

Summary of Comments and Responses on the Path Proposal

Submitted to the Community Preservation Committee and the CIA

December 8, 2008 by the Steering Committee of the Chappy Path Committee

Bob Colvin, Chair
Will Geresey
Melissa Kagan
Dick Knight
Joe Sullivan
Tom Tilghman
Peter Wells



This document summarizes the comments over the last 4 months elicited in response to the Shared Use Path questionnaires and the grant proposal to the Community Preservation Committee. We added a response by the Chappy Path Committee, which is either a clarification of our position, additional information, or a rebuttal of the argument. Many of these comments have gone out before as part of our updates to the Chappy community. In general we have kept the source of the comments anonymous. For some of the recent positive responses, we have indicated the source of the quote. Apologizes to those we have paraphrased and not cited.

These comments and responses are offered because we believe that a rational approach to the issues will promote a consensus and the best decision on the path.

We have organized the comments into these categories:

- 1. Safety**
- 2. Rural Character and Esthetics**
- 3. Environment**
- 4. Design**
- 5. More People**
- 6. Speeding**
- 7. Sand**
- 8. Economic considerations**
- 9. Property rights**
- 10. History and Consensus**
- 11. Need**

1. SAFETY

| Comments | Responses |
|--|---|
| <p>Can you tell me what the rationale is behind the present proposal? If it is safety, has anyone come up with anything to back it up? I'd love to know about it. It would be hard to argue against a bike path if it actually made things safer.</p> | <p>Important point, since safety is a central argument. The vast majority of fatal bicycle accidents involve a collision with a vehicle (92% in one study of 225 fatalities), a risk that will be greatly reduced by a separate bicycle path. Bike paths do not prevent other accidents between bikes or between bikes and pedestrians. This can be minimized by the design of the path, including an ample width, separation of the lanes, signage and good visibility.</p> |
| <p>I have not known of a single auto-bike collision on Chappy.</p> | <p>According to the computerized records of the Edgartown police, from 1988-2005, there were 8 serious bicycle accidents on Chappy that were reported to police. None of these involved a collision with a vehicle, although a role of vehicles in the accidents, such forcing off the road, is not excluded. During this time there were 35 motor vehicle accidents on Chappy, 6 involving injuries. Any role of bicycles or pedestrians in these accidents is similarly unknown.</p> <p>In the last 10 years I have witnessed many occasions when a car came dangerously close to a young child on a bicycle. We have been very fortunate that there has not been a tragedy on our road. This sort of accident can happen at any time of year not just the summer (Karen Stephens).</p> <p>The past is no indication of the future. We have observed many a near-miss over the years and the congestion on the roads is increasing.</p> |
| <p>Over its length, a bike path will intersect with at least 50 dirt driveways. At many of these intersections, visibility for bikers and for drivers coming out of driveways will not be good. Drivers who do not slow down or stop and look both ways could easily strike a child or adult passing over their driveway. Many drivers will be guests or renters not aware of this danger. But even owners, like myself, could be forgetful or careless. Also, it would not be wise to count on the cyclists stopping to look three ways at each of the 50 intersections. Obviously, none of us would like to cause a serious injury or death.</p> | <p>Whether bikes are on a path or on the road there will be intersections with driveways. Drivers exiting their driveways have no greater chance of being careless if there is a bike path. Fewer interactions with cars, not more will be the consequence of the path.</p> <p>A recent survey of the proposed Phase I route from the ferry to the Dike Bridge reveals only 11 driveways and 6 roads. Each was surfaced with sand, which itself would prompt a bicyclist to pay attention. The driveways probably have little traffic (none seen during the survey).</p> |

