Executive Summary

This Plan was developed under the guidance of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee of the Capitol Region Council of Governments’ (CRCOG) Transportation Committee. The Subcommittee was formed in November 1998 to oversee the development of the region’s Bicycle Plan (completed in 2000) and its membership included representatives from each CRCOG member town, the Connecticut Department of Transportation, as well as citizens at large, including, members of the Connecticut Bicycle Coalition. In 2003, the Subcommittee membership was expanded to insure representation from additional groups interested in pedestrian issues, including public health professionals, public safety officials, recreation organizations, Main Street programs, and the disabled community.

Introduction

Walking Matters – We Are All Pedestrians: Walking, sometimes considered an “alternate” form of transportation, might better be considered the primary form of transportation. Most trips, regardless of length or mode of travel (personal vehicle or public transit) involve some element of walking, whether from the home to the car, from the home to the bus stop, or from the vehicle to the final destination. In spite of this, over the past several decades, scant attention has been paid to the pedestrian environment and to the needs of pedestrians. This lack of focus has been prevalent throughout the country and in our region and has led to a decrease in the number of trips that can be made via walking. Fortunately, in recent years there has been an awakening to the need to provide for pedestrian travel and there has been a growing understanding of the importance of the pedestrian network for healthy, livable communities.

Walking Matters – Some Are More Dependent on Walking: Even though everyone is a pedestrian some of the time, certain segments of the population are more likely than others to depend upon walking for much of their travel. Children, too young to drive, or without access to a car, rely upon walking to independently get where they want to go. The elderly, who may no longer be able to drive, or who prefer not to drive, also rely on walking to maintain their independence. Many members of the disabled community meet more of their travel needs through walking than does the general population. And finally, those who do not own cars, either by choice or financial necessity, are more dependent upon walking as a means to get around. When considering the need for safe pedestrian facilities, it is important to consider the everyday and special needs of these groups.
WALKING MATTERS – WALKABLE COMMUNITIES ARE LIVABLE

COMMUNITIES: Years ago towns and developments were built for all modes of transportation and it was assumed that walking would be a vital part of getting around in town. As development in the last 50 years focused more upon the needs of automobiles – how to get them to a development, how to park them once they were there - assumptions were made that people would not walk, and pedestrian facilities were not provided. Recent surveys indicate that this was a mistake, that many people would like to be able to walk more. A recent survey conducted by Smart Growth America and the National Association of Realtors indicates that for 72% of the population, having sidewalks and places to walk is an important factor when buying a home. Trends in construction of new shopping centers, where life style centers try to recreate the feel of a traditional downtown, indicate that the public responds positively to the provision of walkable places. A 2000 Regional Development Issues Survey, conducted for CRCOG by the Center for Survey Research and Analysis at the University of Connecticut indicated that in all three communities surveyed (Hartford, West Hartford, and Suffield), strong majorities (86%, 81% and 65% respectively) agreed that more places where people can walk, rather than drive, from their home to shops, work, and recreation are needed. And simple observation of vibrant town and city centers shows us that walkability is a key component of vital centers. Further, recent safety studies have indicated that when more people are visible walking in a community, the environment actually becomes safer for walking, without any physical changes. 1

WALKING MATTERS – IT’S PART OF A BALANCED TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM: A successful transportation system is one that accommodates a variety of modes of travel and does not require individuals to depend on one way of getting around. Census trends show that walking is becoming less common for work trips (mode share for bicycling and walking to work in the region declined from 10% to 6% from 1990 to 2000). In addition, nationwide, over the past 30 years the percent of children walking or biking to school has declined from 66% to 13%. Nationally, about 50% of all trips are less than 3 miles in length, and of those trips less than 0.5 mile in length, more than 50% are made in a vehicle. These trips could quite reasonably be converted to walking trips if sufficient, safe facilities are provided. Furthermore, work trips, which may be less amenable to walking, comprise less than 20% of total daily trips (2001 National Household Travel Survey), so there is quite a base of trips that might be suitable for walking.

**Walking Matters – Walkability leads to Healthy Communities:**
In recent years, there has been growing concern with the prevalence of overweight and obesity in the adult population in the US. Currently, it is estimated that more than 30% of the nation’s adult population is categorized as obese. Obesity increases the risk of developing many health conditions, including Type 2 diabetes, hypertension, coronary heart disease, stroke, colon cancer, and other cancers, gall bladder disease, osteoarthritis, and sleep apnea. It is estimated that poor diet and physical inactivity lead to 300,000 premature deaths each year, second only to deaths caused by tobacco. And these risks have a cost to the public: it is estimated that Medicaid and Medicare costs in the state of Connecticut attributable to overweight and obesity are in excess of $650 million annually\(^2\). This includes only direct medical costs and not the costs of increased absenteeism and loss of productivity. Moderate physical activity, including walking, is one of the best antidotes to the obesity epidemic. Just ½ hour of walking, 5 times a week, can greatly change an individual’s health status.

**Walking Matters – Providing Pedestrian Infrastructure is Part of a Policy of Environmental Justice:** The federal government requires that all transportation projects be evaluated for “environmental justice,” which means that the impact of a project upon low income and minority neighborhoods must not be disproportionate. Recently there has been greater awareness that transportation policies which favor infrastructure for automobiles over that for pedestrians have a negative effect on environmental justice. That is, use of transportation resources for motor vehicle facilities disproportionately benefits those who choose to drive over those for whom walking is a primary form of transportation and low income and minority neighborhoods tend to be more dependent upon walking for transportation than the average population.

**Walking Matters – Pedestrian Safety is a Public Safety Responsibility:** Providing a walkable infrastructure is an important public safety responsibility. Over the past decades, the transportation safety focus has been almost exclusively on automobiles. An unintended consequence of making streets safer for autos has been to make them less safe for the primary transportation mode, that of walking.

**Walking Matters** – Walking does matter and as a result, many communities are beginning to recognize that they need to **Complete the Streets**, providing a road system that accommodates all users, including pedestrians.

There is no question, *Walking does matter*, it is our primary form of transportation. Even when we drive or take transit, walking is part of our journey. For some in our society, young, elderly, or disabled, walking is a means of maintaining independence. And for our towns and communities, pedestrian facilities and the presence of an active pedestrian culture help to create a livable community.

---

But in the past 50 years, development patterns have not reflected the importance of walking. New roads have been built without sidewalks, commercial developments have been designed for auto access with little thought given to pedestrians. Many new residential developments are distant from community activity centers – parks, schools, shops and offices.

Road and highway improvements have focused primarily on moving vehicles and scant attention and resources have been devoted to pedestrian facilities. In addition, some roadway improvements have inadvertently deteriorated pedestrian safety, only because pedestrian needs were not considered.

This Capitol Region Pedestrian Plan is designed to correct these trends, to insure that our region provides for all forms of transportation, including walking. To change the habits of many decades will take persistence and will require that all involved in decisions regarding pedestrian facilities – planners, engineers, and local elected officials – be brought on board. Conventional wisdom regarding roadway design and development patterns will need to be questioned and redefined. New tools and techniques will have to be introduced. A Complete the Streets ethic, which recognizes the importance of the roadway system serving all users, including pedestrians, must emerge in the region. This plan includes a wide range of actions that can be taken at the regional level to move us toward these goals and to create a region that is truly livable for all its citizens.

The region can begin to transform itself if planners, engineers and decision makers shift their way of thinking to recognize that indeed, Walking Matters. If professionals and elected officials do, in fact, believe that walking matters, a true pedestrian friendly ethos will result. This will lead to a new way of approaching issues:

**WALKING MATTERS: A NEW PLANNING ETHIC FOR THE REGION**

- Inclusion of pedestrian considerations in all planning studies.
- Consideration of pedestrian needs in all land use decisions.
- Consideration of pedestrian needs in all transportation projects.
- Rethinking of funding priorities
- Consideration of pedestrian access when approving new developments
- Consideration of pedestrian access when locating government facilities (including schools.)
Vision

This plan is based upon a vision:

In the future, residents and visitors of the region will be able to walk, bicycle, or take another type of non-motorized vehicle via roads and multi-use trails, safely and conveniently to employment centers, shopping areas, bus and train centers, recreation and cultural attractions, and schools. Residential and commercial land use planning and development incorporate walking and bicycling as transportation modes, providing people of all ages efficient and enjoyable transportation options within development clusters and to nearby destinations. It is our intent that such steps will also contribute to a greater sense of community and friendliness in our communities while enhancing our appreciation of the natural environment.

Realizing this vision will require a variety of actions and the participation of all of the municipalities in the region. Change will not happen overnight, but continual focus on our vision and actions in accord with this plan will enable the region to move toward its goal of being a walkable, pedestrian friendly place.

Learning from Others

When it comes to pedestrian planning and design, there is no need to reinvent the wheel, a good deal of work has already been completed. But the latest information on pedestrian safety and design is not always readily available to the town planners and engineers who need it. A review of pedestrian safety literature and design guides provides the following guidance for enhancing pedestrian safety and improving pedestrian facilities.

Factors to Consider in Planning

- Compact, mixed-use developments create more opportunities for walking.
- A fine grained (characterized by short blocks) and interconnected street system allows for human scaled streets that facilitate walking.
- Pedestrian connections to major generators (retail, schools, transit, major developments) insure that walking is an option.
- Careful location of developments that tend to produce more walking trips (schools, senior housing, retail) facilitates walking.
- Walking can be encouraged with attention to parking lot design and placement of parking. Pedestrians are discouraged when they need to walk across a sea of parking.
- Provision of appropriate bicycle facilities can improve pedestrian safety by keeping bikes off the sidewalks.

* Electric wheelchairs are not considered motorized vehicles.
Features that Improve Pedestrian Safety

- Sidewalks and walkways enhance pedestrian safety and mobility.
- Improved nighttime lighting can improve pedestrian safety.
- Clear sight lines for pedestrians are vital. Pedestrians must be able to see the traffic and the traffic must be able to see the pedestrians.
- Marked crosswalks alone do not necessarily increase pedestrian safety. Other measures may be needed:
  - Medians to provide a pedestrian refuge. Raised medians are especially useful in reducing pedestrian-vehicular conflicts on multi lane roads.
  - Proper illumination of the crosswalk to insure the pedestrian is visible.
  - Signs, signals, and lights that alert motorists that pedestrians are crossing.
- Shorter crossing distances are safer. Shorter crossing distances can be achieved by:
  - Providing curb bumpouts
  - Reducing corner radii
  - Providing median refuge
- Raised crosswalks and raised intersections slow traffic enabling motorists more reaction time when they see pedestrians at the crosswalk.
- Traffic signals must be visible to pedestrians.
- Travelers on foot need convenience. Traffic signals should be designed to provide this:
  - Exclusive pedestrian signal phases (where all vehicular traffic is stopped and pedestrians can cross all legs of the intersection) can improve pedestrian safety, but such signals are only effective at locations with more than 1200 pedestrians per day. Careful consideration of all factors is needed before selecting exclusive pedestrian phases.
  - Short cycle lengths, of 90 seconds maximum ideally, are important to reduce pedestrian delay.
  - Where pedestrian traffic is regular and frequent, pedestrian phases should come up automatically. Actuation should only be used when pedestrian crossings are intermittent.
• Allowing right turn on red results in a small but clear safety problem for pedestrians.

• Safety of trips to and from school can be enhanced by sidewalks and proper signalization but also by well-trained adult crossing guards, selective enforcement, and warning signs and markings. Safe Routes to Schools programs can identify needed improvements in a comprehensive way.

• Traffic calming has a positive effect on pedestrian safety.

• The number of access points and curb cuts on a roadway has a large impact on pedestrian comfort and safety.

• All sidewalks and pedestrian facilities must be built in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements. This includes providing:
  
  ➢ Detectable (tactile) warnings at boundaries between streets and sidewalks
  ➢ Curb ramps at all locations where a sidewalk accesses a street.
  ➢ Clear pathways on sidewalks of at least 36 inches. Where sidewalk widths are less than 60 inches, passing areas 60 by 60 inches must be provided every 200 feet.

**Existing Conditions for Walking in the Region: Identified Needs**

In order to better understand the characteristics of the pedestrian environment in the region, CRCOG undertook a pedestrian safety study and also surveyed each town regarding pedestrian issues. While there are many pedestrian friendly enclaves in the region, every town, when asked, was able to identify pedestrian safety concerns within their borders. The CRCOG pedestrian safety study examined the characteristics of pedestrian accidents in the region in order to identify general areas for improvement.

Following is a summary of the needs identified by examining existing conditions:

• The statistics show a need for pedestrian safety improvements. Our regional study indicates that these improvements should be focused in the following areas:
  
  ➢ The physical environment should enhance safety.
  ➢ A sidewalk network is a vital component for pedestrian safety.
Because 80% of all regional pedestrian accidents occur when the pedestrian is crossing the street, street crossings should be made safer and more convenient.

Safety improvements should be focused on commercial/retail areas, schools, and health care facilities.

Pedestrians need to be educated on how to cross streets, both signalized and unsignalized, safely and legally. A special emphasis should be placed upon education of children.

Motorists need to be educated as to the rights of pedestrians. Most motorists yield to pedestrians in cross walks only when a sign indicating they should do so is placed at the crosswalk.

Towns need to be careful with right turn on red permissions so as not to compromise pedestrian safety.

Pedestrian laws need to be enforced.

- There is a need to create a sense of the “value” of sidewalks and other pedestrian facilities.
- Ordinances dealing with sidewalk requirements are not rigorously enforced currently.
- There appears to be an overuse of exclusive pedestrian signal phases in the region.
- A more systematic approach is needed for providing pedestrian facilities.

**Plan to Reach Our Vision**

Our Plan to improve pedestrian safety and to achieve our vision of a pedestrian friendly region is contained in four major recommendations:

1. **Provide an accessible, integrated and safe regional transportation system in which bicycling, walking and transit are prioritized.**
2. **Promote the increased use of non-motorized travel**
3. **Decrease the number of pedestrians and bicyclists killed and injured**
4. **Improve funding opportunities for the construction, maintenance and operation of bicycle and pedestrian facilities**
Recommended actions are listed below, not in priority order.

1. **Provide an accessible, integrated and safe regional transportation system in which bicycling, walking and transit are prioritized.**

   **1.1 Put the proper regulations into place**

   To enable the development of an integrated and region wide pedestrian network, it is important to have in place regulations that support such development.

   1.1.1 Advise the State Traffic Commission to give consideration to bicycle and pedestrian needs during their permitting process.

   1.1.2 Advocate for the Connecticut Department of Transportation to revise their current policy regarding funding of sidewalks.

