

# Capitol Region Council of Governments

241 Main St., Hartford, CT 06106  
Phone: (860) 522-2217 FAX: (860) 724-1274

## BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PLANNING COMMITTEE

Tuesday June 14, 2011

### DRAFT MINUTES

#### ATTENDANCE

Rob O'Connor  
Neil Pade  
Jonathan Thiesse  
Michele Lipe  
John Waiculonis  
Matt Cornelius  
Robert Phillips  
Flo Dickie  
Stuart Popper  
Jenna Nichols  
Kate Rattan  
Dave Head  
Mary Ellen Thibodeau  
John Owens  
Ray Favreau  
Chris Greenlaw  
Chuck Guarino  
Jeff Doolittle

#### TOWN/ORGANIZATION

South Windsor Walk and Wheelways  
Town of Canton  
Town of Bloomfield  
Town of South Windsor  
CT BESB  
CTBESB  
Town of Ellington  
Town of Newington  
Milone & McBroom, Inc., Bike Walk CT  
URS Corp.  
CTDOT  
CTDOT  
Bike Walk CT  
Bloomfield Greenway Committee  
Town of South Windsor Parks and Rec.  
Town of Newington  
Town of West Hartford  
Town of South Windsor

#### STAFF

Sandy Fry

CRCOG

The meeting was called to order by staff member Sandy Fry at 12:10.

**Approval of Minutes:** Michele Lipe made a motion to approve the March 2011 meeting minutes, seconded by Neil Pade. Motion passed.

#### **Updates:**

Sandy acknowledged the work that the **Town of South Windsor** and its bike/pedestrian committee, the South Windsor Walk and Wheel Ways have done to promote bike and pedestrian friendliness in the community. South Windsor was recently recognized by the League of American Bicyclists with an honorable mention in their bike friendly community program. This accomplishment is due to the efforts that the town has undertaken with regard to Safe Routes to Schools, bike education (this school year fourth graders in 3 of the town's 4 elementary schools received 4 hours of bike safety education), bike parking (South Windsor Walk and Wheelways has a program to encourage placement of bike racks), and the towns interest in incorporating bike and ped features in its transportation projects. More information on the South Windsor Walk and Wheelways is available at this link: [www.swwww.org](http://www.swwww.org). A map of bicycle facilities in town is available on a google map: <http://goo.gl/maps/109m>. Sandy also acknowledged the cooperatin of the town and the Police Department in holding this meeting at the police headquarters in South Windsor.

**Upcoming funding opportunities:** CRCOG has sent to each town a notice that the DEP is now (through September 1, 2011) accepting applications for the **recreational trails program**. The applications are being requested in anticipation that the state will receive about \$1 million through this program in federal fiscal year 2012. Because of uncertainties regarding federal transportation funding (since the surface transportation reauthorization, that is, the bill that will replace SAFETEA-LU, is past due) it is not certain that this funding will be available, but it is worth the effort to submit applications for this funding, to be on the list if the funds come through. CRCOG expects to issue an **STP-Urban project solicitation on June 27**. This solicitation will include a **set aside for bike and pedestrian projects** (this is new) so towns are encouraged to submit multi use path and other bike ped facility projects for consideration for funding. The DOT has not yet established a timeline for the solicitation of **Transportation Enhancement** (or STP-E, or TE) projects. That request will be distributed by CRCOG to the Towns. Early estimates have indicated that CRCOG will likely receive approximately \$3 million over a 4 year program. Like the rec trails program, with both STP-Urban and TE funds, there is uncertainty as to how much total funding the region can expect, given the lack of a multi year surface transportation authorization. There is also a possibility that the new authorization will change project funding categories.

**Data collection:** with the assistance of our UMass planning intern, Ahmed Ismail, CRCOG has developed a data base which will simplify our data entry and data manipulation for the bike ped count program. We hope to utilize volunteers again in 2011 to count at numerous locations and we need the bike ped committee's help to identify the most important count locations. Please give your thoughts on count locations to Sandy.