| Comments | Responses |
|---|---|
| <p>Our roads are safe already.</p> | <p>Granted we have yet to have a disaster. However, serious injuries to bicyclists have occurred, including one to a member of our committee who was run off the road by a vehicle and had to go to the MVH. As noted above the police have 8 reported incidents of bicycle injuries in their computer files and many more are no doubt unreported.</p> <p>Nobody in a car can truly operate safely around a child or even an adult on a bicycle. A person on a bike can easily wobble ten feet and unless drivers wait to pass when they can get completely into the other lane they have come too close (Peter Wells).</p> <p>A line from Man of La Mancha has always served me well when picking my battles. It describes the inevitable effect of a collision between a large heavy object like a car and a small fragile object like a biker or pedestrian. "Whether the stone hits the pitcher or the pitcher hits the stone, it will be bad for the pitcher." My vote is to move the pitchers away from the stones. (David Clinnin).</p> <p>Most drivers are cautious. However, I was nearly hit once and have seen quite a few cars going very fast and passing bikers on the blind corners. A bike path would at least keep people safer than being on the main road (Louise and Graham Marx).</p> |
| <p>There are studies showing that it is actually more dangerous to ride on bike paths across intersecting driveways than riding along the side of a road.</p> | <p>It is hard to generalize from other paths. The number of intersecting driveways on the proposed route is small (11) and these are sand and will prompt the bikers to slow down. Bike paths should reduce the likelihood of a collision with a motor vehicle. More 90% of fatal accidents of bikers involve a motor vehicle. The design of the path and the amount of traffic influence the safety of the path.</p> |

2. RURAL CHARACTER AND ESTHETICS

| Comments | Responses |
|---|---|
| <p>We have an unspoiled rural island and we want to keep it that way. We are so fortunate to have this unspoiled landscape and I wish the people who come here because of its beauty wouldn't keep trying to ruin it. The bikers and walkers love it and enjoy coming here and the way it is.</p> | <p>Hardly unspoiled, considering the increasing car and truck traffic. Not clear how a bicycle/walking path "ruins" the beauty. In fact it has potential to increase the beauty and enjoyment of the island for those who choose not to drive.</p> |
| <p>Bicycle paths will drastically change the character of Chappy. Let them use the roads if they really want to see the place.</p> | <p>The "character" of Chappy is hard to define. The character should include respect for those who wish to have alternatives to driving a car and safety for all. The "them" in this argument is mostly "us." The main beneficiaries by far will be the Chappy residents.</p> <p>Would it really "drastically" change the character to allow an alternative route for walkers, joggers and bicyclists out of our traffic?</p> <p>What could be more quintessentially rural than an opportunity to get away from the tyranny of motor vehicles?</p> |
| <p>More bikers will increase the trash on the island.</p> | <p>In fact, you rarely if ever, see trash on bicycle paths. One reason is that it is difficult to eat, drink or smoke on a bike, as opposed to a vehicle. Most of our trash along the roads comes from cars and trucks. The other reason is that bikers in general have great respect for the environment and that is one of the motivations to bicycle instead of drive.</p> <p>We would also like to point out that we already have a network of walking trails connecting environmentally sensitive areas and neighborhoods on Chappy. We observe our neighbors and visitors alike daily enjoying the small portion of the path that we personally donated to the Land Bank 11 years ago. Not once have we regretted our decision to welcome the construction of a segment of the Cross Chappy Trail through our own backyard. There isn't any additional bother or trash, only the sounds of quiet conversations and the laughter of children. These trails do not diminish the Chappy way of life they enhance it. A "bike" trail will not destroy the Chappy experience either (Susan and Will Gerese).</p> |

