub / Perennial Plantings</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawn Seeding</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>41,643</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>$4,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$148,848</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Brodhead Avenue Intersection 35’ wide</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing Signage</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Paving</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$9,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Paving</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$8,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollards</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art / Artifact</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb Cuts</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$48,529</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Brodhead Avenue to Third Street</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Preparation</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenway Signage</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Improvements</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
<td>$72,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12’ Wide Asphalt Path</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>1,206</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$21,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting Fixture</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Conduit</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$4,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash Receptacles</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2” - 2 1/2” Caliper Trees</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$10,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrub / Perennial Plantings</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawn Seeding</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>29,307</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>$2,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$211,793</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Third Street Intersection 45’ wide</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing Signage</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Paving</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$6,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Paving</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollards</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art / Artifact</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb Cuts</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$41,299</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Third Street to New South Street</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Preparation</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenway Signage</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Improvements</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>$35,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Paving</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>2,156</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$38,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color Concrete Paving</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>16,758</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>$100,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting Fixture</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Conduit</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$2,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Service for Plaza / Stage</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Service for Stage</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash Receptacles</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2” - 2 1/2” Caliper Trees</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$1,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrub / Perennial Plantings</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$267,103</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Opinion of Probable Development Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. New Street Intersection 35' wide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing Signage</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$4,667.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Paving</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$3,739.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Paving</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$4,592.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollards</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$10,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art / Artifact</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb Cuts</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$30,498.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. New South Street to Adams Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Preparation</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenway Signage</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Improvements</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
<td>$26,720.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12' Wide Asphalt Path</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$8,028.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb for Parking Lot</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$9,439.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Paving for Parking Lot</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$16,013.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Striping</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$320.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosswalk Striping</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting Fixture</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Conduit</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$1,670.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash Receptacles</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&quot;-2 1/2&quot; Caliper Trees</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$1,290.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$2,430.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrub / Perennial Plantings</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawn Seeding</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>6,626</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>$663.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$120,783.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Adams Street Intersection 40' wide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing Signage</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$5,333.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Paving</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$4,007.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Paving</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$7,918.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollards</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$10,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art / Artifact</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb Cuts</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$34,758.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Adams Street to Webster Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Preparation</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenway Signage</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Improvements</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