   1.1.3 Advocate for Connecticut DOT and the region’s towns to adopt the USDOT Policy on Integrating Biking and Walking into the Transportation Infrastructure.

   **1.2 Provide education and outreach**

   Many of the improvements that are needed to improve pedestrian safety are under the purview of the region’s towns and CRCOG cannot directly cause them to be implemented. But CRCOG can play a large role in insuring that the towns are aware of best practices in pedestrian design. Areas to be focused upon include traffic signal timing, emerging techniques, model ordinances, traffic calming, and community design.

   **1.2.1 Provide resources to towns as they design bicycle/pedestrian facilities.** This will include a number of different activities:

   1.2.1.1 Develop a Bike/Pedestrian/Traffic Calming Newsletter.

   1.2.1.2 Sponsor annual design workshops on bike and pedestrian issues.

   1.2.1.3 Develop and disseminate to the towns model ordinances for sidewalk installation and maintenance.

   1.2.1.4 Provide model language for local Plans of Conservation and Development.

   1.2.1.5 Provide model details for pedestrian accommodations.

   1.2.1.6 Develop educational materials that towns can use with developers.

   1.2.1.7 Plan an annual walking audit with town officials and staff.

   **1.2.2 Work with towns to test promising strategies.**

   **1.2.3 Encourage towns to learn from each other.**
1.3 Provide the right transportation system for Biking and Walking

In order to increase pedestrian activity within the region, it is important that the transportation system encourage walking by providing safe and convenient facilities. Pedestrian and bike advocates have called for a campaign to complete the streets throughout the country. The goal of the complete the streets movement is to insure that all streets meet the needs of all users: motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians. Most of the following recommendations that can help complete the streets require town action to be implemented, but CRCOG can play an important role in encouraging the towns to act.

1.3.1 Encourage towns to develop a street grid network in areas of development.

1.3.2 Encourage towns to assess pedestrian facility needs.

1.3.3 Encourage towns to adopt design standards for sidewalk and pedestrian facilities.

1.3.4 Facilitate efforts to provide pedestrian access to other modes.

1.3.5 Work with the towns to continue to develop the regional multi use trail system.

1.3.6 Operate a pedestrian road problem reporting system.

1.3.7 Insure that transportation planning and traffic studies done in the region include an assessment of pedestrian needs.

2. Promote the increased use of non-motorized travel.

At the same time that pedestrian facilities are enhanced, it is important to encourage the public to consider walking for regular transportation needs. Currently, walking is seen as somewhat of an extraordinary effort, except for very short trips within urban or town center environments. The following tasks are designed to change the culture in the region to one that accepts and encourages walking as an important part of the transportation mix.

2.1 Safe Routes to School

The Safe Routes to Schools program is designed to assess why children do not walk to school and then to identify how to improve conditions so that children will walk to school in greater numbers. These programs can lead to reduced traffic in the vicinity of schools, with concomitant reductions in pollution and improvements in children’s health.
2.1.1 Offer training to regional professionals, parents, school staff, and other stakeholders.

2.1.2 Run one or more pilot Safe Routes program.

2.2 Promotional Activities

The following actions are designed to increase the numbers of people walking and to indicate the region’s commitment to walking as a viable mode.

2.2.1 Walk to Work Promotion.

2.2.2 Walking Clubs.

2.2.3 Walk/Health Information.

3. Decrease the number of pedestrians and bicyclists killed and injured

Provision of safe and convenient facilities will improve pedestrian safety, but education and enforcement efforts are also needed. Both motorists and pedestrians, and even some law enforcement officers, are confused about their rights and responsibilities with regard to pedestrian law. This is a sampling of items that do not seem clear to the average individual: Does a motorist only have to yield to pedestrians in crosswalks when a sign so directing is located adjacent to the crosswalk? Does a turning vehicle always need to scan for pedestrians in the crosswalk before turning? Can a pedestrian ever legally cross mid block? An education campaign aimed at providing universal understanding of the rights and responsibilities of pedestrians will provide more certainty to those walking and those driving. This will be most successful when backed up with an enforcement campaign that reinforces safe and legal behavior.

3.1 Education

3.1.1 Work with the state to conduct a statewide pedestrian safety campaign.

3.1.2 Develop a local consortium for a pedestrian safety education effort.

3.1.3 Integrate pedestrian education into the state and City of Hartford Police Academy curriculum.

3.1.4 Develop a model for in class education.
3.2 **Enforcement**

3.2.1 Evaluate enforcement programs in use in the region and elsewhere.

3.2.2 Create targeted program for pedestrian law enforcement in the region.

3.3 **Safe Infrastructure Design**

Providing safe pedestrian infrastructure is a key component of improving pedestrian safety. Accomplishing the strategies noted above in Section 1.3, Provide the right transportation system for biking and walking, will create a safer pedestrian environment.

4. **Improve funding opportunities for the construction, maintenance and operation of bicycle and pedestrian facilities**

Most of the above listed strategies are dependent upon funding availability for success. The following strategies are designed to insure that appropriate funding is available.

4.1 **Encourage Capital Programming**

Annual set asides of funding provide certainty that enables long range planning for bike and pedestrian needs.

4.1.1 Encourage Towns to program capital and maintenance dollars each year for bicycle and pedestrians facilities.

4.1.2 Encourage a greater emphasis upon bike and pedestrian projects in the selection of projects to be funded by STP Urban money.

4.1.3 Encourage CT DOT to program more funds for bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

4.2 **Grant funding**

CRCOG and the towns should aggressively pursue grant programs appropriate for bike and pedestrian projects.

4.2.1 Notify Towns of grant programs to which they can apply.

4.2.2 Apply for those grants appropriate for a regional agency.
Priorities and Next Steps

While all of the recommendations listed above have merit, it is not possible to implement them all immediately, priorities must be set. For the implementation of the Pedestrian Plan to be balanced, each goal area should be addressed. Based upon input received from the public, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee, the CRCOG Transportation Committee, Policy Board and Regional Planning Commission, and an assessment of the difficulty involved with each recommendation, it is recommended that in the first year, the following be implemented:

1. **Work with the state:**
   a. To change the state sidewalk policy (Recommendation 1.1.2).
   b. To program more dollars for bike and pedestrian projects (Recommendation 4.1.3).
   c. To have the State Traffic Commission consider bike and pedestrian needs (Recommendation 1.1.1).

   After initial discussions of these items with the state, select the one that is most likely to move forward and concentrate efforts there.

2. **Provide Resources to Towns:**
   a. Model ordinances (Recommendation 1.2.1.3)
   b. Model language for Plans of Conservation and Development (Recommendation 1.2.1.4)
   c. Sponsor at least one design workshop. Additional workshops may be sponsored if they do not involve a lot of planning and setup. (Recommendation 1.2.1.2)
   d. Safe routes to school training, in the City of Hartford (Recommendation 2.1.1).
   e. Encourage the development of pedestrian facility master plans (Recommendation 1.3.2)

   For successful implementation of these recommendations, it will be very important to work with town Planning and Zoning commissions along with town elected officials and town staff.

3. **Pedestrian Safety Campaign**
   Work to have this adopted as a statewide effort (Recommendation 3.1.1). If not successful, run a local program.

4. **Trail System**
   Work with the towns to continue to develop the trail system (Recommendation 1.3.5). Focus first on planned trails and then take a look at where trails are needed but no plans have been developed yet.

Realizing our vision of a pedestrian friendly region will require action on the part of the towns with support and resources provided by CRCOG. Upon adoption of the plan, CRCOG will schedule quarterly meetings of the region’s Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee to discuss progress. Regular reports on progress will be made to the
Transportation Committee, and as deemed necessary, reports will be made to the Policy Board. In addition, as appropriate, meetings will be scheduled with town planners, engineers, and or Planning and Zoning Commissions. These meetings will provide opportunities for redirecting efforts and resolving issues that might arise. **Persistence, vigilance, and dedication to our vision will bring success.**
Purpose of Document

The purpose of this document, the Capitol Region Pedestrian Plan, is to lay out the strategies that the Region can undertake to improve pedestrian access and safety. For many years planners and engineers have not considered pedestrian needs to be of significance in the design of roadways and communities. This has led to conditions that discourage walking in some places and make walking unsafe in others. This Plan seeks to establish the importance of planning for pedestrian needs in the region and to provide guidance as to how best to improve the pedestrian friendliness of the Capitol Region.
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Organization of the Pedestrian Plan

This document is organized into the following chapters:

1. Introduction
2. Goals and Objectives
3. Principles of Good Pedestrian Planning and Design
4. Existing Conditions
5. Recommended Strategies
6. Next Steps and Implementation
Chapter 1  Introduction

Why Walking Matters

**Walking Matters – We Are All Pedestrians:** Walking, sometimes considered an “alternate” form of transportation, might better be considered the primary form of transportation. Most trips, regardless of length or mode of travel (personal vehicle or public transit) involve some element of walking, whether from the home to the car, from the home to the bus stop, or from the vehicle to the final destination. In spite of this, over the past several decades, scant attention has been paid to the pedestrian environment and to the needs of pedestrians. This lack of focus has been prevalent throughout the country and in our region and has led to a decrease in the number of trips that can be made via walking. Fortunately, in recent years there has been an awakening to the need to provide for pedestrian travel and there has been a growing understanding of the importance of the pedestrian network for healthy, livable communities.

**Walking Matters – Some Are More Dependent on Walking:** Even though everyone is a pedestrian some of the time, certain segments of the population are more likely than others to depend upon walking for much of their travel. Children, too young to drive, or without access to a car, rely upon walking to independently get where they want to go. The elderly, who may no longer be able to drive, or who prefer not to drive, also rely on walking to maintain their independence. Many members of the disabled community meet more of their travel needs through walking than does the general population. And finally, those who do not own cars, either by choice or financial necessity, are more dependent upon walking as a means to get around. When considering the need for safe pedestrian facilities, it is important to consider the everyday and special needs of these groups.

**Walking Matters – Walkable Communities Are Livable Communities:** Years ago towns and developments were built for all modes of transportation and it was assumed that walking would be a vital part of getting around in town. As development in the last 50 years focused more upon the needs of automobiles – how to get them to a development, how to park them once they were there - assumptions were made that people would not walk, and pedestrian facilities were not provided. Recent surveys indicate that this was a mistake, that many people would like to be able to walk more. A recent survey conducted by Smart Growth America and the National Association of Realtors indicates that for 72% of the population, having sidewalks and
places to walk is an important factor when buying a home. Trends in construction of new shopping centers, where life style centers try to recreate the feel of a traditional downtown, indicate that the public responds positively to the provision of walkable places. A 2000 Regional Development Issues Survey, conducted for CRCOG by the Center for Survey Research and Analysis at the University of Connecticut indicated that in all three communities surveyed (Hartford, West Hartford, and Suffield), strong majorities (86%, 81% and 65% respectively) agreed that more places where people can walk, rather than drive, from their home to shops, work, and recreation are needed. And simple observation of vibrant town and city centers shows us that walkability is a key component of vital centers. Further, recent safety studies have indicated that when more people are visible walking in a community, the environment actually becomes safer for walking, without any physical changes\(^3\).

**WALKING MATTERS – IT’S PART OF A BALANCED TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM:**
A successful transportation system is one that accommodates a variety of modes of travel and does not require individuals to depend on one way of getting around. Census trends show that walking is becoming less common for work trips (mode share for bicycling and walking to work in the region declined from 10% to 6% from 1990 to 2000). In addition, nationwide, over the past 30 years the percent of children walking or biking to school has declined from 66% to 13%. Nationally, about 50% of all trips are less than 3 miles in length, and of those trips less than 0.5 mile in length, more than 50% are made in a vehicle. These trips could quite reasonably be converted to walking trips if sufficient, safe facilities are provided. Furthermore, work trips, which may be less amenable to walking, comprise less than 20% of total daily trips (2001 National Household Travel Survey), so there is quite a base of trips that might be suitable for walking.

**WALKING MATTERS – WALKABILITY LEADS TO HEALTHY COMMUNITIES:**
In recent years, there has been growing concern with the prevalence of overweight and obesity in the adult population in the US. Currently, it is estimated that more than 30% of the nation’s adult population is categorized as obese. Obesity increases the risk of developing many health conditions, including Type 2 diabetes, hypertension, coronary heart disease, stroke, colon cancer, and other cancers, gall bladder disease, osteoarthritis, and sleep apnea. It is estimated that poor diet and physical inactivity lead to 300,000 premature deaths each year, second only to deaths caused by tobacco. And these risks have a cost to the public: it is estimated that Medicaid and Medicare costs in the state of Connecticut attributable to overweight and obesity are in excess of $650 million.

annually. This includes only direct medical costs and not the costs of increased absenteeism and loss of productivity.

Moderate physical activity, including walking, is one of the best antidotes to the obesity epidemic. Just ½ hour of walking, 5 times a week, can greatly change an individual’s health status.

**Walking Matters – Providing Pedestrian Infrastructure is Part of a Policy of Environmental Justice:** The federal government requires that all transportation projects be evaluated for “environmental justice,” which means that the impact of a project upon low income and minority neighborhoods must not be disproportionate. Recently there has been greater awareness that transportation policies which favor infrastructure for automobiles over that for pedestrians have a negative effect on environmental justice. That is, use of transportation resources for motor vehicle facilities disproportionately benefits those who choose to drive over those for whom walking is a primary form of transportation and low income and minority neighborhoods tend to be more dependent upon walking for transportation than the average population.

**Walking Matters – Pedestrian Safety is a Public Safety Responsibility:** Providing a walkable infrastructure is an important public safety responsibility. Over the past decades, the transportation safety focus has been almost exclusively on automobiles. An unintended consequence of making streets safer for autos has been to make them less safe for the primary transportation mode, that of walking.

**Walking Matters** – Walking does matter and as a result, many communities are beginning to recognize that they need to Complete the Streets, providing a road system that accommodates all users, including pedestrians.

**Status of Pedestrian Planning in the Region**

In the late ‘90’s, CRCOG began to focus on bicycling and walking as part of the region’s transportation system. At that time, it was decided to first focus on the production of a Bicycle Plan with a Pedestrian Plan to follow. The Bicycle Plan, which was completed in April of 2000, included a vision statement and a set of goals and objectives that include both biking and walking. These provide a foundation for the development of this pedestrian plan.