| Comments | Responses |
|--|--|
| We like our rural roads and don't want them paved either | We do not propose paving roads but only the provision of a safe and esthetically pleasing path for those walkers and bikers who choose not to walk or bike in the road. |
| We don't want any more asphalt on Chappy. | We agree and that is why we investigated alternatives. The stone dust/binder path in the Concord Minuteman National Park is an attractive choice. |
| Laying a sleek, smooth asphalt bike path on Chappaquiddick will, in a single stroke, destroy the rural pace of life that makes our little island so different in this frenetic day and age -- and so special. | Once again, we do not propose an asphalt path. The rural pace of life is lively for those walkers and bikers trying to dodge cars, garbage trucks and pickups on the road. |
| This will be an esthetic disaster. | We believe that a non-paved path no more than 8' separated from the road by 3 feet or more can be designed to improve the esthetics of Chappy. Such a path would certainly improve the esthetic experience of those who now have no other choice but to walk or ride on the road with the car and truck traffic. |
| For those who believe that a paved bike path would "improve" Chappaquiddick, why not a WalMart on the site of the Chappy store, halogen street lights along the Chappaquiddick road, and a boardwalk casino at Wasque? | We will let that one speak for itself. |
| This will change Chappaquiddick forever. | We hope for the better, like electricity and indoor plumbing, Land Bank trails, and the Trustees of Reservations properties. This proposal is an antidote to pollution and increased motor vehicles. |

3. ENVIRONMENT

| Comments | Responses |
|--|--|
| <p>With the water supply in some areas of Chappaquiddick (Manaca Hill, North Neck) already in jeopardy as a result of salt infiltration , and of questionable potability in other areas (Chappy Store, former dump on Walter Woods's property) as a result of the long time presence of heavy metals and industrial solvents in and on the soil, can the island afford to add additional pollutants (as would be the case, were a path built) to the remaining groundwater ?</p> | <p>The path will not contribute pollutants or interfere with drainage. In fact the path will help reduce pollutants by reducing car use and moving the paved road away from wetlands.</p> <p>Regarding ground water quality, the negative impacts from our paved road (runoff during storms, oil drips, etc.) is likely to vastly outweigh the impacts of constructing or having a bike path that is a non-asphalt surface and unlikely to contribute significantly to runoff (not to mention that bikes are widely recognized as a non-polluting alternative) (Silva Malm).</p> |
| <p>The path cannot be built without interfering with wetlands.</p> | <p>If this is true, then the opponents could argue that a survey should be done, just to stop the debate.</p> <p>However, based on our own investigations, we believe that the survey will reveal that reasonable solutions can be found that will avoid encroachment on wetlands.</p> |

4. DESIGN

| Comments | Responses |
|--|--|
| <p>In concept, I would like a walking, biking path. Need to know more of width & location of path before voting in favor.</p> | <p>Agree, but before we can get to the design stage, we needed a clear sense of whether Chappy residents supported the concept, which fortunately they do by a considerable margin. This support can be used to encourage the town to develop the best design possible and bring this back for further discussion and refinement by the Chappy community.</p> |
| <p>Don't want to widen road enough for a bike path. Only in favor if path is separated and set back from the road like the bike path on the West Tisbury Rd.</p> | <p>Many advantages to this type of path. Main limitation is getting easements through the properties. May be possible for some of the path.</p> |
| <p>I favor a biking/walking path but only if it's the kind of path I'd like to see, which is more about what I don't want to see - paved, wide, and no bridge structure next to Caleb's, etc. One idea I had is a one-bike-wide path on both sides of the road - like a tow path for a horse next to a canal, and dirt or some permeable natural type surface so it looks like a path.</p> | <p>Paths on both sides of the road are worth considering and have some merits. One of the problems however, is that they keep the path people close to the road and are less safe for children.</p> <p>We like your idea of a "permeable natural type surface". Shared use paths have been made of stone dust and sand with a binder in Minuteman National Park in Concord with excellent results. We would prefer this choice as well, but we need to prove its durability on Chappy.</p> |
| <p>Walking path- yes (not paved bike path)</p> | <p>We believe that the path can be non-paved and serve both uses. More walking paths are also desirable.</p> |

