UPDATES AND NEWS

Region/State
UPCOMING PROJECTS

Traffic calming in Simsbury

Regional Bike/Ped plan for RiverCOG

Traffic diversion in East Hartford
Plainville FCHT Status Update

Split into three sections (North, Center, and South)

South is in design

Construction in 2022 (anticipated)

Presentation in May

Full completion anticipated for 2025
Zagster selected as vendor
Regional contract signed
Town contracts underway
Looking for title sponsor
Spring/Summer rollout
MassDOT studying rail connection between Pittsfield and Worcester

Would connect to Hartford Line

CRCOG issued RFP for an economic impact study
REGIONAL COMPLETE STREETS POLICY

Approved by Policy Board January 22

Requires that all project consider all users to get funding

Includes an exceptions process
TRANSIT PRIORITY CORRIDORS

Scoping right now

Develop more detailed plans for priority transit corridors

RFQ in the Spring
Multiple aspects of the plan, focused on implementation

A regional network of key complete streets links

Guidance on what can be done to make these links “complete”

An action plan focused on what the region can do

A guide for municipalities wanting to take a tactical approach to implementation
Two Open Planning Studios held to solicit feedback

- Presentation of draft products
- Focus groups around specific topics
- Talks by industry experts
- Workshops on policies and design

Sought input through a series of online surveys

Began seeking during Fall of 2017 with three pop-up events
PLAN GOALS

Enact policies, plans, and guidelines that promote the implementation of complete streets.

Develop a robust complete streets network linking important nodes of activity throughout the region.

Provide materials, events, and projects that educate officials and the public about the benefits of complete streets, as well as encourage them to use and implement them.

Monitor Progress
Public Comment Period for Complete Streets Plan

CRCOG is seeking public comment on the draft Capital Region Complete Streets Plan. The plan is available below, along with “A Capitol Region Guide to Community Quick-Builds for Complete Streets”. Comments can be sent to Tim Malone. Questions may be sent via email or phone: (860) 724-4221. Comments are due by 2pm on April 17, 2020.

CRCOG Complete Streets Plan Public Draft (PDF: 75 MB)
CRCOG Quick Build Guide (PDF: 28 MB)

This entry was posted in Featured, Plans and Studies, Public Comment Period, Transit and Bicycle/Pedestrian and tagged bike, Complete streets, pedestrians. Bookmark the permalink.
Regional Network started with a data-centric approach, followed by local and public vetting.

Initial network focused on areas with identified safety problems, identified traffic generators, and areas with high levels poverty or traditionally underserved groups.

Data regarding physical attributes of roads was used to further refine the choice of network links.

Municipal officials and the general public were asked to provide input on what the data missed or got wrong.
DEVELOPED REGIONAL NETWORK TOOL

- Developed an online interactive map to help with implementation of the network
- Shows all the links in the regional network
- Each link is classified based on physical and location attributes
- Each class of road is provided with a sample cross section to aide in implementation
REGIONAL NETWORK TOOL

Segment Info:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approx. ROW</th>
<th>Approx. Pavement Width</th>
<th>Transit Route</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70ft</td>
<td>55ft</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constraints: [TBD]
Options: [TBD]
Cost Range: [TBD]
Design Guidance: [TBD]
A Capitol Region Guide to Community Quick-Builds for Complete Streets