Although the development of a Pedestrian Plan was not immediately embarked upon after the completion of the Bicycle Plan, several CRCOG projects have addressed pedestrian needs and pedestrian planning. These include: Picture it Better Together: Taking

---

Transportation Goals from Policy to Reality, the adoption of the US DOT Policy on integrating Bicycling and Walking into the Transportation Infrastructure, Walkability Workshops, the Station Area Planning Project for the New Britain/Hartford Busway, a Pedestrian Crossing Seminar, and a Pedestrian Safety Study.

The first is the **Picture It Better Together: Taking Transportation Goals from Policy to Reality** initiative, which ran from 1999 to 2002. This project was funded by a grant from the Transportation and Community and System Preservation (TCSP) Pilot Program of the Federal Highway Administration, a division of the U.S. Department of Transportation. That project produced Livable Communities Toolkit: A Best Practices Manual for Metropolitan Regions (available at [http://www.crcog.org/publications.htm](http://www.crcog.org/publications.htm), scroll down to Tool Kit.) This manual includes practical information for towns on how to use various tools to create more livable communities. It stresses the importance of shaping the pedestrian environment, and providing safe pedestrian access as tools for livability.

In June of 2001, the CRCOG Policy Board adopted the **US DOT Policy on Integrating Bicycling and Walking into the Transportation Infrastructure**. This Policy requires that all projects subject to CRCOG funding approval give consideration to bicycle and pedestrian accommodations in the design phase.

In 2003, CRCOG was successful in obtaining grant money to fund a series of **Walkable Community Workshops**. (A report summarizing the workshops is included in the Appendix.) This program was sponsored by the National Center for Bicycling and Walking (NCBW). The workshops brought together a wide array of stakeholders to investigate specific community issues of walkability. While the workshop sites differed, several universal principles of walkability were discovered:

- High traffic speeds make pedestrian crossings difficult, unsafe, and unpleasant.
- Long pedestrian crossings are less safe than short crossings.
- Pedestrian access that requires crossing a sea of parking is unpleasant and inherently unsafe.
- Pedestrian crossing signals that require extraordinarily long waits are seldom respected.
- Land use and the built environment largely influence how walkable a community is. Modern zoning requirements tend to result in built environments that discourage walking.
• Providing a separate facility for pedestrians (a sidewalk) leads to a safer and more pleasant condition for walking.

• Facilities for pedestrians need to be designed with all users (elderly, handicapped, and children) in mind.

• Street plantings make a street environment more attractive and comfortable for pedestrians.

• A finely grained network of streets is important in both village centers and town centers to insure that no single road has to become so wide that it is no longer pedestrian friendly. That is, the denser the street grid system and the more options that traffic has, the more attractive individual streets will be for pedestrians. A grid system also provides more direct routes for pedestrians. Arterial systems will often force people to walk long distances to reach their destinations, rather than a more direct, “as the crow flies” approach.

In 2004, CRCOG worked with the cities of Hartford and New Britain and the towns of West Hartford and Newington to encourage transit-oriented development along the New Britain/Hartford Busway. The **Station Area Planning Project** examined the one half-mile area around 12 proposed stations along the busway. One half-mile around a station is approximately the comfortable walk distance to and from a station. Experts assert that success for a rapid transitway depends on many factors, including planning for and bringing about appropriate and coordinated development in this half-mile area along with a pedestrian-focused urban design. One goal for the station area planning was to enhance the efficiency of the transportation system by encouraging development around the busway that supports this major investment of the public’s resources. A second aim of station area planning was to maximize the benefits to municipalities by encouraging vibrant, walkable neighborhoods along the busway corridor.

The **Pedestrian Safety Study** was undertaken at the recommendation of the Federal Highway Administration in order to better understand pedestrian safety issues in the region. This study is discussed in more detail in Chapter 4 of this plan. That study points up the following needs:

• Need to concentrate on making crossings safer (80% of accidents involve a pedestrian crossing the road)

• Need to educate pedestrians

• Need to educate motorists and change attitudes of drivers

• Need for enforcement: both pedestrians and motorists

• Need for a physical environment that enhances pedestrian safety.
In order to keep the Region’s towns up to date on pedestrian design concepts, in September 2004, CRCOG sponsored a Seminar/Workshop on Alternative Treatments for Pedestrian Crossings. Thirty-three individuals, representing 12 towns and 4 organizations, attended. The format of the event was something new for CRCOG, the seminar was actually a “webinar” presented by the American Society of Civil Engineers over a live internet link. Following the seminar, attendees split up into four groups and took a look at real world pedestrian crossing problems in the region. They then developed solutions based upon the seminar presentation.

All of these efforts have been used to raise the region’s level of understanding of pedestrian issues and have laid the groundwork for this Pedestrian Plan.
Chapter 2: Vision/Goals and Objectives

The Vision for this Pedestrian Plan is identical to that adopted in 1999 for the Regional Bicycle Plan. The Goals and Objectives are derived from those adopted in 1999 and have been modified to better reflect pedestrian concerns.

The vision is an expression of the region’s dreams for its future relative to walking and bicycling. The goals present more formal statements of what it is the region wants to accomplish and the objectives are statements of end results that will move us toward achievement of the goals.

Our Vision

In the future, residents and visitors of the region will be able to walk, bicycle, or take another type of non-motorized vehicle† via roads and multi-use trails, safely and conveniently to employment centers, shopping areas, bus and train centers, recreation and cultural attractions, and schools. Residential and commercial land use planning and development incorporate walking and bicycling as transportation modes, providing people of all ages efficient and enjoyable transportation options within development clusters and to nearby destinations. It is our intent that such steps will also contribute to a greater sense of community and friendliness in our communities while enhancing our appreciation of the natural environment.

This vision is complimentary to other efforts underway in the region and state. Particularly, the vision is complimentary to the State of Connecticut’s goals in its adopted Climate Change Action Plan. The Climate Change Plan seeks to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through a variety of measures, including increased walking.

Goals and Objectives

The goals and objectives were developed as means to achieve the Vision and helped guide the development of the Regional Pedestrian Plan. Goals 1 and 2 define the desired results of a regional pedestrian plan to be increased use of non-motorized travel and a regional transportation system that fully integrates pedestrians. Goals 3 and 4 define emphasis areas that will help achieve Goals 1 and 2.

† Electric wheelchairs are not considered motorized vehicles.
Goal 1: Provide an accessible, integrated and safe regional transportation system in which bicycling, walking and transit are prioritized

There is a new phrase that captures the intent of this Goal and that is COMPLETE THE STREETS. The Complete the Streets movement is based upon the premise that the streets and roadways should serve all users: motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians. A street is complete when it safely serves all users, including pedestrians.

OBJECTIVES:

- Local and regional government and advocacy organizations will build a coordinated, comprehensive network of on street and off street pedestrian and bicycle facilities including multi-use paths, on-street bike routes, sidewalks and pedestrian amenities.
- Bicycle and pedestrian needs will be integrated into the transportation planning process.
- Bicycle and pedestrian needs will be integrated into the roadway design process.
- Bicycle and pedestrian needs will be included in roadway management and maintenance.
- Bicycle and pedestrian needs will be integrated into the design of commercial, residential, and industrial developments.
- Bicycle and pedestrian facilities will be clearly visible and well marked.

Goal 2: Promote the increased use of non-motorized travel

OBJECTIVES:

- More students will walk and bike to school.
- More employees will walk and bike to work.
- More individuals will walk or bike for short trips (under 2 miles in length).
- More individuals will recognize the importance of walking and biking in creating balanced transportation systems and livable communities.
- More individuals will recognize the health benefits of walking and biking.
Goal 3: Decrease the number of pedestrians and bicyclists killed and injured

OBJECTIVES:

- Motorists, bicyclists and pedestrians will understand their responsibilities in sharing the road with other users.
- Schools and community organizations will provide educational opportunities for children and adults to develop skills that reduce their risk of injury while encouraging lifelong bicycling and walking habits.
- Law enforcement will enforce traffic laws, citing motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians whenever they violate the law. Motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists will obey existing traffic laws.
- Engineers and planners will consider safety of pedestrians as a routine matter in designing and approving new projects.

Goal 4: Improve funding opportunities for the construction, maintenance and operation of bicycle and pedestrian facilities

OBJECTIVES:

- All levels of government - state, regional, and local - will set aside funds on an annual basis for the development and maintenance of bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
- The region will be successful in obtaining grants for the implementation of the Bike and Pedestrian Plans.
Chapter 3: Principles of Good Pedestrian Planning and Design

When it comes to pedestrian planning and design, there is no need to reinvent the wheel, a good deal of work has already been completed. But the latest information on pedestrian safety and design is not always readily available to the town planners and engineers who need it. This chapter lists some of the principles of good planning and design that are practiced in those communities that have been most successful with improving pedestrian mobility. It includes:

- factors to consider in planning
- features that improve pedestrian safety
- up to date pedestrian design guidelines
- Americans with Disabilities (ADA) access requirements
- innovations

A listing of resources for more detailed information on all these topics is included at the end of the chapter.

Factors to Consider in Planning

For communities to become more pedestrian friendly, pedestrian needs must be considered early in the planning process. Following are basic principles of community design that affect pedestrian access:

- Compact, mixed-use developments create more opportunities for walking.
- A fine grained (characterized by short blocks) and interconnected street system allows for human scaled streets that facilitate walking.
- Pedestrian connections to major generators (retail, schools, transit, major developments) insure that walking is an option.
- Careful location of developments that tend to produce more walking trips (schools, senior housing, retail) facilitates walking.
- Walking can be encouraged with attention to parking lot design and placement of parking. Pedestrians are discouraged when they need to walk across a sea of parking.
- Provision of appropriate bicycle facilities can improve pedestrian safety by keeping bikes off the sidewalks.
Features that Improve Pedestrian Safety

In the past several years there has been extensive pedestrian safety research conducted in this country. Much of that research has been synthesized and distilled to identify the roadway features that can improve pedestrian safety:

Crosswalk Related

- Marked crosswalks alone, at uncontrolled intersections (no stop sign or traffic signal) do not improve pedestrian safety. On two lane roadways the presence of a marked crosswalk is not associated with a change in crash rate. On multi lane roadways with traffic volumes above 12,000 vehicles per day, providing marked crosswalks alone, is associated with higher pedestrian crash rates compared to locations with unmarked cross walks. To improve pedestrian safety at such crossings, other measures, in addition to marking the crosswalk, are needed.
- Raised medians on multilane roads can substantially reduce pedestrian crash risk.
- Raised medians are most useful on arterial streets.
- Raised medians should be designed to provide tactile cues for pedestrians with visual impairments.
- Landscaped medians should not obstruct visibility between pedestrians and approaching motorists.
- Crossing islands should be illuminated.
- Marked crosswalks should guide pedestrians to cross at locations where there is street lighting at night.
- At some locations, adding signals or lights that alert motorists that pedestrians are crossing, can improve pedestrian safety.
- Shorter crossing distances are safer. Shorter crossing distances can be achieved by:
  - Providing curb bumpouts
  - Reducing corner radii
  - Providing median refuges
- Raised crosswalks and raised intersections slow traffic enabling motorists more reaction time when they see pedestrians at the crosswalk. Where raised crosswalks are provided, visible pavement markings are required on the roadway approach slopes. Raised crosswalks eliminate the need for curb ramps for disabled access but they do require detectable warning strips for vision impaired individuals.
Clear sight lines are vital for pedestrian safety. Attention needs to be paid to:

- Intersection angle, right angle crossings provide optimal sight distance.
- Parking location: parking must be set back at least 20 feet from crosswalks (or more, if speeds are greater than 30 mph) to insure adequate sight distance.
- Stop bar location: when vehicles stop too close to the crosswalk, vehicle operators (particularly of large vehicles) may be unable to see pedestrians in a crosswalk. Setbacks of at least 4 to 10 feet should be used. On multilane crosswalks setbacks of 20 feet or more may be needed.

Traffic Signal Related

- At signalized intersections, adding a pedestrian signal (Walk/Don’t Walk, or “the man” and “the hand”) without providing an exclusive pedestrian phase has no significant effect on pedestrian crashes. Providing an exclusive pedestrian phase can reduce pedestrian crashes by 50%. However, exclusive timing schemes can increase pedestrian and motorist delay and are most appropriate at downtown intersections with a combination of heavy pedestrian volumes, good pedestrian compliance, and low vehicle volumes. The safety effect attributed to exclusive pedestrian signals was only seen at locations with more than 1200 pedestrians per day.

- As a general principle, travelers on foot need convenience. Traffic signals should be designed to provide this:
  - As discussed above, exclusive pedestrian signal phases can improve pedestrian safety, but such signals are only effective at locations with more than 1200 pedestrians per day. An exclusive pedestrian signal, where inappropriate, can increase delay unacceptably for both motorists and pedestrians. In some cases, a leading pedestrian indicator, where the walk light comes on before the green light for parallel traffic, can improve the safety of the signal for pedestrians, without adding too much time to the cycle length.
  - Short cycle lengths, of 90 seconds maximum ideally, are important to reduce pedestrian delay.
  - Where pedestrian traffic is regular and frequent, pedestrian phases should come up automatically. Actuation should only be used when pedestrian crossings are intermittent.

- Allowing right turn on red results in a small but clear safety problem for pedestrians. Countermeasures which can reduce risks related to RTOR include off set stop bars where RTOR is permitted, illuminated NTOR signs, and signs Stating “No Turn on Red When Pedestrians are Present.”
• No turn on red signs should be installed adjacent to the signal indication on the right side of the street, so as to be clearly visible to right turning motorists.

• Signals must be visible to pedestrians.

• It is desirable to have pedestrian actuation buttons give feedback that the call has been registered.

Other

• The number of access points and curb cuts on a roadway has a large impact on pedestrian comfort and safety.

• Certain pedestrian and motorist warning signs have been found to be effective in reducing vehicle speeds or conflicts between pedestrians and motorists. These include the “strong yellow green” pedestrian warning sign, YIELD TO PEDESTRIANS WHEN TURNING sign, and PEDESTRIANS WATCH FOR TURNING VEHICLES sign.

• Improved nighttime lighting can improve pedestrian safety in certain situations.

• Placement of bus stops can affect pedestrian safety. Far side stops can discourage pedestrians from crossing unsafely in front of the bus. (This research finding is for school buses, not transit buses.)

• Safety of trips to and from school can be enhanced by sidewalks and proper signalization but also by well trained adult crossing guards, selective enforcement, and warning signs and markings.

• Sidewalks and walkways enhance pedestrian safety and mobility.

• Traffic calming has a positive effect on pedestrian safety.

• Educational measures have been found to reduce pedestrian crashes.

• The effect of enforcement of traffic laws and regulations upon pedestrian safety has not been studied quantitatively.

