Oxford Route 67
Alternative Transportation Plan
Public Information Meeting

6/17/2021
Agenda

- **Introduction**
  - Jeffrey Luff, Oxford Economic Development Director
  - David Labriola, State Representative, 131st District

- **Project Background & Need** (Aaron Budris, NVCOG)

- **Project Presentation** (Casey Hardin, TranSystems)
  - Existing Conditions Overview
  - Bike / Ped Recommendations
  - Transit Recommendations
  - Next Steps

- **Questions & Comments** (Project Team)
Project Background
The mission of the OMSP is to create and build a pedestrian/bicycle friendly pathway along Oxford’s riverside giving residents access to municipal buildings, churches, local businesses and nature.
Existing Conditions Analysis

- Route 67
  - Traffic volumes
  - Travel speeds
  - Crashes

ADT Through the Corridor

To Southbury

To Seymour
Sidewalks

- Lack of pedestrian infrastructure
- Creates difficult environment
Bicycling

- High volumes and speeds
- Shoulder (if sufficiently wide) would be used by confident cyclists only
Typical Sections

- All based on 10’ Sidewalk
- Preferred 5’ minimum buffer
- Developed linear foot costs (with and without lighting)
Typical Sections

Normal Section
$130 / LF = $690K / Mile
$220 / LF = $1.2M / Mile w/ Lighting
Typical Sections

Normal Section – Developed Area
$130 / LF = $690K / Mile
$220 / LF = $1.2M / Mile w/ Lighting
Typical Sections

Steep Slope
$270 / LF = $1.5 / Mile
$360 / LF = $2M / Mile w/ Lighting
Typical Sections

Retaining Wall
$1,850 / LF = $10M / Mile
$1,935 / LF = $10.25M / Mile w/ Lighting
**Typical Sections**

**Rock Cut**

$230 / LF = $1.25M / Mile

$250 / LF = $1.7M / Mile

w/ Lighting
Typical Sections

Wayfinding / Rest Area
## Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Met / Not Met</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The alternative maximizes transportation benefits by providing connections to key origins and destinations along its route</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>Alternative provides direct connections to all key origins and destinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>Alternative provides direct connections to some key origins and destinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>Alternatives does not provide direct connections to many key origins and destinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The alternative is not likely to encounter significant construction cost increases when compared with the base shared path section</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>Alternative not likely to encounter significant increases in comparison with the base shared path section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>Alternative may encounter some increase in comparison with the base shared path section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>Alternative likely to encounter significant increases in comparison with the base shared path section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The alternative does not require significant ROW acquisition</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>Alternative does not require ROW acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>Alternative requires some partial acquisitions or easements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>Alternative requires many partial acquisitions or easements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>Alternative requires acquisition of one or more parcels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The alternative does not introduce wetland, floodplain, cultural or natural resource impacts that would likely require mitigation</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>The alternative does not introduce impacts and is unlikely to require an environmental permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>The alternative does not introduce impacts but would likely require environmental permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>The alternative introduces impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The alternative affords access to areas for recreational opportunities and locations of scenic value</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>The alternative affords access to areas for recreational opportunities and locations of scenic value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>The alternative does not afford access to areas for recreational opportunities and locations of scenic value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The alternative minimizes the need for users to cross Route 67</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>The alternative does not require users to cross Route 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>The alternative requires users to cross Route 67 at signalized locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>The alternative requires users to cross Route 67 at unsignalized locations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quarry Walk to Seymour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Met / Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connections to destinations</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic / Recreational Value</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossings</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Segments for Implementation

- Each broken into implementable projects
Central Segment

- Project 1 (Ongoing) – Town Hall to Dutton Road
- Project 2 – Sidewalk East side though Center / Extend path to Riggs Street
- Project 3 – Riggs Street to Quarry Walk
Central Segment
Southern Segment

- Project 1 – Quarry Walk to Park Road
- Project 2 – Park Road to Great Hill Road
- Project 3 – Great Hill Road to Sidewalk Network in Seymour
- Future Connection – Across Naugatuck River
Southern Segment

Quarry Walk

Project S-1
Apx. $2.45 M

Project S-2
Apx. $1.375M

Project S-3
Apx. $850k
Northern Segment

- Project 1 – Oxford Center to Christian Street
- Project 2 – Christian Street to Hawley Road
- Project 3 – Hawley Road to Larkin State Park Trail
Northern Segment
Transit Recommendations

- Demand: 13,600 rides per year
- Commuter demand too limited
- Recommended Option: Join VTD
Next steps / Wrap-up

- Report posted on website
  - 30 day comment period
- Incorporate revisions
- Board of Selectmen endorsement
- Finalize!
Thank you for your time!