Capitol Region Complete Streets Plan
Capitol Region Council of Governments

February 2020
This chart illustrates the progression of an iterative approach to project delivery. Though not all projects need to follow this exact model, it can be helpful to see how each project type builds towards the next, using incremental steps to deliver a capital project intended to create long-term change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type (time interval - relative cost)</th>
<th>DEMONSTRATION (1 day - 1 month - $)</th>
<th>PILOT (1 month - 1+ year - $$)</th>
<th>INTERIM DESIGN (1 year - 5+ years - $$$)</th>
<th>LONG-TERM/CAPITAL (20 years - 50+ years - $$$$$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Leaders</strong></td>
<td>Anyone (city, non-profit, business owner, students etc.)</td>
<td>Government / organizational leadership + involvement required</td>
<td>Government / organizational leadership + involvement required</td>
<td>Government / organizational leadership + involvement required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Permission Status</strong></td>
<td>Sanctioned or unsanctioned</td>
<td>Sanctioned</td>
<td>Sanctioned</td>
<td>Sanctioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Materials + Maintenance</strong></td>
<td>Very low-cost, typically low-durability. May be borrowed, easily made, or purchased; no maintenance required</td>
<td>Relatively low-cost, but semi-durable materials to maximize design flexibility while minimizing maintenance needs</td>
<td>Low and moderate cost materials, designed to balance design flexibility, performance outcomes, and maintenance</td>
<td>High-cost, permanent materials that cannot be adjusted easily; maintenance needs vary tremendously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Involvement</strong></td>
<td>Optional before project implementation, Recommended during brief project lifespan</td>
<td>Required, frequent before implementation and frequent during evaluation period</td>
<td>Recommended, frequent before implementation, required during initial evaluation period, optional thereafter</td>
<td>Required before implementation, recommended during implementation and initial evaluation period, optional thereafter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flexibility of Design</strong></td>
<td>High: organizers expect project to be adjusted and removed within a short timeline, typically one week or weekend</td>
<td>High: proponents expect project to be adjusted; it may be removed if it does not meet goals upon initial evaluation</td>
<td>Moderate: organizers expect project to be adjusted, but it is intended to remain in place until capital upgrades are possible</td>
<td>Low: project is considered a permanent capital upgrade that is unlikely to be adjusted significantly once installed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Collection / Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Qualitative: optional</td>
<td>Qualitative: required</td>
<td>Qualitative: recommended</td>
<td>Qualitative: optional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Terms and diagram format based on PeopleForBike’s “Quick Builds for Better Streets,” which defines the pilot / interim time intervals above as “quick build” projects. To access Quick Builds for Better Streets, visit bit.ly/QuickBuildsReport (Images: Street Plans).
Regional Context Zones

CONTEXT-SENSITIVE PLANNING

The Institute for Transportation Engineers (ITE) describes conventional engineering practice as a process that "prioritizes vehicular mobility and access using functional classification, design speed, traffic volume, and vehicular level of service as the primary determinants for design criteria—an approach with limited sensitivity to the surrounding context."

A counter-approach and recommended practice is what the Federal Highway Administration calls Context-Sensitive Solutions (CSS). CSS recognizes that thoroughfare design should respond to and positively influence the character of neighborhoods, advancing the community vision for the future. FHWA describes CSS as “an approach that considers the total context within which a transportation improvement project will exist.” Thus, applying the principles of CSS in thoroughfare design allows for planners and engineers to integrate Complete Streets design principles that are more consistent with their surroundings and that support the activities of the adjacent or desired land uses and built form.

The CSS and Complete Streets approach does not abandon conventional traffic measurement tools entirely, but augments them with new people and context-oriented considerations that enrich the design decision-making process.

GREATER HARTFORD CONTEXT ZONES

From the most rural settings to the most urban, think downtown Hartford, the CRCOG Complete Streets planning process identified six normative context zones, and four sub-context zones. They are:

- C1: Natural
- C2: Rural
  - C2 T: Small Town General
- C3: Suburban
  - C3 SR: Suburban Residential
  - C3 SC: Suburban Commercial
- C3 TC: Town Center
- C4: Urban General
- C5: Urban Center
- C6: Urban Core

From C1 to C6, each context zone becomes more urbanized, with less natural or agricultural areas and more structured/programmed public open space; a greater diversity of land uses and resulting building types and functions; and an increasing intensity of social, economic, and cultural activity.