Pedestrian Design Guidelines
A number of documents are available that present guidelines for pedestrian facilities. Following is a summary of some of the recommendations included in Design and Safety of Pedestrian Facilities: A Recommended Practice of the Institute of Engineers. This document was adopted as the region’s pedestrian design guide with the adoption of the USDOT Policy on Integrating Bicycling and Walking into the Transportation Infrastructure.

• All roadways should have some type of walking facility out of the vehicular traveled way included in the initial construction
• Recommended minimum sidewalk widths:
  - Central business district (CBD): 8 feet
  - Commercial industrial area outside the CBD: 5 feet with a 2 foot planting strip or 7 feet if no planting strip. (Wider planting strips of 4 to 5 feet are recommended)
  - Residential area outside the CBD. On arterials and collectors, minimum 5 feet wide with minimum 2 ft planting strip. Local streets, with densities greater than 4 dwelling units per acre, 5 feet wide with 2 foot planter strip. Densities 4 DU per acre or less, 4 ft wide with 2 ft planting strip.

• Recommended planting strip or buffer strip widths: the minimal width for a planting strip is 2 feet, 6 feet is the desirable width. In northern climates wider buffer strips provide for snow storage.

• Design walking speed: 3 to 4 ft. per second, with the lower end used where significant numbers of elderly are expected to be walking.

The AASHTO Guide for the Planning, Design, and Operation of Pedestrian Facilities, July 2004, recommends similar dimensions for sidewalks: on arterials not in the CBD, 6 to 8 feet, if a planting strip is provided, 8 to 10 feet if no planting strip; in the CBD, 10 ft minimum. The AASHTO Guide notes that its minimums are for clear, unobstructed sidewalk widths.

As illustrated in the adjacent figure, there are 3 zones in a sidewalk, the furniture zone (where light posts, mailboxes, trees and street furniture can be located), the pedestrian zone, which is the unobstructed sidewalk width, and the frontage or “shy” zone. Chapter 18 of the Institute of Transportation Engineers’ Highway Capacity Manual defines shy distances for various lateral obstructions (2 feet for building faces, 1.5 feet for fences or low walls.)

 ADA Design Guidelines

The Americans with Disabilities Act requires that local governments provide facilities which are accessible to those with disabilities. ADA design is required to provide access to the community for those with disabilities. But in fact, ADA design helps all users, not just the disabled. When the ADA was passed, all local governments were to develop transition plans explaining how they intended to bring old facilities into compliance with ADA requirements. New construction and alterations (and this is defined to include street repavings) are to be built in compliance with ADA regulations.
Following is a brief summary of current ADA requirements relative to pedestrian facilities and a list of resources that can provide more detail. Currently, new standards are in the process of being approved for access in the public right of way. It is not clear when those standards will be released.

In order to be accessible, sidewalks must have these characteristics:

- At least 36” in width is required to accommodate individuals in wheel chairs. This is the minimal width permitted and if a width less than 60 inches is used, passing areas of at least 60 inches wide by 60 inches long must be provided at reasonable intervals, not to exceed 200 feet. The preferred minimum sidewalk width for ADA access is 48 inches, which will better accommodate those with crutches.
- Cross slopes: it is important to avoid cross slopes on sidewalks, especially at driveways. Cross slopes may not exceed 2%.
- Sidewalks must be provided with detectable warnings for detecting the boundary between the sidewalk and the street. (there is some confusion regarding this requirement as it was suspended from 1991 to 2001, but has been in effect since July of 2001.) Truncated domes are the only detectable warning allowed.
- Curb ramps must be provided at all intersections. While ramps can be provided in a number of different ways, the new AASHTO Pedestrian Design Guide strongly recommends the use of 2 curb ramps per corner rather than a single diagonal ramp. (See references for details.)

ADA regulations do not yet require audible pedestrian signals, however, the documents listed at the back of this chapter do explain design principles for such signals.

**Innovative Approaches**

In both this country and abroad, a number of new pedestrian treatments have been tested and some are proving to provide significant benefits for pedestrian safety. The innovations include:

- Leading pedestrian indications: the pedestrian interval at a light appears for a few seconds before the parallel green light comes up. This enables pedestrians to establish themselves in the crosswalk before vehicles turn across the cross walk.
- Pedestrian countdowns: the pedestrian signal includes a countdown feature letting the pedestrian know how much time is left before the light changes and motor traffic is released. These work best where the pedestrian clearance interval (the time it takes for a pedestrian to cross the street, from stepping off the curb to reaching the curb on the far side) is 15 seconds or more.
- Lighted crosswalks: a couple of techniques have been tested, in pavement lights and overhead flashing lights. The lights come on to indicate that a pedestrian is in the crosswalk. The in pavement lights have been tested in our region and are discussed in the following chapter.
• Various signing and marking techniques.
• Refuge islands on crosswalks.
• Textured surfacing on crossings.
• Raised intersections or raised crossings.
• Auto free zones.
• Traffic calming.
• Safe Routes to Schools Programs: School drop off zones today are generally required to handle far more vehicles than they were designed for and it is estimated that school related traffic can comprise 25% of the morning peak period. Many schools are finding it essential to reduce congestion. Safe Routes to Schools programs are designed to encourage more children to walk to school. They raise awareness of the health benefits of walking, examine the reasons children don’t walk to school and identify solutions that will increase walking to school. Successful programs can lead to decreased congestion at schools.

Resource Listing

Planning Factors
• Planning and Designing for Pedestrians, Model Guidelines for the San Diego Region, June 2002, Community Design + Architecture, Inc., W-Trans for SANDAG, San Diego’s Regional Planning Agency. (Available at http://www.sandag.cog.ca.us/uploads/publicationid/publicationid_713_3269.pdf) This document presents a coherent set of guidelines to create an environment conducive to walking. It begins with a discussion of pedestrian oriented design and defines elements of a walkable environment. One chapter is devoted to community structure and land use and how they relate to walkability. The bulk of the report has site and detail designs for a variety of locations and situations.

Pedestrian Safety Research
• *Pedestrian Facilities Users Guide – Providing Safety and Mobility*, March 2002, FHWA-RD-01-102 Charles V. Zegeer, Cara Seiderman, Peter Lagerway, Mike Cynecki, Michael Ronkin, and Robert Schneider (Available at [http://www.walkinginfo.org/insight/features_articles/userguide.htm](http://www.walkinginfo.org/insight/features_articles/userguide.htm)). This guide contains useful information regarding how to create walking environments, the main causes of pedestrian crashes and ways to counter them, and engineering improvements that can be made to improve the quality of life for all citizens.

• *NCHRP Report 500 Guidance for Implementation of the AASHTO Strategic Highway Safety Plan: Volume 10: A Guide for Reducing Collisions Involving Pedestrians*, 2004, (Available at [http://gulliver.trb.org/publications/nchrp/nchrp_rpt_500v10.pdf](http://gulliver.trb.org/publications/nchrp/nchrp_rpt_500v10.pdf)). This report is one of a series of reports providing guidance for the implementation of the AASHTO Strategic Highway Safety Plan. The goal of the Strategic plan is to reduce annual highway fatalities by 5000 to 7000. This Volume includes a set of strategies that can be used to reduce the number of collisions involving pedestrians. It examines strategies that reduce pedestrian exposure to vehicle traffic, that improve sight distance and visibility of pedestrians, that reduce vehicle speed and that improve pedestrian and motorist safety awareness and behavior. It provides a useful overview of strategies and references other resources for more information on individual strategies.

• “Promoting Safe Walking and Cycling to Improve Public Health: Lessons from The Netherlands and Germany” John Pucher and Lewis Dijkstra, 2003, *American Journal of Public Health*, Volume 93, No. 9. This report discusses the public health consequences of unsafe and inconvenient walking and bicycling conditions in American cities and suggest improvements based upon successful policies in The Netherlands and Germany. The recommended policies are:
  - Traffic calming (area wide)
  - Auto free zones
  - Urban design oriented to people not cars
  - Restrictions on motor veh use
  - Traffic education
  - Traffic regulations and enforcement

• *Safe Routes to School*, 2002, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. (Available at [http://www.walktoschool.org/srts-start/index.cfm](http://www.walktoschool.org/srts-start/index.cfm)). This document is a tool kit, designed to enable interested communities to create Safe Routes to School programs. The Safe Routes to School program can reduce congestion around schools and is designed to integrate health, fitness, traffic relief, environmental awareness, and safety under one program.

**Design Guides And Innovative Approaches**

• *Planning and Designing for Pedestrians, Model Guidelines for the San Diego Region*, June 2002, Community Design + Architecture, Inc., W-Trans for SANDAG, San

- American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Pedestrian Design Guide, 2004. Similar to the AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities, this document provides information on facility type and design. It is not currently available electronically, but CRCOG does have a copy available in our office. This document provides an excellent overview of pedestrian design needs and serves as a companion to the AASHTO Green Book, providing greater detail for pedestrian design issues.

- Design and Safety of Pedestrian Facilities: A Recommended Practice of the Institute of Transportation Engineers, Charles V. Zegeer, March 1998. A copy of this report was distributed to each town in the region in 2001, after the region adopted the US DOT Policy on Integrating Walking and Biking into the Transportation Infrastructure. This document was adopted as the region’s pedestrian design guide with the adoption of the USDOT Policy on Integrating Bicycling and Walking into the Transportation Infrastructure. It includes recommended guidelines for sidewalk installation and design. This document also discusses in detail all other types of pedestrian facilities, including signals, signs, ramps, and crosswalks.

- Alternative Treatments for At-Grade Pedestrian Crossings, An Informational Report, ITE, Nazir Lalani, 2001. This report was the subject of the Pedestrian Crossing Workshop and Seminar sponsored by CRCOG in September of 2004. It presents a variety of innovative designs that have been installed at pedestrian crossings in this country and abroad. It describes each technique, what the objective of the installation was, the cost, advantages and disadvantages, sites where implemented, and studies completed. This is not available on line, but CRCOG does have a copy available.

- Signalized Intersection Safety in Europe, FHWA, 2003, Gene Fong et al. (International Scanning Study Team). This document is focused upon signalized intersections in Europe and not specifically upon pedestrian design issues, but it does include findings having to do with pedestrian safety.

ADA Requirements


Chapter 4: Existing Conditions

Before defining ways to improve the pedestrian environment, it is important to first understand the current conditions for pedestrians. This chapter examines pedestrian accident patterns and experience, municipal concerns with pedestrian safety, and municipal policies and state law relative to pedestrians.

Pedestrian Safety

To examine pedestrian safety, CRCOG staff undertook a pedestrian safety study and surveyed town staff (planners, engineers, and public safety officials) regarding safety concerns. Our pedestrian safety records, for the state as a whole and for the City of Hartford specifically, point up the need for improvement. The town surveys indicate that pedestrian access and safety are a concern in all areas of the region, urban, suburban, and rural.

Pedestrian Accident Patterns and Experience

Over the past year, CRCOG staff undertook a pedestrian safety study, examining the patterns of pedestrian accidents in the region and the state. (The full Pedestrian Safety Study is included as an appendix to this report.) The study was undertaken at the behest of the Federal Highway Administration, who was concerned with the unfavorable ranking of the state and City on pedestrian safety when compared to other states and cities. The FHWA’s new vision “Improving Transportation for a Strong America” has a strong emphasis on safety. In its safety initiative, it intends to reduce intersection deaths, pedestrian deaths, and deaths from roadway departures. Two of the FHWA’s national safety strategies have direct bearing on CRCOG’s pedestrian planning:

- Encourage the implementation of strategic safety programs, on the state, local and MPO level.
- Approach community safely systematically, including, increase public and political awareness of pedestrian safety issues, educating and training of state and local officials on pedestrian safety issues, improved design elements for safe pedestrian accommodations and emphasizing pedestrian safety within MPOs and other organizations
Why should we be concerned about pedestrian safety? While pedestrian fatalities and accidents are just a fraction of total traffic fatalities and accidents, pedestrians are over represented in terms of severity of accident and rate of accidents per mile of travel. In a motor vehicle accident in the state of Connecticut, a pedestrian is:

- Over 25 times more likely to be killed than a driver or a passenger
- Over 12 times more likely to have a disabling injury
- 7 times more likely to have a visible injury

**Comparison to National Experience**

Pedestrian statistics for the State of Connecticut indicate that there is much room for improvement in pedestrian safety in the state. Looking first at the New England states, we find that in 2001, Connecticut ranked second and third respectively in terms of pedestrian fatalities per 100,000 population and pedestrian fatalities as a percent of total traffic fatalities (see Table 1 below). On a national basis, Connecticut does not fare as poorly, ranking 35th and 22nd respectively compared to the other states.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2001</th>
<th>Total Traffic Fatalities</th>
<th>Resident Population (Thousands)</th>
<th>Pedestrian Fatalities</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>Pedestrian Fatalities per 100,000 Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Total Traffic Fatalities</td>
<td>Resident Population (Thousands)</td>
<td>Pedestrian Fatalities</td>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Total Traffic Fatalities</td>
<td>Resident Population (Thousands)</td>
<td>Pedestrian Fatalities</td>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Total Traffic Fatalities</td>
<td>Resident Population (Thousands)</td>
<td>Pedestrian Fatalities</td>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Total Traffic Fatalities</td>
<td>Resident Population (Thousands)</td>
<td>Pedestrian Fatalities</td>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Total Traffic Fatalities</td>
<td>Resident Population (Thousands)</td>
<td>Pedestrian Fatalities</td>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking next at how the City of Hartford compares to other cities, Table 2 shows the pedestrian fatality rates per 100,000 populations for US cities with over 100,000 residents. This table is based upon the average annual number of pedestrian fatalities from 1998-2000 and uses the 2000 population, as published in the Pedestrian Roadway Fatalities published by the Traffic National Highway Traffic Safety Administration in April 2003. Table 2 includes all New England cities. Out of the 245 cities with population of more than 100,000, Waterbury ranked 20 on a national basis and has the highest rank of all the New England cities, while Hartford ranked 40th nationally and has the third highest rank among all the New England cities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>City, State</th>
<th>Average Fatalities 1998 - 2000</th>
<th>2000 Population</th>
<th>Fatality Rate per 100,000 Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Waterbury, CT</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>107,271</td>
<td>16.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Worcester, MA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>172,648</td>
<td>6.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Hartford, CT</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>121,578</td>
<td>11.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Stamford, CT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>117,083</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>589,141</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Cambridge, MA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>101,355</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Springfield, MA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>152,082</td>
<td>7.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Bridgeport, CT</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>139,529</td>
<td>6.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>New Haven, CT</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>123,626</td>
<td>9.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Lowell, MA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>105,167</td>
<td>5.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Regional Pedestrian Accident Analysis**

CRCOG examined all pedestrian accidents that occurred in the three-year period 1999-2001 and focused a more detailed analysis on the pedestrian accidents occurring in East Hartford, Hartford, Manchester, and West Hartford, the municipalities in the Region with the highest rate of pedestrian accidents per thousand population. Most of the statistics indicate that the four town data is quite similar to the region as a whole, though for many of the statistics, we do not have similar regional data. Following are the major findings.