**Other Power Driven Mobility devices (OPDMDs):** Sandy has collected trail use guidelines from other locations that have addressed the use of OPDMDs by disabled trail users. She will send these guidelines out to Bike Ped committee members. Reminder – the Department of Justice has made a ruling that trails must permit OPDMDs unless they have written guidelines regulating their use. For more information go to <http://www.americantrails.org/resources/accessible/power-mobility-questions-answers.html>

**State of CT news:** Sandy introduced Kate Rattan, the CTDOT non motorized transportation coordinator, and her supervisor, Dave Head. Kate and Dave have already had an impact on the walkability and bikeability of the state, and the League of American Bicyclists annual bike friendly state ranking just moved CT up from 40<sup>th</sup> place to 21<sup>st</sup>. The state has just issued a new bike ped design checklist (attached to these minutes) to all of its designers to work toward implementing the complete streets law. The checklist includes a requirement that the designer reach out to bike and ped advocacy groups and has a series of questions to insure that the designer has considered the safety of bicyclists and pedestrians in the design. The CT Bike Ped Advisory Board is also keeping an eye on how the complete streets law is implemented. Transportation for America just released its most recent Dangerous by Design report, which evaluates pedestrian crash statistics in all 50 states and the 52 largest metro areas. The Hartford metro area has the second highest pedestrian danger index of all Northeastern metro areas. Sandy did note that the pedestrian danger index as used in the Dangerous by Design report, may not truly measure pedestrian

danger. You can access more information online: Connecticut report: <http://t4america.org/docs/dbd2011/ct-dangerous-by-design.pdf>. Dangerous by Design website: <http://t4america.org/resources/dangerousbydesign2011/>

### **Complete Streets**

Sandy gave a presentation on Complete Streets, which addressed the rationale for designing with all users in mind. Not only is complete streets the law for municipalities and the state, including bikeability and walkability in transportation projects is important for mobility, a balanced transportation system, climate and environment, economic vitality and public health. The presentation included enumeration of principles for walkability and bikeability and a number of examples of each. The slide show is available to any town or group that would find it useful and is available for review on our website: [http://www.crcog.org/transportation/bicycle/bp\\_eng.html](http://www.crcog.org/transportation/bicycle/bp_eng.html) Also, Sandy is able to make a presentation in your community on the topic, if that is helpful.

Jeff Doolittle, town engineer for South Windsor, described the Sand Hill Road project and its bike and pedestrian features. The improvement project included striping of bicycle lanes, addition of a sidewalk on one side, marking of several crosswalks, and use of textured pavement as a traffic calming feature. The road was not widened.

At the end of the meeting, attendees walked a segment of the Sand Hill road project to observe the bike and ped features.

### **Next Meeting**

The meeting schedule for committee meetings for the remainder of the year is Sep. 13, Dec. 13.

The September 13 meeting will be held at the Boathouse at riverfront Recapture in Hartford.

**Adjournment** 2 pm

**BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN TRAVEL NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

**Project Number(s):** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Type of work:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Municipality(s):** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Route(s):** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Planning Region(s):** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Prepared by:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date Prepared:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Approved by:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date Approved:** \_\_\_\_\_

In accordance with Connecticut General Statutes, Section 13a-153f, and the Department's focus on accommodating non-motorized travel modes, consideration of all users shall be a routine part of the planning, design, construction and operating activities of all highways. The need for inclusion of accommodations for bicyclists and pedestrians, including those with disabilities, should be reviewed for every project. This form provides the documentation and basis for determining the need and extent for providing bicycle and pedestrian accommodations.

Although bicycle and pedestrian accommodations should be considered for all projects, certain types of projects (e.g. bridge deck patching, culvert re-lining, projects on expressways) do not typically provide reasonable opportunity to provide improvements for these travel modes. If this project falls into this category, please explain why, do not complete the rest of the form, and file this form with the project documents.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

For all other projects, please complete the following questionnaire:

1. What is the suitability of the project area for bicycle travel according to the ConnDOT Bicycle Map website (<http://www.ctbikemap.org/bikemap.html>)? For town roads, is any portion of the project located on a road identified in a Regional Planning Organization, or Municipal Bicycle Plan?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

2. Is the project located on, or in close proximity to, a route identified in the Department's Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Transition Plan?  
[http://www.ct.gov/dot/lib/dot/documents/ddbe/ADATransition\\_Plan\\_March\\_2011.pdf](http://www.ct.gov/dot/lib/dot/documents/ddbe/ADATransition_Plan_March_2011.pdf)

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN TRAVEL NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

3. Is there a history of bicycle or pedestrian accidents/incidents in the project area?

---

---

---

---

4. Where would bicyclists and/or pedestrians cross the project?

---

---

---

---

5. Where would bicyclists and/or pedestrians need to travel parallel to the project?

---

---

---

---

a. Does the project provide unique or primary access (see Note 1):

i. Across a river, highway corridor or other natural and/or man-made barrier?