Within these six context zones, 10 common thoroughfare types were identified. In the following pages, the reader will find an overview of these context zones, their appropriate thoroughfare types, and how they relate translate to conventional functional classification. This is followed by a “menu” of Quick-Build interventions that are generally appropriate given the range of thoroughfare types and their corresponding context.
Quick-Build Intervention Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Types</th>
<th>RH</th>
<th>RR</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SCA</th>
<th>SRA</th>
<th>SRS</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>UCA</th>
<th>URA</th>
<th>URS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Placemaking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parklet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Plaza</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Mural</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosswalk (High Visibility)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Crossing</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb Extension</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Safety Island</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking Lane</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bicycling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprotected Bike Lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Bike Lanes</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Greenway</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Super Sharrows”</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Parking Corral</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Box</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossbike</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Stage Turn Box</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not every Quick-Build intervention is appropriate for every thoroughfare type and context. Similarly, some Complete Streets project elements do not lend themselves to the Quick-Build methodology. While not exhaustive, this matrix provides 23 potential Quick-Build interventions across five general project categories and identifies the thoroughfare types for which they are appropriate.

Note, even where project interventions are shown to be appropriate, a close review of actual existing conditions is required before implementing a Quick-Build project. For more complete guidance, visit www.nacto.org.

**CS Thoroughfare Types + Context Zones**
- RH = Rural Highway 1 2
- RR = Rural Road 1 2
- B = Boulevard 3 4 5
- SCA = Suburban Commercial Avenue 2 3
- SRA = Suburban Residential Avenue 2 3
- SRS = Suburban Residential Street 2 3
- CS = Community Street 2 3 4
- UCA = Urban Commercial Avenue 3 4 6 8
- URA = Urban Residential Avenue 4
- URS = Urban Residential Street 4
Context Zone: 3, 4
Thoroughfare Type: SRS, CS, URS
Also called “bicycle boulevards,” Neighborhood Greenways provide low-stress bicycle routes along local streets, characterized by slow travel speeds and low vehicle volumes. Neighborhood Greenways feature many traffic-calming tools, including, but not limited to, mini roundabouts, chicanes, pinch points, curb extensions, etc. Directional markings and wayfinding provide bicyclists with legible routing. Sometimes motor vehicle traffic is even limited to local access only, which helps prioritize thru-movement only, which helps prioritize thru-movement for people walking and cycling.

Context Zone: 2, 3, 4
Thoroughfare Type: SRS - CS, URA - URS
Super sharrow are a pavement marking used to indicate a shared lane for people bicycling and people driving. Like regular shared use lane markings ("sharrows"), super sharrows should not be considered a substitute for dedicated bike infrastructure, such as bicycle lanes or protected bikeways. However, the two parallel dashed line markings are intended to emphasize cyclist priority along designated neighborhood slow zone / neighborhood greenway streets where bicycle lanes may not be warranted.

Burlington Quick Build Program
Burlington, VT | Interim Design
The City of Burlington’s North End Neighborhood Greenway was built using the city’s new Quick-Build design and material standards, a companion implementation guide for the WalkBikeBTV Master Plan. Materials include wayfinding signs, planter and delineator-protected bike lanes, and a variety of intersection and mid-block traffic-calming treatments.

BikeNWA Pilot Projects
Rogers, AR | 1-Month Pilot
In Rogers, “super sharrows” were installed in the center of the right-of-way along a Neighborhood Greenway route to both emphasize bicyclist placement and to reduce thru traffic speeds. This treatment was part of a much larger pilot project initiative across Northwest Arkansas that sought to improve connectivity to the 35-mile Razorback Greenway.
Example Project Criteria

**CONNECTIVITY**
How well does the project improve pedestrian and non-motorized connectivity?

**MATERIALS**
What kind of materials will meet the project duration/durability goals?

**VISIBILITY**
How well does the project create visual recognition from passersby?

**COMPLEXITY**
How complex are the installation logistics? Does the budget align?

**SAFETY**
How much does the project improve street safety?

**PUBLIC ENTHUSIASM**
Does the project relate to a recent master plan, or is there other public support?

**LOCAL BUSINESSES**
How well does the project support existing retail, or attract new tenants?

**PARTNERSHIP**
Have possible partners been identified?

**COST**
How much of an investment will the project be in labor, design, installation?

**STEWARDSHIP**
How complex is the maintenance of the project? Is there a steward with capacity?
WHAT’S NEW IN YOUR TOWN? A time to share information around the table.