- For both the region and the four towns, there are few patterns apparent relative to day of the week or month of the year or weather condition. While there is a tendency for accidents to occur on Fridays as opposed to other days of the week, this is not a strong pattern.
• In the region most pedestrian accidents occur in the 3 to 6 PM time period (25%), with the second highest accident occurrence from noon to 3 PM (21%). This differs slightly from national experience, where pedestrian accidents are most prevalent from 3 to 6 PM (25%) and 6 to 9 PM (21%).

• In the four towns, the pedestrian accident experience by time of day is more similar to the national experience: The highest occurrence of pedestrian accidents is between 3 and 6 PM (29%), with a secondary peak from 6 to 9 PM (21%) and some additional peaking between noon and 3 PM.

• Looking at the contributing factor to the accident, we find that in the Capitol Region, approximately 50% of all pedestrian accidents are caused by “Unsafe use of the highway by the pedestrian”. Approximately 20% of the pedestrian accidents are caused by the “driver failed to grant right of way” and a similar percent are caused by “driver’s behavior”. Similar statistics are not available on a national level for comparison. These statistics point up the need to educate both pedestrians and motorists about pedestrian safety.

• Similarly, about 50% of pedestrian accidents in the four towns are attributed to “unsafe use of the highway by a pedestrian” and about 25% are attributed to “driver failed to grant right of way” and 18% to “driver behavior.” Of those accidents occurring when the driver failed to grant the right of way, 6% involve vehicles turning right on red.

• The pedestrian accident pattern in each of the towns is similar to the regional, with the exception that East Hartford and Manchester have fewer accidents (on a percentage basis) occurring when a pedestrian is crossing a road than the other towns (70% vs 80%). This may be due to a greater number of roadways without sidewalks in these two towns.
The following findings are based upon the four town analysis only. Similar statistics were not available for the regional data:

- In the four towns, of those accidents that occur when a pedestrian is crossing the road, about 50% of the pedestrians cross between intersections, about 25% at signalized intersections and about 25% at unsignalized intersections.

- The majority of pedestrian accidents in the four towns occurred in commercial/retail areas.

- Accidents were not clustered at single locations. The location with the highest incident of pedestrian accidents was Garden Street and Albany Avenue in Hartford, with 6 pedestrian accidents over the three year period. The second highest pedestrian accident location was at Washington Street and Jefferson Street in Hartford (5 accidents.) These locations should be examined closely to determine if they can be made safer for pedestrians. Notably, both of these locations are near health care facilities (a community health center in the former case, two hospitals in the latter case.)

- Pedestrian accidents most frequently occurred on minor arterials (39%), principal arterials (27%), minor roads (19%), and collectors (13%). Principal arterials are roads like Albany Avenue, Wethersfield Avenue, Main Street and Farmington Avenue. Minor arterials include Maple Avenue, Franklin Avenue, and Park Street. Collectors include roads like Hillside Avenue in Hartford and Quaker Lane in West Hartford. Fatal pedestrian accidents occur predominantly on principal arterials (54%).

- Pedestrian accidents involving those under 15 are most likely to be on minor arterials (38%), minor roads (33%), collectors (17%) and principal arterials (12%). This differs from all pedestrian accidents in the four towns, and reflects the different travel patterns of young pedestrians.
• Where the pedestrian was determined to be at fault in the accident, a majority of the accidents involved pedestrians crossing the roadway, between intersections. For those under fifteen, the involvement of pedestrians crossing the roadway between intersections in pedestrian at fault accidents is significantly higher.

• For those under 15 in the four towns, 75% of the pedestrian accidents are attributed to unsafe use of the highway by the pedestrian. This signals a need for education about safe pedestrian practices for youngsters.

• Where the driver was determined to be at fault in the accident, the majority of the accidents involved a pedestrian crossing the road at an unsignalized intersection. This points up the need to educate drivers on the duty to yield to pedestrians in crosswalks.

• Less than 20% of the accidents involved a pedestrian who was NOT crossing the roadway. Of these, about one quarter involved walking in the road, and about one fifth, playing in the road.

• Fatal pedestrian accidents occur predominantly between 3 and 6 PM (30%) and 6 and 9 PM (30%). This differs from the national experience where most fatal accidents occur between 6 and 9 PM (25%) and 9 and midnight (19%).

Because of the large number of pedestrian accidents in the City of Hartford, we were able to examine individual corridors. We looked at Albany Avenue, Franklin Avenue, Main Street, Maple Avenue, Park Street and Wethersfield Avenue. On most measures, these corridors showed similar patterns as the four towns in total, with a few exceptions:

• The six corridors exhibited a higher incidence of accidents occurring when a pedestrian crossed a roadway (88%) as compared to the four towns and the Hartford totals (80%). But these crossing accidents exhibited a similar breakdown: about 50% between intersections, and 25% at signalized intersections and 25% at unsignalized intersections.

• Staff made observations of the six corridors over the lunch hour to examine pedestrian behavior and the characteristics of the corridors. On the day of observation, Hartford schools had an early dismissal so
it was possible to observe student pedestrians. These observations were made:

- It appeared that pedestrians get frustrated by long wait times at traffic lights, and frequently are unwilling to wait for the pedestrian signal.
- Wanton disregard for signal indications by the average Hartford pedestrian – crossing between signals, crossing at signals against the light. The adolescent “saunter” across the street with no regard to the signal is common.
- Areas near schools have a higher concentration of pedestrian accidents.

In evaluating the four town pedestrian accident data, we considered, is there something in these towns that makes them less safe than the other towns in the region. This does not appear to be the case. The four towns are more densely developed, with more pedestrians and more pedestrian trip generators and attractors and this likely leads to the higher accident rates. What we learned about pedestrian accident characteristics in the four towns is largely applicable throughout the region and points up the following needs:

- Need to concentrate on making crossings safer (80% of accidents involve a pedestrian crossing the road)
- Need to educate pedestrians
  - How to legally cross the street
  - What the pedestrian signals mean
  - How to cross at unsignalized intersections
  - How to make oneself visible
- Need to educate motorists and change driver attitudes
  - Duty to yield to pedestrians at unsignalized intersections
  - Duty to yield to pedestrians when turning and when turning right on red
  - Need to watch for pedestrians
- Need for enforcement: both pedestrians and motorists
- Need for a physical environment that enhances pedestrian safety
  - Safe pedestrian ways and crossings
  - Appropriate signal phasing.
Municipal Concerns Regarding Pedestrian Safety

Over a two month period in 2003-2004, a survey was conducted of towns in the Region to learn about pedestrian issues, pedestrian safety, and regulations related to pedestrians. Two separate surveys were conducted: one was of town planning and/or engineering staff and the other was of town Police. All towns were contacted. (A Summary report on the surveys is included in the Appendix.)

The surveys indicate that pedestrian safety is a problem throughout the region. Particularly in locations that have not been designed for pedestrians (suburban shopping areas), very unsafe situations have been created. In more developed areas that have sidewalks and cross walks there are also safety problems, related to vehicle and pedestrian volumes and vehicle and pedestrian behavior. Education regarding pedestrian safety is not provided throughout the region, and most education efforts focus on very young children. Finally, there are limited enforcement activities relative to pedestrian law.

When asked about possible pedestrian hazards in town, every town could identify at least one problem area. Generally these are locations that are likely to attract pedestrians, particularly schools, sports centers, and notably, retail areas. In those towns with very little sidewalk infrastructure, pedestrian safety issues are a large concern at retail locations. Many suburban retail sites are not designed with pedestrian needs in mind, but pedestrians (especially students who do not have cars available and elderly who do not drive) will still on occasion try to access them. These locations, without sidewalks and crosswalks, are hazardous for pedestrians. In addition, housing developments that generate walking trips (particularly those designed specifically for the elderly or the disabled) have been placed in locations that are not well designed for pedestrian access (no sidewalks, along a busy roadway) and safety concerns arise after the facilities are built and occupied.

Towns have tried innovations to improve pedestrian safety. Many towns have had success with high visibility “Yield to Pedestrians in Crosswalk” signs placed at crosswalk locations. Farmington installed lights in the pavement at a mid block crosswalk located in a corporate office environment. The lights operated on a push button and served to warn motorists that pedestrians were in the crosswalk. Subsequently the Town removed the lights. They found that pedestrians frequently failed to push the button that would cause the lights to come on. In addition, they posed maintenance challenges: the lights would fill with sand requiring regular maintenance to clean the lights and one light was damaged by a plow. The Town replaced the lights with a raised crosswalk, with tiger tooth markings on the sloped approaches and signs warning traffic of the speed bump. South Windsor expects to test the in pavement lights at a location on Route 30, where the mid block crosswalk links a restaurant and a parking lot. In this location, the in pavement lights may better match the location needs, since frequent nighttime crossings will be made.
Six of the 25 towns responding to the police department survey have ongoing programs to address pedestrian safety. Ten have programs to educate youngsters about pedestrian safety, however, half of these are geared to young children with no ongoing education after first grade. Only two of the towns have any pedestrian education programs at the middle school level. None have programs at the high school level. Fifteen of the towns have enforcement programs to encourage motorists to obey the traffic law, but the majority of these are focused on speeding violations. One town (Glastonbury) does plan to begin an innovative program with a plain clothes officer making use of crosswalks to insure that motorists yield to pedestrians as required at crosswalks.

Specific pedestrian safety issues identified by the towns:

- Lack of crosswalks on major roadways, and lack of pedestrian signals.
- Lack of sidewalks
- Crosswalks on wide roads with high pedestrian volumes.
- Areas near concentrations of disabled citizens.
- Problems with both vehicles and pedestrians yielding the right of way appropriately at pedestrian signals (pedestrians don’t want to wait for the signal).
- Unsignalized crosswalks, need to be visible.
- Around the public schools the mixture of pedestrian and vehicular traffic leads to conflicts.
- Town Center areas are areas of concern.
- In general, retail locations are likely locations for pedestrian vehicle conflicts.
- In downtown Hartford, the major issues are downtown during lunch and at the end of the day. When large events are held (Civic Center and Meadows) pedestrian /vehicular conflicts occur.

**Municipal Pedestrian Policies**

The surveys of the town staff indicate that in general there is an awakening in the towns to the needs of pedestrians but there is not yet a commitment region wide to fully accept pedestrians as legitimate road users nor to accept sidewalks as an integral feature of the transportation infrastructure. This lack of commitment is found both on the part of town decision makers and town citizens. In some towns the decision makers are ready to address pedestrian needs but their constituents are not. There is also an uncertainty in the
towns of how best to address pedestrian needs. The towns have taken a variety of approaches to the responsibility for installation and maintenance of sidewalks.

The majority of these towns have some requirements relative to sidewalk installation in either their subdivision or zoning codes. In the majority of towns, the property owner is responsible for keeping the sidewalk in good repair, though in many cases, this is not rigorously enforced. A sizeable minority of towns take on the responsibility for sidewalk maintenance (not including snow removal).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Towns</th>
<th>Towns responding to survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towns requiring sidewalks in zoning ordinance</td>
<td>9 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towns requiring sidewalks in subdivision ordinance</td>
<td>18 (72%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towns requiring the property owner to keep the sidewalks in good repair</td>
<td>14 (56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towns that have keeping sidewalks in good repair as a Town responsibility</td>
<td>8 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towns with few or no sidewalks</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The surveys indicated that many of the towns are faced with a dilemma regarding sidewalks. The town staff recognizes the value of sidewalks, but frequently property owners do not see sidewalks as a thing of value, but rather an obligation, requiring them to shovel snow in the winter. In addition, some residents in developing suburban areas consider sidewalks as an “urban” amenity and do not want them in their suburban neighborhood. It appears that winter maintenance is the largest issue for property owners.

There is a difference of opinion among the towns regarding the need for sidewalks in subdivisions. Some towns require sidewalks on only one side of the street in new subdivisions. Others believe that the sidewalk is an important feature and needs to be provided on both sides. In one town, as part of ongoing sidewalk maintenance, sidewalks might be repaired on one side of a street and removed from the other. At least one town locates sidewalks on the “sunny” side of the street to help with snow and ice melt. Towns would appreciate some guidance that would help them to set priorities for sidewalk construction by identifying where sidewalks are most needed.

In a few of the region’s towns, efforts are made to provide walking links between developments, even when a sidewalk system may not be provided on the roads serving the development. Pedestrian ways or rights of way linking cul de sacs to adjacent roads are important features that improve pedestrian convenience. Pedestrian links between private commercial developments also improve pedestrian convenience.
Even in those towns where the property owner is to provide all maintenance, the towns frequently include sidewalk repair in their capital maintenance program. It does not appear that any towns currently install sidewalks and then assess the property owner for the full cost of the sidewalk, even if town ordinance permits this. This indicates that towns do recognize the importance of sidewalks as an amenity that benefits the town as a whole, not just the individual property owner. But this recognition has not translated (yet) into regular, adequate funding for sidewalks as a matter of course. One town staff person indicated that their sidewalk program is not designed to promote pedestrian safety or convenience, but seeks to minimize town risk and cost.

Another issue that has arisen in the region is encroachment onto sidewalks. An adequate sidewalk can be made inadequate when encroached upon: by parked cars, piles of snow, newspaper machines, mailboxes, and utility poles. There is little uniform enforcement taken against these encroachments.

Towns have developed innovative means to finance the installation of sidewalks:

- The town pays half the cost and the property owner pays half
- Economic development grant funds have been used for sidewalk installation
- Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds have been used for sidewalk construction.
- In one town, the town pays a varying percent of sidewalk installation cost depending on the degree to which the sidewalk is considered a general use sidewalk.
- In some towns, if a developer is not required to build a sidewalk when a property is developed, he must make a payment in lieu of sidewalk construction. These monies are then placed in a sidewalk fund. In other towns, if a sidewalk requirement is waived for a developer, he is notified that he might be required to install the sidewalk at a future date.