| Comments | Responses |
|---|---|
| <p>If we have to have bike paths I hope they would not end up looking like the bike paths on the Edgartown-Vineyard Haven Rd and the Katama Road, which have lost almost all the grass on the strip separating the path from the main road. This is a real eyesore. The remedy would be to have greater separation, enough to allow trees and natural vegetation to remain as a real buffer between the two. I would think many property owners along the road would prefer this even if it meant giving up a few feet of their property because the outcome overall would be so much better looking and could actually afford more protection from the road.</p> | <p>Agree with this analysis—a moderately separated path is the first choice wherever possible.</p> |
| Comments | Responses |
| <p>Safest would be to get two narrow one-way bike paths, one on each side of the roadway, marked for travel in the same direction as traffic flow. The relatively narrow one way paths diminishes bike-bike, bike-car, bike-pedestrian accidents and provide for much safer conditions for all involved. Plus, casual walkers are far less apt to use the road-shoulder bike paths to lollygag and dilly dally.</p> | <p>We believe this excellent suggestion should be seriously considered as an alternative for at least some of the path.</p> |

| Comments | Responses |
|--|---|
| <p>Mixed use bi-directional paths are dangerous unless they are very wide, have smooth pavement, good drainage, and are free of debris - especially sand. Bi-directional mixed use paths generally, create a high likelihood that pedestrians, especially mature and elderly strollers will be injured by inexperienced bike riders. Also, pedestrians bring leashed dogs, kiddie-strollers, baby carriages, toddlers and youngsters with training wheels on to a mixed use path which often soon renders it unsuitable for bicycle riders and walkers alike. A mixed use path is generally ill advised.</p> | <p>We already have a mixed use bidirectional path, namely our roads, which cars and trucks share with “bicycle riders, walkers, pedestrians with leashed dogs, kiddie-strollers, baby carriages, toddlers and youngsters with training wheels.” At least these will not encounter a motor vehicle on the proposed mixed use path. Almost all serious injuries to bicyclists involve a motor vehicle.</p> <p>In Boston the Paul Dudley White Bicycle Path along the Charles River is mixed use, approximately 6-8 feet wide and quite pleasant. With far more users of the type mentioned in the comment than we would ever have on Chappy, the people adapt and are able to share the space without significant problems.</p> |
| <p>The non-paved path will not be durable.</p> | <p>We agree that this is an important consideration. We are encouraged by the experience of the shared use path in Concord, where according Lou Siderus, who built it 10 years ago, it has proved quite satisfactory, not requiring annual maintenance.</p> <p>Stuart Fuller said in his letter that he prefers asphalt, but also describes the advantages the stone dust/binder path and indicates that that this decision will be made considering esthetics, cost and durability. Testing on Chappy would help with this decision. We believe that it will be quite adequate over most if not all of the route.</p> |

5. MORE PEOPLE

| Comments | Responses |
|--|--|
| <p>On nice days, a significant percentage of the hundreds of MV visitors who rent bikes would come to Chappy. Large numbers will increase the likelihood of accidents. When multiple bikes are loaded and organized on the Chappy Ferries, trips seem to take longer than usual. If correct, this will increase the time spent in Ferry lines.</p> | <p>We would all agree that more time spent in Ferry lines is bad (unless you use it as a way of keeping people away from Chappy). However, the main reason the ferry line is long is because of cars, not bikes.</p> <p>Will the bike path significantly increase the number of bikers coming to Chappy? Perhaps it will, or perhaps more bikers mean fewer tourist cars driving onto Chappy which might actually decrease the ferry lines.</p> <p>Large bike parties may increase ferry lines: It's hard to believe that loading bikes slows the ferry significantly, but if you allow that argument to affect whether a bike path is built you are using the scare tactic of confusing unrelated issues. Extrapolating from a bike path to more bikers and from more bikers to slower ferry lines requires not one but two unsupported assumptions and is less an argument than speculation. One could argue that to the extent bikes replace cars coming over to Chappy the net effect could be beneficial.</p> |
| <p>Many of us believe that the more troublesome (and expensive) it is to get here, the more folks will stay away.</p> | <p>To paraphrase, "Let's make Chappy unpleasant so everyone will stay away." Most affected by "troublesome" and "expensive" are the Chappy residents. Better to make the visitors less visible and able to go to their destination (usually the beaches) with minimal effect on the residents.</p> <p>It is clear that the greatest benefit by far of the proposed path will accrue to the year round and summer Chappy residents, who ride, walk or bike the island roads almost every day we are here, even if we have to share it with a few more visitors.</p> |
| <p>The path will just bring more people to Chappy. Paved bike paths are magnets. They draw bicyclists like bees to honey.</p> | <p>Perhaps it will, but at least they will not be driving cars. In fact the car traffic might be less, not more, because of the more attractive alternative path.</p> <p>We hope that many of the bees will be Chappy residents who are attracted to this alternative to our cars and trucks.</p> <p>In any case Chappy will still have some defenses—ticks, poison ivy and the price of the ferry.</p> |