<td>$24,160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12' Wide Asphalt Path</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$7,293.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Paving</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$1,757.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting Fixture</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>$16,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Conduit</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$1,510.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash Receptacles</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&quot;-2 1/2&quot; Caliper Trees</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$1,320.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$6,180.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrub / Perennial Plantings</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawn Seeding</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>16,843</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>$1,684.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$94,051.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Webster Street Intersection 40' wide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing Signage</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$4,027.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Paving</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$7,714.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Paving</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollards</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art / Artifact</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$34,573.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Webster Street to Taylor Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Preparation</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenway Signage</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Improvements</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
<td>$25,040.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12' Wide Asphalt Path</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$7,570.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting Fixture</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>$16,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Conduit</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$1,565.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash Receptacles</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&quot;-2 1/2&quot; Caliper Trees</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$11,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$6,360.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrub / Perennial Plantings</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawn Seeding</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>17,334</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>$1,733.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$83,213.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Opinion of Probable Development Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Taylor Street Intersection 24' wide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing Signage</td>
<td>EA 2</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>SY 160</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$3,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Paving</td>
<td>SY 134</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$2,412</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Paving</td>
<td>SF 234</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$4,685</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollards</td>
<td>EA 14</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb Cuts</td>
<td>EA 2</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art / Artifact</td>
<td>EA 1</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$27,797</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Taylor Street to Polk Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Preparation</td>
<td>LS 1</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenway Signage</td>
<td>EA 2</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Improvements</td>
<td>LF 328</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
<td>$26,043</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12' Wide Asphalt Path</td>
<td>SY 434</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$7,813</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting Fixture</td>
<td>EA 5</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Conduit</td>
<td>LF 326</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$1,630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>EA 2</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash Receptacles</td>
<td>EA 2</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&quot; - 2 1/2&quot; Caliper Trees</td>
<td>EA 43</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$21,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>CY 200</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrub / Perennial Plantings</td>
<td>SF 1,000</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawn Seeding</td>
<td>SF 16,381</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>$1,638</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$96,124</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Polk Street Intersection 24' wide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing Signage</td>
<td>EA 2</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>SY 160</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$3,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Paving</td>
<td>SY 134</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$2,412</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Paving</td>
<td>SF 233</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$4,667</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb Cuts</td>
<td>EA 2</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollards</td>
<td>EA 14</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art / Artifact</td>
<td>EA 1</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$27,779</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Polk Street to Fillmore Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Preparation</td>
<td>LS 1</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenway Signage</td>
<td>EA 2</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Improvements</td>
<td>LF 311</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
<td>$24,880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12' Wide Asphalt Path</td>
<td>SY 414</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$7,461</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curbing for Parking Lot</td>
<td>LF 752</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$10,531</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Paving for Parking Lot</td>
<td>SY 1,082</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
<td>$17,314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Striping</td>
<td>LF 450</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting Fixture</td>
<td>EA 4</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Conduit</td>
<td>LF 311</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$1,555</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>EA 2</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash Receptacles</td>
<td>EA 2</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&quot; - 2 1/2&quot; Caliper Trees</td>
<td>EA 20</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>CY 69</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$2,070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrub / Perennial Plantings</td>
<td>SF 1,000</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawn Seeding</td>
<td>SF 5,667</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>$567</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$104,327</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Fillmore Street Intersection 40' wide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing Signage</td>
<td>EA 2</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>SY 267</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$5,333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Paving</td>
<td>SY 221</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$3,978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Paving</td>
<td>SF 408</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$8,166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb Cuts</td>
<td>EA 2</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollards</td>
<td>EA 14</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art / Artifact</td>
<td>EA 1</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$34,977</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Fillmore Street to Pierce Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Preparation</td>
<td>LS 1</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenway Signage</td>
<td>EA 2</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Improvements</td>
<td>LF 332</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
<td>$26,560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12' Wide Asphalt Path</td>
<td>SY 443</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$7,967</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting Fixture</td>
<td>EA 5</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Conduit</td>