The towns have similar policies with regard to crosswalks. Generally they try to discourage mid block pedestrian crossings, though most do consider them and will mark them when the demand seems to warrant it. Most mid block crossings are located near schools and municipal facilities (like Town Hall or the library). Regarding pedestrian traffic signals, many signals in the region have no pedestrian accommodation, some have a pedestrian signal that runs concurrent with the green phase, but the large majority of pedestrian signals run on an exclusive phase, that is, when the pedestrian walk light is on, all traffic is stopped. This can lead to some conflicts: many pedestrians assume that if they see any pedestrian signal, that it provides them with an exclusive phase. In addition, cars turning right on red are not anticipated by many pedestrians. (National studies recommend exclusive phases only when pedestrian volumes are 1200 pedestrians per day or higher).

None of the towns surveyed were aware of Walk to school programs operating in their town. Fourteen of the 25 towns surveyed indicated that either all or the vast majority of
students are bused to school. Some of the region’s schools do not permit any children to walk to school because of concerns about safety. At this point none of the towns have implemented a comprehensive Safe Routes to Schools program to provide safety improvements on school walk routes and to encourage more children to walk to school.

The Town of East Hartford has undertaken a “Healthy East Hartford Initiative”. Part of this program involves encouraging individuals to get out and be more active and has specifically encouraged walking, though the Town noted that this effort is time consuming and is difficult to sustain.

Practices that other towns might consider to improve their sidewalk program include:

- Form a Pedestrian Review Board, (including representatives of the Police, highway, engineering and planning departments and of the community) to consider pedestrian issues.
- Include an annual line item in the town budget to cover sidewalk installation and maintenance.
- Complete a sidewalk master plan.

**Concerns of the Public Regarding Pedestrian Safety**

During the Public Outreach phase of the development of this plan, individuals described their concerns with regard to pedestrian safety in the region. Following is a summary of those concerns:

- Pedestrian signals do not provide enough time for pedestrians to cross, especially young children and the elderly. They cannot walk as fast as others.
- All pedestrian crossing signals should be audible.
- Sidewalks are needed on more roads, especially state highways.
- Pedestrian signage at traffic signals is unclear and confusing.
- Bike lanes are needed to keep bikes off the sidewalks.
- Children are learning bad pedestrian behavior from their parents and need regular pedestrian safety education.

**Connecticut Law Relative to Pedestrians**

The Connecticut statutes for pedestrian rights of way are very similar to those found in other states (the relevant law is found in Connecticut General Statutes 14-297-300). Note, in the following summary of the statutes, Where the term crosswalk is used, is is defined as that portion of a highway ordinarily included within the prolongation or connection of the lateral lines of sidewalks at intersections, or any portion of a highway distinctly indicated, by lines or other markings on the surface, as a crossing for pedestrians, except such prolonged or connecting lines from an alley across a street.
Duties of pedestrian:

- At a signalized intersection, only enter the crosswalk when the facing signal is green, or if there is a pedestrian indicator, when the facing signal says walk. The pedestrian has the right of way over all vehicular traffic, including turning traffic.
- A pedestrian crossing a roadway at any location other than a marked or unmarked crosswalk must yield the right of way to all vehicles upon the roadway.
- A pedestrian crossing a roadway at a location where a pedestrian tunnel or overhead pedestrian crossing has been provided shall yield the right of way to any vehicle upon the roadway.
- Where a sidewalk is provided, the pedestrian will use the sidewalk.
- Where a sidewalk is not provided, the pedestrian will walk along the roadway as near to the outside edge as possible, or upon the shoulder if available. If the pedestrian must walk in the roadway, he/she must walk facing traffic.
- A pedestrian shall not cross a roadway between adjacent intersections at which traffic or pedestrian control signals are in operation except within a marked crosswalk. (This means that a mid block crossing is legal, if the adjacent intersections are not signalized. If the adjacent intersections are signalized, it is not legal to cross mid block, unless a crosswalk is marked.)
- A pedestrian shall not cross a road diagonally unless authorized by a pedestrian-control signal or police officer.

Duties of Motorist:

- At a traffic signal, yield to any pedestrians lawfully in a crosswalk. This includes turning traffic.
- At any marked or unmarked crosswalk (which are not controlled by police officers or traffic control signals) motorists are to grant the right-of-way (and slow or stop if necessary), to any pedestrian crossing the roadway within the crosswalk, provided the pedestrian steps to the curb at the entrance to the crosswalk or is within the crosswalk. Another motorist may not overtake a vehicle that has stopped to yield to a pedestrian.
- A motorist crossing a sidewalk shall yield the right of way to each pedestrian and any other traffic on the sidewalk.
- Motorists are required to exercise due care to avoid pedestrians.

**Summary: Identified Needs**

In summary, there are many ways that the pedestrian environment can be improved to better serve the region, and both local governments and CRCOG have roles to play:

- The statistics show a need for pedestrian safety improvements. Our regional study indicates that these improvements should be focused in the following areas:
  - The physical environment should enhance safety.
  - A sidewalk network is a vital component for pedestrian safety.
  - Street crossings should be made safer and more convenient.
的安全改进应侧重于商业/零售区、学校和医疗机构。

- 行人需要接受如何安全、合法地过马路的教育，无论是信号化还是未信号化的路口。特别要强调对儿童的教育。
- 驾驶员需要接受关于行人的权利的教育。
- 镇需要谨慎处理红灯右转的权限，以免危及行人安全。
- 行人法规需要得到严格执行。

- 需要创造一种“价值”感，即对人行道和其他行人设施的认知。
- 处理人行道要求的法令目前未得到严格执行。
- 在该地区似乎存在过度使用独行人行信号期的情况。
- 需要一个更具系统性的方法来提供行人设施。
  - 镇正在寻找工具来帮助他们做出关于铺设人行道的决定，尤其是在分区中。
Chapter 5: Recommended Strategies

The recommended strategies for improving the pedestrian environment are listed by Goal area in the following sections. They are not listed in priority order.

Goal 1  Provide an accessible, integrated and safe regional transportation system in which bicycling, walking and transit are prioritized.

1.1 Put the proper regulations into place
1.2 Provide education and outreach
1.3 Provide the right transportation system for Biking and walking

Goal 2  Promote the increased use of non-motorized travel

2.1 Safe Routes to School
2.2 Promotional Activities

Goal 3  Decrease the number of pedestrians and bicyclists killed and injured

3.1 Education
3.2 Enforcement
3.3 Safe Infrastructure Design

Goal 4  Improve funding opportunities for the construction, maintenance and operation of bicycle and pedestrian facilities

4.1 Set Asides
4.2 Grant funding
Goal 1  Provide an accessible, integrated and safe regional
transportation system in which bicycling, walking and transit
are prioritized.

1.1  Put the proper regulations into place

To enable the development of an integrated and region wide pedestrian network, it is
important to have in place regulations that support such development.

1.1.1  Advocate for the State Traffic Commission to give consideration to bicycle
and pedestrian needs during their permitting process.  In the process of certifying
major traffic generators, the STC does not typically look at issues of bicycle and
pedestrian access to and within the project.  In some cases, this leads to roadways
becoming less bike and pedestrian friendly after the STC recommendations are
implemented than before.  Also, this means that frequently the needs of pedestrians are
not considered within a development proposal.  This item can be approached in two
ways.  First, through the legislative process, this can be added as a review item for the
STC.  In addition, well informed local staff, who flag any possible bike and pedestrian
safety problems with a proposed project before it goes to the STC, can help to insure that
the STC considers bicycle and pedestrian access.

1.1.2  Advocate for the Connecticut Department of Transportation to revise their
current policy regarding funding of sidewalks.  The DOT’s policy relative to
providing sidewalks where they don’t currently exist results in local municipalities
having to bear 20 to 100% of the sidewalk cost.  The state policy allows the use of federal
funds for “new” sidewalks but withholds any state matching funds (20% or 100% on a
state funded project.)  The exception to this is bridge construction where the state
recently changed its policy to include sidewalks on all new or reconstructed bridges.
Other states (for example, Maryland) have begun to include sidewalks as a matter of
course on state highways.  Justification is not required for including a sidewalk on a
project, rather, it is required for not including a sidewalk.

1.1.3  Advocate for Connecticut DOT and the region’s towns to adopt the USDOT
Policy on Integrating Biking and Walking into the Transportation Infrastructure.
CRCOG has already adopted the USDOT Policy as have many states.  CRCOG will
encourage each of the region’s towns to adopt the policy, and will work with DOT to
develop a Task Force that would consider how the state might adopt the Policy.  This
would be modeled on the very successful task force used in Kentucky for the same
purpose.
1.2 Provide education and outreach

Many of the improvements that are needed to improve pedestrian safety are under the purview of the region’s towns and CRCOG cannot directly cause them to be implemented. But CRCOG can play a large role in insuring that the towns are aware of best practices in pedestrian design. Areas to be focused upon include traffic signal timing, emerging techniques, model ordinances, traffic calming, and community design.

1.2.1 Provide resources to towns as they design bicycle/pedestrian facilities. This will include a number of different activities:

1.2.1.1 Develop a Bike/Pedestrian/Traffic Calming Newsletter. This newsletter, to be distributed to the region’s towns quarterly, will provide design guidelines, updates on the state of the art, and suggestions for making towns more pedestrian friendly. Implementation of this item has already begun, with the first issue distributed in September 2004.

1.2.1.2 Sponsor annual design workshops on bike and pedestrian issues. It is difficult for town engineers and planners to keep on top of innovations in pedestrian design, and to keep abreast of the latest ADA requirements for pedestrian accommodations. Design workshops provide a cost effective, and time efficient way to disseminate this information. Pedestrian safety issues within town center commercial areas are of particular importance.

1.2.1.3 Develop and disseminate to the towns model ordinances for sidewalk installation and maintenance. Several models, for rural, suburban, and urban areas, will be developed. These ordinances will be developed recognizing that the towns are not uniform in terms of who is responsible for sidewalk installation and maintenance. Special attention should be given to sidewalk needs in subdivisions.

1.2.1.4 Provide model language for local Plans of Conservation and Development. It is important that towns address pedestrian access to and within most categories of land use and the Plan of Conservation and Development is an important place to include these considerations. This model language should stress the importance of walkability and bikeability to smart growth and vice versa. In addition, the linkage of walkability to community cohesiveness can also be noted. The value of walkability to commercial development should be included. Discussion will be included regarding the importance of considering the pedestrian environment when approving the location of commercial and residential developments and public buildings.

1.2.1.5 Provide model details for pedestrian accommodations. Town planners and developers will benefit from the provision of model details of pedestrian accommodations that can be incorporated into specifications, site plan review of both commercial and residential developments, and subdivision regulations.
1.2.1.6 Develop educational materials that towns can use with developers. There is a need to educate private developers to the importance of pedestrian linkage. Quality “promotional” materials would help to support town staff when they speak with developers.

1.2.1.7 Plan an annual walking audit with town officials and staff. Set this up similarly to the Walkability Workshops that were held in the region in June of 2003. These efforts enable decision makers and staff members (planners, engineers, law enforcement) to understand the pedestrian safety problems in our built environment.

1.2.2 Work with towns to test promising strategies. There will be times when a promising strategy for improving pedestrian safety and convenience is identified, but there is a desire to test it locally before recommending it. CRCOG will work with towns to identify and then test promising strategies, particularly in the area of pedestrian crossings treatments.

1.2.3 Encourage towns to learn from each other. Facilitate opportunities for towns to share with each other practices that have worked and those that have not worked in the area of pedestrian infrastructure. Particularly, towns will be interested in learning how others fund sidewalk improvements and how others resolve sidewalk issues (one town has a Pedestrian Review Board including representatives of the Police, highway, engineering and planning departments and of the community which reviews and attempts to resolve pedestrian issues.) This will be facilitated with the Newsletter and the workshops.

1.3 Provide the right transportation system for Biking and Walking

In order to increase pedestrian activity within the region, it is important that the transportation system encourage walking by providing safe and convenient facilities. Pedestrian and bike advocates have called for a campaign to complete the streets throughout the country. The goal of the complete the streets movement is to insure that all streets meet the needs of all users: motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians. Most of the following recommendations that can help complete the streets require town action to be implemented, but CRCOG can play an important role in encouraging the towns to act.

1.3.1 Encourage towns to develop a street grid network in areas of development. A dense street system, which provides many paths, both for pedestrians and for motorists, is also one of the safest systems for pedestrians. In developing areas of the region, it is common for several large developments to all rely upon a single arterial roadway for access. This requires the roadway to be widened to accommodate the traffic, and the traffic and the width make the road difficult for pedestrians to cross. In areas where there is a robust street grid, motorists have numerous choices in how they access a development and a single road does not have to carry all of the traffic. Pedestrians also have many choices for how to get to their destination. Town planning commissions are empowered by State statute to create road plans for their towns as part of the Plan of
Conservation and Development. A road plan can delineate the general location of roads by functional type and with an adopted road plan, the planning commission’s mandated review of proposed municipal improvements and subdivisions can be much more proactive and rational. This is a tool that can help a town to insure that it has a healthy grid street system. Where cul de sac developments are created, towns should be encouraged to seek ways to link the cul de sacs with walking paths.

1.3.2 Encourage towns to assess pedestrian facility needs. Each town should be encouraged to develop a sidewalk and pathway master plan, either as a stand alone plan or as part of a larger capital improvement plan, a road plan, or the Plan of Conservation and Development. This plan should address pedestrian connections to all land use types and should consider the need to reserve ground for connections as land develops. These plans should set targets for implementation with initial efforts to complete the pedestrian network focused upon retail/commercial areas, schools, and health facilities. The location of crosswalks and the need for special signing (school zones) should also be identified. The master plan should also address the need for regular maintenance of the pedestrian infrastructure and identify who is responsible for what maintenance. These plans should include design standards (see following recommendation.) CRCOG can assist Towns by providing guidance for these documents with information on sound pedestrian planning practices. CRCOG should also work to encourage the towns to implement these plans once developed.

1.3.3 Encourage towns to adopt design standards for sidewalk and pedestrian facilities. Work with the Towns to develop a hierarchy of sidewalk standards based upon roadway characteristics and land use characteristics. While appropriate design standards for sidewalk construction in much of the region are 5 foot minimum width sidewalks and 4 to 6 foot minimum planting strips (or snow shelf) with sidewalks located on both sides of collectors and arterials, there may be cases, however, such as in rural areas, where different sidewalk materials (stone dust paths) or standards make sense. Special attention will be given to the need for sidewalks in subdivisions. Consideration of roadway width (especially to the extent that it can be reduced to allow for enough width for sidewalks and a snow shelf on existing rights of way) will be included. The development of design standards will also address traffic signals and make recommendations for new and updated signals. This will include discussion of where countdown signals can be appropriate, where exclusive ped phases work well, what pedestrian walking speeds are appropriate, and will recommend provision of audible signals. Other innovative signal treatments will be included as appropriate. The Towns will be encouraged to adopt the standards.