6. SPEEDING

| Comments | Responses |
|---|---|
| <p>Many of us can get frustrated when we have to slow down or stop for cyclists. We could often go faster if bikes were not on our roads. Some drivers would end up going much faster. This would increase the chance of accidents.</p> | <p>Bikers as speed bumps - interesting point, but hopefully not serious.</p> |
| <p>The bikers and walkers help to keep drivers going slowly.</p> | <p>As above. Let's do not rely on people to slow down the traffic.</p> |
| <p>Prior to building a new road we should enforce the laws on the books today. The 25 MPH speed limit is mostly ignored by Chappy residents, workers and visitors alike. Vigilant enforcement of speeding laws and increased signage are effective ways of changing habits. Enforcement is cheaper, can be implemented immediately and aesthetically more pleasing solution to the risk of injury or death to cyclist and walkers by automobile vs. building a walkway.</p> | <p>Agree we need to reduce the speeding on Chappy through the measures suggested.</p> <p>However, even if everyone drives at 25 mph, the hazards to walkers and bicyclists forced off the road and the stress to motorists forced to stop or change lanes on curves will remain.</p> <p>There has only been limited, if any, improvement in the speeding over the last 10 years, despite some effort by the Edgartown police.</p> |
| <p>Some cyclists would still use the road, even if there was a bike path.</p> | <p>Those biking closer to the speed limit (25 mph) may find it easier and safer. However, there are many not able to ride that fast or who should not get close to traffic (children).</p> |

7. SAND

| Comments | Responses |
|--|---|
| <p>One consistent MV problem is clearing sand from bike paths - sand makes the path unsafe and dangerous. Unless we have a budget for labor and equipment to sweep the sand off - this could create a big safety problem.</p> | <p>Should be no more sand on the path than on the current road (or shoulder) which is the only current alternative.</p> <p>A paved path even with a layer of sand would be an improvement over the roads that pure sand and often soft.</p> <p>Bikers on Chappy are used to sand, since they have to go down sand roads to beaches.</p> |
| <p>As cars drive on dirt drives over the bike path, and with rain wash off, sand will be on the bike paths at many intersections. Sand will also be washed on to the bike path in places where it is down gradient from the road-particularly where the road is not paved out toward Wasque. Sand on bike paths is very dangerous! In fact, in the few places where sand has accumulated on the Chappy paved road, there have been some serious falls causing bad injuries. The problem would be increased many fold on a bike path.</p> | <p>The bike path will intersect driveways where the road now intersects driveways. The same sand from driveways that may mar the smooth surface of Chappy Road may mar the smooth surface of the bike path if it is along Chappy Road, but the presence of a bike path will not increase the chance of a biker encountering a little sand on his path. Secondly, the bike paths along other sandy areas of the island, such as State Beach, do not accumulate the dangerous amounts of sand you warn of, and in fact are quite smooth in my experience (I have biked and rollerbladed over the Beach Road path many times without encountering any "dangerous sand.") Lastly, only deep sand presents a significant problem for the fat tire mountain bikes that are the predominant bike these days. A little sand, unlike a little knowledge, is not a dangerous thing.</p> |