<td>LF 332</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$1,660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>EA 2</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash Receptacles</td>
<td>EA 2</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&quot; - 2 1/2&quot; Caliper Trees</td>
<td>EA 25</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>CY 200</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrub / Perennial Plantings</td>
<td>SF 1,000</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawn Seeding</td>
<td>SF 16,381</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>$1,638</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$89,825</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Opinion of Probable Development Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>18. Pierce Street Intersection 24' wide</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing Signage</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Paving</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$2,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Paving</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$4,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb Cuts</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollards</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art / Artifact</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$27,833</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **19. Pierce Street to Buchanan Street** | | | | |
| Site Preparation | LS | 1 | $5,000.00 | $5,000 |
| Greenway Signage | EA | 2 | $250.00 | $500 |
| Drainage Improvements | LF | 324 | $80.00 | $25,920 |
| 12' Wide Asphalt Path | SY | 432 | $18.00 | $7,783 |
| Lighting Fixture | EA | 5 | $4,000.00 | $20,000 |
| Electrical Conduit | LF | 324 | $5.00 | $1,620 |
| Benches | EA | 2 | $1,000.00 | $2,000 |
| Trash Receptacles | EA | 2 | $500.00 | $1,000 |
| 2" - 2 1/2" Caliper Trees | EA | 36 | $500.00 | $18,000 |
| Topsoil | CY | 199 | $30.00 | $5,970 |
| Shrub / Perennial Plantings | SF | 1,000 | $5.00 | $5,000 |
| Lawn Seeding | SF | 16,296 | $0.10 | $1,630 |
| **Subtotal** | | | | **$94,422** |

| **20. Buchanan Street Intersection 30' wide** | | | | |
| Site Preparation | LS | 1 | $5,000.00 | $5,000 |
| Greenway Signage | EA | 2 | $250.00 | $500 |
| Drainage Improvements | LF | 879 | $80.00 | $70,320 |
| 12' Wide Asphalt Path | SY | 1,173 | $18.00 | $21,107 |
| Ramp | LS | 1 | $30,000.00 | $30,000 |
| Stairs | EA | 1 | $25,000.00 | $25,000 |
| Lighting Fixture | EA | 13 | $4,000.00 | $52,000 |
| Electrical Conduit | LF | 879 | $5.00 | $4,395 |
| Benches | EA | 2 | $1,000.00 | $2,000 |
| Trash Receptacles | EA | 2 | $500.00 | $1,000 |
| 2" - 2 1/2" Caliper Trees | EA | 106 | $500.00 | $53,000 |
| Topsoil | CY | 516 | $30.00 | $15,478 |
| Shrub / Perennial Plantings | SF | 1,000 | $5.00 | $5,000 |
| Lawn Seeding | SF | 42,214 | $0.10 | $4,221 |
| **Subtotal** | | | | **$289,021** |

| **21. Buchanan Street to Hayes Street** | | | | |
| Site Preparation | LS | 1 | $5,000.00 | $5,000 |
| Greenway Signage | EA | 2 | $250.00 | $500 |
| Drainage Improvements | LF | 308 | $14.00 | $4,317 |
| 12' Wide Asphalt Path | SY | 490 | $18.00 | $8,816 |
| Parking Lot | LF | 180 | $1.00 | $180 |
| Lighting Fixture | EA | 10 | $4,000.00 | $40,000 |
| Electrical Conduit | LF | 980 | $5.00 | $4,900 |
| 2" - 2 1/2" Caliper Trees | EA | 115 | $500.00 | $57,500 |
| Topsoil | CY | 186 | $30.00 | $5,569 |
| Shrub / Perennial Plantings | SF | 5,000 | $5.00 | $25,000 |
| Lawn Seeding | SF | 15,187 | $0.10 | $1,519 |
| **Subtotal** | | | | **$61,072** |

| **22. Hayes Street Intersection 45' wide** | | | | |
| Site Preparation | LS | 1 | $5,000.00 | $5,000 |
| Sidewalk Improvements | SF | 4,901 | $5.00 | $24,507 |
| Curbing for Parking Lot | LF | 308 | $14.00 | $4,317 |
| Asphalt Paving for Parking Lot | SY | 490 | $18.00 | $8,816 |
| Parking Striping | LF | 180 | $1.00 | $180 |
| Lighting Fixture | EA | 10 | $4,000.00 | $40,000 |
| Electrical Conduit | LF | 980 | $5.00 | $4,900 |
| 2" - 2 1/2" Caliper Trees | EA | 115 | $500.00 | $57,500 |
| Topsoil | CY | 186 | $30.00 | $5,569 |
| Shrub / Perennial Plantings | SF | 5,000 | $5.00 | $25,000 |
| Lawn Seeding | SF | 15,187 | $0.10 | $1,519 |
| **Subtotal** | | | | **$177,307** |
### Opinion of Probable Development Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24. Hayes Street to Fourth Street Bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Preparation</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenway Signage</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Improvements</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>3,858</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
<td>$308,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stairs from Green Way to street level</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12' Wide Asphalt Path</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>5,144</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$92,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curbing for Parking Lot</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>1,459</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$20,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Paving for Parking Lot</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>1,946</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$35,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting Fixture</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash Receptacles</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate Park Fencing</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td>$76,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate Park</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$300,000.00</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Stop Enclosure</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&quot; - 2 1/2&quot; Caliper Trees</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$155,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>2,169</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$65,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrub / Perennial Plantings</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall Repair</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,502,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Third Street Intersection Remodel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing Signage</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$29,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Paving</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Paving</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$5,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb Cuts</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art / Artifact</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$47,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Fourth Street Bridge to Lynn Street Bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Preparation</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenway Signage</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Improvements</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>1,131</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
<td>$90,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12' Wide Asphalt Path</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>1,306</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$27,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting Fixture</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>$64,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Conduit</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>1,131</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$5,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash Receptacles</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td>$117,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramp</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$45,000.00</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&quot; - 2 1/2&quot; Caliper Trees</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$20,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrub / Perennial Plantings</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawn Seeding</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>55,440</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>$5,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$417,548</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total $4,146,116
10% Contingency $414,612
Total $4,560,728
14% Engineering and Environmental $638,502
Total Trail Improvements $5,199,230
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