1.3.4 Facilitate efforts to provide pedestrian access to other modes. CRCOG can play a key role in working with the towns and CTTransit to insure that safe pedestrian access is assured at all transit stops and stations.

1.3.5 Work with the towns to continue to develop the regional multi use trail system. It is important that the region’s multi use trail system effectively links with the surrounding land uses. Currently the system is limited in size. Ideally, all the residents
of the region would be within walking distance of a multi use trail. The region’s multi use trail system can ultimately serve both recreational and regular transportation needs. The trail system should be properly signed with points of interest highlighted. CRCOG will work with all the region’s towns to create the missing links in the system. This will involve meeting with the towns to understand all the current trail plans and to identify routes for missing links, setting priorities for trail completion, and then working to locate funding for the projects. This will build upon the identification of trail priorities from the Capitol Region Bicycle Plan (2000). As appropriate, work with any “Friends of the Trail” groups.

1.3.6 Operate a pedestrian road problem reporting system. CRCOG already operates a hazard identification system for bikers. With the system in place, bicyclists notify CRCOG of any road issues they observe (via a post card or email) and CRCOG forwards the concern to the appropriate parties (state or town). Numerous problems have been reported and ameliorated through this program. A similar system can be operated for pedestrian concerns.

1.3.7 Insure that transportation planning and traffic studies done in the region include an assessment of pedestrian needs. Pedestrian needs must be considered in all transportation planning studies conducted in the region. CRCOG, the towns and the Connecticut DOT should include this in all studies.

Goal 2 Promote the increased use of non-motorized travel.

At the same time that pedestrian facilities are enhanced, it is important to encourage the public to consider walking for regular transportation needs. Currently, walking is seen as somewhat of an extraordinary effort, except for very short trips within urban or town center environments. The following tasks are designed to change the culture in the region to one that accepts and encourages walking as an important part of the transportation mix.

2.1 Safe Routes to School

The Safe Routes to Schools program is designed to assess why children do not walk to school and then to identify how to improve conditions so that children will walk to school in greater numbers. These programs can lead to reduced traffic in the vicinity of schools, with concomitant reductions in pollution and improvements in children’s health.

2.1.1 Offer training to regional professionals, parents, school staff, and other stakeholders. Successful safe routes to schools programs are based in individual schools and the participants include students, parents, teachers, school administrators, and town staff. Involvement of the school board is vital to the success of these programs. There have been a number of pilot programs operated throughout the country and our region
can learn from the techniques that they have followed. In this task, work with the towns that forbid walking to school and work to address the underlying concerns.

2.1.2 **Run one or more pilot Safe Routes program.** To help jump start this program, CRCOG can facilitate the Safe Routes program in individual schools. This will develop local expertise with the program. It is anticipated that CRCOG would work with 2 or 3 communities, beginning with the City of Hartford. Other towns would be given the opportunity to observe the pilot programs.

### 2.2 Promotional Activities

The following actions are designed to increase the numbers of people walking and to indicate the region’s commitment to walking as a viable mode.

2.2.1 **Walk to Work Promotion.** Similar to CRCOG’s successful Bike to Work program, a Walk to Work program will differ in scale and execution from the Bike to Work effort. This program will first focus upon town centers, town halls, and downtown areas. Because walking is a community-based effort, CRCOG will rely upon the individual towns to implement this program.

2.2.2 **Walking Clubs.** Encourage health districts, health agencies, and health departments to develop walking clubs. This will include the development of a manual on how to develop a club. The Healthy East Hartford program may provide a useful model for this effort. These efforts appear to be most successful when sponsored in part by a hospital.

2.2.3 **Walk/Health Information.** CRCOG will disseminate information to the municipalities and to the media on the links between health and walking.

### Goal 3 Decrease the number of pedestrians and bicyclists killed and injured

Provision of safe and convenient facilities will improve pedestrian safety, but education and enforcement efforts are also needed. Both motorists and pedestrians, and even some law enforcement officers, are confused about their rights and responsibilities with regard to pedestrian law. This is a sampling of items that do not seem clear to the average individual: Does a motorist only have to yield to pedestrians in crosswalks when a sign so directing is located adjacent to the crosswalk? Does a turning vehicle always need to scan for pedestrians in the crosswalk before turning? Can a pedestrian ever legally cross mid block? An education campaign aimed at providing universal understanding of the rights and responsibilities of pedestrians will provide more certainty to those walking and those driving. This will be most successful when backed up with an enforcement campaign that reinforces safe and legal behavior.
3.1 **Education**

3.1.1 *Work with the state to conduct a statewide pedestrian safety campaign.* A state-wide campaign is key to insure that knowledge of the pedestrian law is widespread. This should include all types of media: radio, tv, billboard, and print, and should focus on the following groups: motorists, adult pedestrians, child pedestrians. The FHWA has developed a comprehensive package of content that can enable a campaign to be up and running quickly. The primary focus of the campaign should be upon pedestrian crossings, as this is the most urgent safety need in the region. The campaign should include information on how to legally cross the street, what pedestrian signals mean, how to cross at unsignalized intersection, how to make oneself visible, and the duties of the motorist relative to pedestrians. A secondary focus of the campaign should be on the proper way to walk along a roadway that has no sidewalks (facing traffic, wearing visible clothing at night).

3.1.2 *Develop a local consortium for a pedestrian safety education effort.* A consortium, including the representatives of motorists, child injury prevention, health agencies, should be created to insure the proliferation of the pedestrian safety message in the region.

3.1.3 *Integrate pedestrian education into the state and City of Hartford Police Academy curriculum.* Work to insure that all police officers in the region are mead aware of pedestrian law in both certification and recertification.

3.1.4 *Develop a model for in class education.* Identify Capitol Region expertise in safety education for young bicyclists and pedestrians, adopt recommended models for in class education on pedestrian safety, and share information on curriculum and resources among town police departments.

3.2 **Enforcement**

3.2.1 *Evaluate enforcement programs in use in the region and elsewhere.*

3.2.2 *Targeted program for pedestrian law enforcement in the region.* Working with the towns, develop a targeted enforcement program that can be implemented on a local basis to insure that motorists and pedestrians behave safely at crosswalks. Traffic light and stop light offenses are of particular concern. Other issues are inattentive drivers, illegal parking which diminishes visibility of pedestrians, speeding, illegal turns on red, failure to obey crossing guards and failure to stop at stop lines. Another area of enforcement that should be addressed is the need to keep sidewalks clear of obstructions (removal of snow, trash, illegal parking).
3.3 **Safe Infrastructure Design**  
Providing safe pedestrian infrastructure is a key component of improving pedestrian safety. Accomplishing the strategies noted above in Section 1.3, Provide the right transportation system for biking and walking, will create a safer pedestrian environment.

Goal 4 **Improve funding opportunities for the construction, maintenance and operation of bicycle and pedestrian facilities**

Most of the above listed strategies are dependent upon funding availability for success. The following strategies are designed to insure that appropriate funding is available.

1.2 **Encourage Capital Programming**  
Annual set asides of funding provide certainty that enables long range planning for bike and pedestrian needs.

4.1.1 **Encourage towns to program capital and maintenance dollars each year for bicycle and pedestrians facilities.**

4.1.2 **Encourage a greater emphasis upon bike and pedestrian projects in the selection of projects to be funded by STP Urban money.**

4.1.3 **Encourage CT DOT to program more funds for bicycle and pedestrian facilities.**

4.2 **Grant funding**  
CRCOG and the towns should aggressively pursue grant programs appropriate for bike and pedestrian projects.

4.2.1 **Notify towns of grant programs to which they can apply.** Investigate both traditional (government programs) sources of funding and non-traditional (private business and foundation grants.) Of particular interest is how sidewalks can be funded on existing streets while holding down costs for adjacent property owners.

4.2.2 **Apply for those grants appropriate for a regional agency.**
Chapter 6 Next Steps and Implementation

While all of the recommendations listed in the previous chapter have merit, it is not possible to implement them all immediately, priorities must be set. As part of the public review of the Draft Pedestrian Plan, individuals were asked to identify the three recommendations that they felt were most important. The members of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee, members of the CRCOG Transportation Committee, Policy Board, and Regional Planning Commission, along with members of the public, responded with their priorities.

The four recommendations that were most highly ranked were the following:

1.1.2 Advocate for the Connecticut Department of Transportation to revise their current policy regarding funding of sidewalks.

4.1.3 Encourage CT DOT to program more funds for bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

3.1.1 Work with the state to conduct a statewide pedestrian safety campaign.

1.1.1 Advocate for the State Traffic Commission to give consideration to bicycle and pedestrian needs during their permitting process.

Notably, each of these strategies is related to action at the state level. This points up two things: the clear need for a partnership of all levels of government in order to improve the pedestrian environment in the region; and the apparent frustration that town officials feel with regard to the state’s concern about pedestrian needs.

Looking more broadly at the recommendations that emerged from the public review process, these categories of strategies were most highly valued:

1.1 Put the proper regulations into place

1.2 Provide education and outreach

4.1 Funding set asides

3.1 Education

1.3 Provide the right transportation system for biking and walking

2.1 Safe Routes to Schools
Finally, we can look at how each goal area was prioritized. Following is the list of the goals in priority order:

**Goal 1:** Provide an accessible, integrated and safe regional transportation system in which bicycling, walking and transit are prioritized.

**Goal 4:** Improve funding opportunities for the construction, maintenance and operation of bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

**Goal 3:** Decrease the number of pedestrians and bicyclists killed and injured.

**Goal 2:** Promote the increased use of non-motorized travel.

For the implementation of the Pedestrian Plan to be balanced, no goal area should be ignored, even if it has a lower priority. Based upon the public input, the prioritization votes, and an assessment of the difficulty involved with each recommendation, it is recommend that in the first year, the following be implemented:

1. **Work with the state:**
   a. To change the state sidewalk policy (Recommendation 1.1.2).
   b. To program more dollars for bike and pedestrian projects (Recommendation 4.1.3).
   c. To have the State Traffic Commission consider bike and pedestrian needs (Recommendation 1.1.1).

   After initial discussions of these items with the state, select the one that is most likely to move forward and concentrate efforts there.

2. **Provide Resources to Towns**
   a. Model ordinances (Recommendation 1.2.1.3)
   b. Model language for Plans of Conservation and Development (Recommendation 1.2.1.4)
   c. Sponsor at least one design workshop. Additional workshops may be sponsored if they do not involve a lot of planning and setup. (Recommendation 1.2.1.2)
   d. Safe routes to school training, in the City of Hartford (Recommendation 2.1.1).
   e. Encourage the development of pedestrian facility master plans (Recommendation 1.3.2)

For successful implementation of these recommendations, it will be very important to work with town Planning and Zoning commissions along with town elected officials and town staff.
3. **Pedestrian Safety Campaign**  
   Work to have this adopted as a statewide effort (Recommendation 3.1.1). If not successful, run a local program.

4. **Trail System**  
   Work with the towns to continue to develop the trail system (Recommendation 1.3.5). Focus first on planned trails and then take a look at where trails are needed but no plans have been developed yet.

Realizing our vision of a pedestrian friendly region will require action on the part of the towns with support and resources provided by CRCOG. When this plan is finalized with a clear list of priorities, we will schedule quarterly meetings of the region’s Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee to discuss progress. Regular reports on progress will be made to the Transportation Committee, and as deemed necessary, reports will be made to the Policy Board. In addition, as appropriate, meetings will be scheduled with town planners, engineers, and or Planning and Zoning commissions. These meetings will provide opportunities for redirecting efforts and resolving issues that might arise. ** Persistence, vigilance, and dedication to our vision will bring success.**
APPENDIX A

LIST OF BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>Armentano Town of Granby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Balzer ConnDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Banks Town of Suffield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill</td>
<td>Barrett Farmington Avenue Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Blejewski GHTD ADA Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Breslin FHWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Brinton Town of Bloomfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Brock CT Safe Kids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Burnham City of Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Carrier citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrice</td>
<td>Carson Town of Somers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>Case Town of East Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie</td>
<td>Chatterton Eastern CT State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Chong FHWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luise</td>
<td>Craig Rockville Dwntwn Assoc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Cyr Town of Farmington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett</td>
<td>Dowe Town of Windsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie</td>
<td>DuBose FHWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Eddy Injury Coalition for Kids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Floroski Simsbury Main Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Francis Town of East Granby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Gillespie Town of Wethersfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Grillo Town of Bolton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyd</td>
<td>Groff town of Windsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck</td>
<td>Guarino Town of West Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Hale Knox Parks Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Herwerth Glastonbury Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Denise</td>
<td>Horan Town of East Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Kazmarski Town of Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Kushner Town of Avon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>LaMalva Town of Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Lee CT Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Lemek All Aboard!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Lessard Town of Bolton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele</td>
<td>Lipe Town of South Windsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Lourie Ct Bicycle Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry</td>
<td>Maine City of Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>AFFILIATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Mancini</td>
<td>Town of Newington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy McMillon</td>
<td>Town of Hebron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Morgan</td>
<td>Town of Granby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Nicol</td>
<td>Riverfront Recapture, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Noble</td>
<td>Town of Simsbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William O'Neill</td>
<td>Fuss &amp; O'Neill, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Parsons-Whitaker</td>
<td>CT Main Street, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Pennington</td>
<td>Town of Glastonbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Phillips</td>
<td>Town of Windsor Locks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Phillips</td>
<td>ConnDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarajane Pickett</td>
<td>Town of Canton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Purtell</td>
<td>Town of Glastonbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Sawitzke</td>
<td>Town of Simsbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Sherwin</td>
<td>CT DEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Simone</td>
<td>CT Main Street, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Sollmi</td>
<td>Town of Rocky Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Squires</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marian Storch</td>
<td>CT DPH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Timberman</td>
<td>Town of Vernon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Turner</td>
<td>Town of Wethersfield</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