8. ECONOMICS

| Comments | Responses |
|--|---|
| <p>These are difficult times, why are we considering a bike path?</p> | <p>Even in difficult times, it is hard to imagine a higher priority than safety of our children, one of the goals of our proposal.</p> <p>We fully acknowledge that setting the relative priority of this project over others is the responsibility of the Community Preservation Committee and there may be more critical needs at this time.</p> |
| <p>\$27,000 is a lot of money in these times.</p> | <p>We agree, but note that \$27,000 probably represents <1% of the annual property tax contributions from Chappy. One could also argue that spending money locally on projects serves the desirable goal of an economic stimulus.</p> |
| <p>Who would be responsible for maintaining the path? Edgartown? Chappy?</p> | <p>The town of Edgartown would be responsible. Stuart Fuller, Head of the Highway Department is a sponsor of our proposal. Little maintenance is required for these paths.</p> |
| <p>Who would be liable for injuries sustained while walking or riding on such a path?</p> | <p>Probably the same people/organizations who are liable for injuries of the walkers and riders now using the road.</p> <p>Those that oppose a path should consider the consequence of their position on the likelihood of future accidents on the Chappy road.</p> |
| <p>How many year round Chappy residents now rely upon bicycles as their primary means of transportation? If fewer than 100 (biking to and from town, summer and winter), then how can the per person cost of such a massive financial and ecological undertaking be justified?</p> | <p>The path will probably increase the use of bicycles, so the present number will be an underestimate. In any case, no accurate counts are known to us. Typically 40+ bicycles are parked at the ferry in the summer. We estimate that several hundred people/day use the road on Chappy for walking, pushing strollers or biking. If we assume 250 people/day x80 days that is 40,000 trips per summer, add to that 30/day another 200 days give 52,000 person trips/year. Over 20 years that is 1,040,000 trips. Probably a cost per trip of less than a \$1. And it saves gas money. And it reduces the need for car parking.</p> |

9. PROPERTY RIGHTS

| Comments | Responses |
|---|---|
| <p>The path cannot be built without interfering with property rights.</p> | <p>If this is true, then the opponents could argue that a survey should be done, just to stop the debate.</p> <p>Edgartown owns 50' right of way along the paved road and 30' along sand roads (e.g. Dike Bridge and Wasque roads). Paved road is ~20-22' wide, permitting an 8' wide path without requiring easements along most of its course.</p> <p>Some utility poles may have to be removed and the wires buried, which would add to the expense but also to the esthetic benefit.</p> <p>Some easements will be required or the road shifted slightly, as the roads are not always centered on the rights of way.</p> <p>Edgartown would presumably pay a fair price for the easements to those willing to allow the path. However, it is not necessary for the path to be perfect and occasional narrowing or return to the roadway may be more acceptable to the Chappy residents than taking land by eminent domain.</p> <p>Some have already volunteered easements on their land for the path (along Chappy Road and at Wasque).</p> |

9. HISTORY AND CONSENSUS

| Comments | Responses |
|--|--|
| <p>Why can't we settle it once and for all instead of having to fight it ever 4-5 years?</p> | <p>We would like to settle this once and for all, through a democratic, open and transparent process that listens and responds rationally to the arguments for and against, and does not give anyone, no matter how vocal or litigious, veto power over the majority.</p> <p>We believe that an accurate land survey of the potential path route will focus the discussion on exactly what is feasible and is it desirable.</p> |
| <p>This community was divided down the middle a few years ago about this idea.</p> | <p>We are no longer divided down the middle: according to an August 2008 survey results from over 200 Chappy residents, including the CIA membership, the overwhelming majority of those responding favor a mixed use bicycle/walking path (70%).</p> <p>A subsequent survey in November-December 2008 showed that 60% of those responding (over 180) favored the land survey and/or a demonstration path. A margin greater than our recent presidential election, which was considered quite decisive.</p> <p>Times and opinions have changed. We now have more interest in health, gas savings, and safety concerns about the ever increasing car/truck traffic.</p> |
| <p>On about six occasions since 1970, this matter has been vigorously advocated - usually by mostly new property owners, and after much discussion, dismissed by the majority.</p> | <p>We are unaware of any vote in the past that could be interpreted as the majority.</p> <p>At the present time support is broad and cannot be dismissed as "mostly new property owners". In any case, in a democracy the new are entitled to an equal voice in matters that concern their community and the public good.</p> |
| <p>We should wait until we have fully discussed this at the summer CIA meetings.</p> | <p>Many discussions have already taken place over the years, and would be much more productive with further information. The central premise of our application is that the decision should be based on facts and that an accurate survey is necessary. We believe that if this is delayed for further discussion, without an engineering survey, we would be back in the same place one year later seeking funds.</p> |