---

---

---

---

ii. Into or out of a residential or commercial development or employment center?

---

---

---

---

iii. Between communities or other likely significant destinations – such as a university campus or recreation facility?

---

---

---

---

**BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN TRAVEL NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

- b. Are there any secondary roads parallel to the project that could reasonably be used by bicyclists and/or pedestrians as alternates to access these destinations (see Note 2)?

---

---

---

---

If so, how far from the corridor are these roads and are there significant destinations located on the project corridor that bicyclists or pedestrians would need to access?

---

---

---

---

- 6. Do local government entities or other organizations have plans for bicycle facilities or generators, such as a school, park or recreational area that could affect this project or generate additional travel in the project corridor?

---

---

---

---

*Notes:*

- 1. *Unique or primary access is defined as access which is not otherwise available within a reasonable riding distance of 2km (1.24 miles).*
- 2. *Secondary roads that could be used as alternate routes are usually within 2-3 blocks in urban areas, within 1 km (0.63 miles) in suburban areas, and within 2 km (1.24 miles) in rural areas.*

**BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN TRAVEL NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

**CHECKLIST FOR BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN TRAVEL GENERATORS  
IN PROJECT VICINITY**

<b>Generators</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>Generators</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>TBD</b>
Residential Areas (R)				Shopping Centers (M)			
Parks (P)				Hospitals/Clinics (H)			
Recreational Area (RA)				Employment Centers (E)			
Churches (C)				Government Offices (G)			
Schools (S)				Local Businesses (B)			
Libraries (L)				Industrial Plants (I)			
Existing Bicycle Trails (BP)				Bus Routes (BR)			
Planned Bicycle Trails (PBP)				Public Transportation Facilities (T)			
Existing Sidewalks (SW)				Other ( ) (O)			

TBD: To Be Determined

A map should accompany this checklist to illustrate (labeling the generator symbol) the respective generators.

If any of the generators listed above are identified in the project area, a determination of the need for, the planning of, and design of bicycle and pedestrian facilities should be coordinated with interested stakeholders. Documentation of coordination should be retained on file. The following is a checklist of possible stakeholder organizations that should be contacted:

**CHECKLIST OF ORGANIZATIONS AND PUBLIC COORDINATION**

<b>Organization</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>Organizations</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>TBD</b>
Regional Planning Organization				Bike Walk Connecticut			
Local Municipalities				Local Community Groups			
CT Department of Environmental Protection				Local Businesses			
ConnDOT Bureau of Public Transportation				Board of Education Services for the Blind (BESB)			
CT Department of Public Health							
ConnDOT Non-Motorized Transportation Coordinator				Other ( )			

NA: Not Applicable

TBD: To Be Determined

**BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN TRAVEL NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

**Evaluation of Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation**

1. Summarize the results of coordination with stakeholders and general public outreach with regards to bicycle and pedestrian needs, including accommodations during construction.

---

---

---

2. Characterize the anticipated pedestrian and bicycle travel within the study area, with emphasis on locations and corridors of high demand.

---

---

---

3. Describe any bicycle/pedestrian accommodation features that were considered for inclusion in the project, features, benefits and approximate costs (i.e. rights-of-way, construction, and long-term maintenance).

---

---

---

4. Describe how the anticipated bicycle/pedestrian travel will be accommodated through existing infrastructure, project-proposed features and features that are planned for the future.

---

---

---

5. Describe any other factors that were considered (e.g. environmental effects, feasibility)

---

---

---

**Conclusion**

Summarize the recommended means of accommodating bicycles and pedestrians.

---

---

---

---