RECORD OF PUBLIC COMMENT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 14, 2005</td>
<td>Draft Pedestrian Plan <em>Walking Matters</em> is reviewed with the Bike and Pedestrian Subcommittee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2005</td>
<td><em>Walking Matters</em> is revised to reflect input of Bike and Ped Subcommittee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 14, 2005</td>
<td>Presentation of <em>Walking Matters</em> (the Draft Pedestrian Plan) to the CRCOG Transportation Committee. The Committee endorsed taking the Draft Plan to public review in a series of public meetings. Committee members were asked to indicate the three recommendations that they think should be implemented first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 18, 2005</td>
<td>Press release regarding the availability of the Plan and the dates of the public input sessions distributed to the region’s media outlets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2005</td>
<td>Legal ads announcing the availability of the Draft Pedestrian Plan and the date of the Public Information meetings were placed in the Hartford Courant, the Journal Inquirer, and the Hartford News (in both English and Spanish in this last publication.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2005</td>
<td>Notices regarding the availability of the Draft Pedestrian Plan and the date of the Public Information meeting along with links to the web location of the draft report were sent to town clerks, town engineers, town planners, individuals on CRCOG Bike to Work lists and other individuals in the CRCOG data base with a potential interest in pedestrian planning. Over 1000 notices were sent out. We offered to make presentations on the plan to other groups if they were interested. Several on the distribution list forwarded the notice on to others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 15, 2005</td>
<td>At a regularly scheduled meeting of the Hartford School Crossing Guards, CRCOG asked for input regarding pedestrian safety in the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 23, 2005</td>
<td>Presentation of <em>Walking Matters</em> (draft Pedestrian Plan) to the CRCOG Policy Board. Policy Board members were asked to indicate the three recommendations that they think should be implemented first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 29, 2005</td>
<td>A Public Information Meeting was held at the Windsor Town Hall. CRCOG staff presented the plan and asked for input. Individuals could speak at the meeting and/or fill out a feedback form. The town advertised this meeting through their regular communications tools with constituents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 30, 2005</td>
<td>A Public Information Meeting was held at the West Hartford Town Hall. CRCOG staff presented the plan and asked for input. Individuals could speak at the meeting and/or fill out a feedback form. The town advertised this meeting through their regular communications tools with constituents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 31, 2005</td>
<td>A Public Information Meeting was held at the South Windsor Town Hall. CRCOG staff presented the plan and asked for input. Individuals could speak at the meeting and/or fill out a feedback form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 12, 2005</td>
<td>Bike and Pedestrian Subcommittee considers public comment received to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 21, 2005</td>
<td>Presentation of Draft Pedestrian Plan to Regional Planning Commission. Town Planners and town planning and zoning commission members were also invited to attend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 23, 2005</td>
<td>CRCOG Transportation Committee considers Draft Pedestrian Plan for adoption.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments received regarding the DRAFT Regional Pedestrian Plan are summarized on the following pages.
Number of individuals providing input via various media:

- Phone: 2
- Email: 8
- Attendees at Public Information Meeting: 19
- Forms/surveys filled out at public Information Meeting: 5

Overall, meeting attendees and those who contacted us via phone, mail or email were pleased to see the approach to pedestrian planning. Several people had suggestions for fine-tuning the Plan to insure that it targets the problems they are most concerned with. Many people took the opportunity to let us know what their priorities are for improving the pedestrian environment in the region.

Specific comments provided and how we can respond to them:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Related Comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Plan does not stress subdivisions much. Since the reality is that most new residential development takes place in subdivisions, the Plan should provide some discussion.</td>
<td>Add text to Chapter 3 regarding current sidewalk policies in subdivisions and add text to Recommendation 1.2.1.3 and 1.3.3 (Provide model ordinances for sidewalk installation and maintenance and Encourage Towns to adopt design standards for sidewalk and pedestrian facilities.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Towns require that in new subdivisions sidewalks be built on only one side on the street, unless the sidewalks link to a particular pedestrian destination. This might not make sense because sidewalks are used by kids to play upon, to learn to ride a bike, for many individuals for walking for health. To place sidewalks on only one side seems inequitable.</td>
<td>Same comment as above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Plan stresses the importance of a grid street system, but in many communities new development is likely to continue with a fair amount of cul de sac development. Could the Plan note the importance of interconnecting cul de sacs with walking paths?</td>
<td>Add text in Chapter 3 and to Recommendation 1.3.1 (Encourage towns to develop grid street systems.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It would be useful if the Plan stressed even more strongly the importance of walkability and bikability to Smart Growth and vice versa. | Add text to Recommendation 1.2.1.4: Provide model language for local Plans of Conservation and Development

Density should be noted as being needed for walkability | Same comment as above.

Pedestrian friendly planning in the Capitol Region makes a lot of sense. Pedestrian friendly planning can enhance business districts, especially where the business district is surrounded by residential areas. | Same comment as above.

For a community to be walkable it needs attractions and destinations, especially stores. Mixed use development is important to create more of a pedestrian presence and to make walking more attractive. | Same comment as above.

The Plan should include an element addressing the need to educate private developers to the importance of pedestrian linkage. Quality “promotional” materials would help to support town staff when they speak with developers. | Add Recommendation 1.2.1.6, Develop educational materials Towns can use with developers.

In town Center areas, planners and engineers need to be particularly aware of pedestrian safety. | Modify Recommendation 1.2.1.2 (Sponsor annual design workshops) to include text on the importance of focusing upon town center areas.

It is important that in improving walkability you encourage people to congregate to be part of their community. | Add text to Chapter 1, Introduction.

**Enforcement Related Comments**

The Plan does not say anything about enforcing the traffic law to prevent traffic light and stop sign offenses – these offenders place pedestrians and cyclists in danger. Legislation permitting video camera enforcement should be supported. | Add more text to Recommendation 3.2, Enforcement, to clarify need for enforcement.

Enforcement is a big issue for pedestrian safety, cars that park too close to crosswalks, double parked delivery trucks, cars parked on sidewalks, inattentive drivers (cell phones, dogs distracting), speeding, illegal right turn on red, failure to obey crossing guards, failure to stop at stop line. | Same as above.

**Health Related Comments**

You could stress the health and walking connection. | Add text to recommendation 2.2.3 Walk/Health Information
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic Signal Related Comments</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The report should advocate for the countdown style of pedestrian walk signals.</td>
<td>Add text to Chapter 3 regarding where these are suitable and add text to Recommendation 1.3.3 Assess pedestrian facility needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All ped crossing signals should be audible.</td>
<td>Same as above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian signals do not give enough crossing time, especially for the young and for the old. This was noted as a problem particularly in Hartford.</td>
<td>Add text to Chapter 4 to reinforce that this is a problem, and add text to Recommendation 1.3.3, Assess pedestrian facility needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian signage can be unclear. Many individuals do not know what the Walk and blinking Don’t Walk signs mean. In some places a ped button is placed but there is no pedestrian signal head, this is confusing to those unfamiliar with this signage.</td>
<td>Address in Recommendation 3.1.1, Pedestrian safety campaign</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities Related Comments</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking paths, trails should be readily accessible and interconnected with points of interest highlighted.</td>
<td>Add text to recommendation 1.3.5, Work with towns to develop the regional trail system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the proposed CT River trail, which is to come through Windsor something that CRCOG supports?</td>
<td>Make clear with text in Recommendation 1.3.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the Plan include a role for CRCOG as a facilitator to promote inter-town pedestrian links</td>
<td>Make clear with text in Recommendation 1.3.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towns need to be aware of the need for safe pedestrian facilities in the vicinity of senior citizen housing and housing that serves the disabled.</td>
<td>Add text to Chapter 3 and to Recommendation 1.2.1.4, Model language for Plans of Conservation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Plan should address the importance of pedestrian access to bus stops.</td>
<td>This is covered in Recommendation 1.3.4, Facilitate efforts to provide pedestrian access to other modes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In some places, crosswalk markings do not seem to be located where people cross.</td>
<td>Add text that highlights this issue to Recommendation 1.3.2, Encourage towns to assess pedestrian facility needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School zone signs, with flashing lights, are needed in more locations.</td>
<td>Same as above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There need to be more bike lanes, so that the bikes are not on the sidewalks.</td>
<td>Note the interrelationship of bike facilities and pedestrian facilities in Chapter 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Plan should not be concerned with how pedestrian appurtenances are funded, get them in place first, worry about who pays second.</td>
<td>The plan needs to be based upon a sound understanding of what hinders towns in investing in pedestrian facilities, funding availability is a consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every town should have a sidewalk plan.</td>
<td>Covered in Recommendation 1.3.2, Encourage towns to assess pedestrian facility needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One thing that Towns can do to come up with appropriately wide (5 feet) sidewalks and to allow for a snow shelf is to decrease the new roadway width requirement (Enfield went from 30 feet to 26 ft.)</td>
<td>Add text “work with towns to develop a hierarchy for roads and pedestrian facilities” to Recommendation 1.3.3, Encourage towns to adopt design standards for sidewalk and pedestrian facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If sidewalks are to be placed on only one side of the street, they should be on the “sunny” side, to help with snow and ice melt.</td>
<td>Add text to Chapter 3 to discuss this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner ring suburbs can establish sidewalk systems because they have adequate density. Less dense communities will have difficulty in developing sidewalk systems. The plan should reflect this.</td>
<td>Add text to Chapter 3 regarding current practices and add text “work with towns to develop a hierarchy for roads and pedestrian facilities” to Recommendation 1.3.3, Encourage towns to adopt design standards for sidewalk and pedestrian facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Plan should include a recommendation that streets and sidewalks be surveyed to see what specific problems may exist and to offer suggestions for improvements. Many problems are minor and could be easily fixed.</td>
<td>This is covered in Recommendation 1.3.2, , Encourage towns to assess pedestrian facility needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Plan does not address the need to keep sidewalks clean (trash removal, snow removal).</td>
<td>Add text to Recommendation 3.2, Enforcement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even rural towns need pedestrian friendly areas. Consider the suitability of gravel/stone dust pathways in rural areas.</td>
<td>Add text to Recommendation 1.3.3, Design Standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Planning Related Comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Plan should note the importance of including pedestrian needs in planning and traffic studies done in the region.</th>
<th>Add as Recommendation 1.3.7.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is this philosophy – the importance of pedestrians and pedestrian access – included in the stat plan of conservation and development?</td>
<td>Informational request only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Related Comments</strong></td>
<td><strong>Add to text of Recommendation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education is a very important element of the Plan. A lot of children are learning bad habits from their parents regarding crossing the street.</td>
<td>3.1.1, Work with state to conduct a statewide pedestrian safety campaign. Add this to the prioritization tally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some kind of marketing outreach is needed to let people know the safe and legal way to cross the street.</td>
<td>Included in Recommendation 3.1.1, Work with state to conduct a statewide pedestrian safety campaign. Add this to the prioritization tally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians need to understand the importance of walking facing traffic where there are no sidewalks.</td>
<td>Add text to recommendation 3.1.1, Work with state to conduct a statewide pedestrian safety campaign.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Implementation Related Comments</strong></th>
<th><strong>Add text to the Implementation chapter.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It will be important to have town Planning and Zoning officials involved with the implementation.</td>
<td>Add text to Recommendation 3.1.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a need to think innovatively about funding of sidewalks on existing roads in order to mitigate costs to current property owners.</td>
<td>Add text to Recommendation 4.2.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to have a “Friends of Local Bike and Pedways” group to further trail efforts.</td>
<td>Add text to Recommendation 1.3.5, Work with towns to develop the regional trail system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian safety should really be the priority.</td>
<td>Add to prioritization tally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You should be sure to reach out to town Planning and Zoning commissions with this plan.</td>
<td>Add to implementation chapter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any private businesses or foundations that might have funding for pedestrian improvements?</td>
<td>Add text to Recommendation 4.2.1, Notify towns of grant programs to which they can apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why not take town officials on a hike to see what walking is like?</td>
<td>Add this as recommendation 1.2.1.6, Plan an annual walk in an area that has been identified as having pedestrian issues. Set up similarly to the Walkability Workshops which were held in the region in June 2003.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is bicycling an element of the pedestrian plan?</td>
<td>The introduction to the report discussed the relationship between bicycle and pedestrian planning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results of Prioritization:

At each public meeting and every presentation of the Draft Pedestrian Plan, we asked that attendees select the three recommendations that they thought should be implemented first.

The four recommendations that received the highest number of votes were:

1.1.2. Advocate for the CT Department of Transportation to revise their current sidewalk policy.

4.1.3 Encourage CT Department of Transportation to program more funds for bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

3.1.1 Work with the state to conduct a statewide pedestrian safety campaign.

1.1.1 Advocate for the State Traffic Commission to give consideration to bicycle and pedestrian needs during their permitting process.

Looking at broader recommendation categories, those receiving the highest number of prioritization votes, and listed in priority order as given by the voting, are:

1.1 Put the proper regulations into place.

1.2 Provide education and outreach

4.1 Funding Set Asides

3.1 Education

1.3 Provide the right transportation system for biking and walking

2.1 Safe routes to school

4.2 Grant Funding

And finally, we can look at how the goal areas were prioritized, as indicated by the prioritization voting:

First: Goal Area 1, Provide an accessible, integrated and safe regional transportation system in which bicycling, walking and transit are prioritized.

Second: Goal Area 4: Improve funding opportunities for the construction, maintenance and operation of bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

Third: Goal Area 3, Decrease the number of pedestrians and bicyclists killed and injured.
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Fourth: Goal Area 2, Promote the increased use of non-motorized travel.

For the implementation of the Pedestrian Plan to be balanced, no goal area should be ignored, even if it has a lower priority. Based upon the public input, the prioritization votes, and an assessment of the difficulty involved with each recommendation, we recommend that in the first year, the following be implemented:

5. Work with the state:
   a. To change the state sidewalk policy (Recommendation 1.1.2).
   b. To program more dollars for bike and pedestrian projects (Recommendation 4.1.3).
   c. To have the State Traffic Commission consider bike and pedestrian needs (Recommendation 1.1.1).

After initial discussions of these items with the state, select the one that is most likely to move forward and concentrate efforts there.

6. Provide Resources to Towns:
   a. Model ordinances (Recommendation 1.2.1.3)
   b. Model language for Plans of Conservation and Development (Recommendation 1.2.1.4)
   c. Sponsor at least one design workshop. Additional workshops may be sponsored if they do not involve a lot of planning and setup (Recommendation 1.2.1.2)
   d. Safe routes to school training, in the City of Hartford (Recommendation 2.1.1).
   e. Encourage the development of pedestrian facility master plans (Recommendation 1.3.2)

For successful implementation of these recommendations, it will be very important to work with town Planning and Zoning commissions along with town elected officials and town staff.

7. Pedestrian Safety Campaign
   Work to have this adopted as a statewide effort (Recommendation 3.1.1). If not successful, run a local program.

8. Trail System
   Work with the towns to continue to develop the trail system (Recommendation 1.3.5). Focus first on planned trails and then take a look at where trails are needed but no plans have been developed yet.