| Comments | Responses |
|--|---|
| <p>This project is divisive.</p> | <p>So are many issues these days. Different views are to be expected and respected in a lively democratic community. We believe that the best way to diffuse controversy is a reasoned analysis of facts, validated by testing. Our goal is to promote a consensus by acquiring facts as to what is feasible and setting up a practical demonstration that can test the benefits.</p> <p>We have great confidence in our neighbors that once the real possibilities are clear, and reasonable solutions proposed, the controversy will dissipate.</p> |
| <p>This is an effort by a small vocal group.</p> | <p>We are happy to be vocal about sometime we believe in. However, we represent a fair number of people. In our email survey last summer 164/233 (70%) of Chappy residents said they were in favor of a shared use path in principle and our committee currently has 39 members, who are Chappy homeowners.</p> <p>In a recent email questionnaire sent out to CIA and non-CIA members, the 60% of the respondents supported the proposal to do an engineering survey and 59% supported the demonstration path. Only 35% were opposed.</p> |

10. NEED

| Comments | Responses |
|---|---|
| <p>We already have paths on Chappy. There is already a network of packed dirt back roads and cleared walking trails that offer an alternative to those who want to want to bike around the island recreationally.</p> | <p>We do have wonderful paths in the TOR and Land Bank properties, and one of our important arguments is that the proposed shared use path will link these together and improve access to the open spaces.</p> <p>Currently there is a whole population of people who are not out biking/walking on the roads because they feel it is too unsafe. Families with small kids, pre-teens and teens whose parents won't let them ride by themselves and anybody else who just feels too frightened to take on the winding roads with the cars.</p> <p>I believe that this study is desperately needed. The activities of the Trustees of the Reservation have increased car, bike and foot traffic on Chappy by enormous levels. I am worried that it is only a matter of time before we have a serious accident on Chappy. I would love it if my children could ride their bikes to the ferry but that is not possible because of the hazardous amount of traffic on the road with no path for bikes (Norm Champ).</p> |
| <p>We don't need another engineering survey, that was done before.</p> | <p>Chappy Path Committee reviewed the engineering survey that had been prepared several years ago. We realized that because the survey was outdated and not sufficiently accurate, we needed a new more complete engineering survey to decide whether a path really could be constructed and how it might be designed. We thought that this was necessary to enable a realistic discussion of the merits of a path among Chappy homeowners.</p> <p>The benefits of having the results of an engineering study would be that we can have a discussion based on facts rather than opinion; we would be able to better assess the environmental impact of a path; we would have clearer idea of its cost; all residents of Chappy whose property is adjacent to the path would be able to determine the impact the path would have on their property. This gives us common ground for a discussion from which we could arrive at a decision that might be acceptable to us all (Karen Stephens).</p> |

| Comments | Responses |
|--|--|
| <p>We don't need a path on Chappy to separate the bikes from the cars—only 3 cars come on the ferry at a time.</p> | <p>While we were driving the proposed route on a bicycle on August morning, we were passed by 21 cars/trucks each of whom had to either cross over to the oncoming lane (see photo on first page) or slow down behind us, if oncoming traffic was present. On the highway we passed six children bicycling, many adult bikers and walkers and two strollers (one double wide).</p> |