Chapter 5: Mobility

Introduction
This section of the Master Plan provides a detailed analysis of existing transportation conditions in the town of Southampton; identifies opportunities and challenges; and provides specific strategies for creating a cost effective, safe and sustainable transportation system for the town.

Southampton is a mostly rural town with a road network of 65 miles of paved roads and approximately 15 miles of unpaved roads. Of these 80 total miles, 92% are maintained by the town. The Massachusetts Department of Transportation Highway Division (MassDOT) maintains Route 10 in Southampton, a total distance of 5.3 miles. A total of 17.2 miles or 26% of all roadway mileage in the town is eligible for Federal Aid.

Route 10 is the major north-south corridor through Southampton. It is classified as an Urban Major Collector, carrying travelers to Easthampton in the north and Westfield to the south. Southampton is also connected to neighboring communities via a network of lesser roads to Easthampton, Westhampton, Montgomery, Holyoke, Westfield and Huntington.

5.1 Existing Conditions
The Pioneer Valley Planning Commission (PVPC) performed field surveys and studies to collect traffic volume, speed, vehicular classification, and crash data for Southampton roads and develop a profile of the existing transportation conditions in the town.

This section provides a technical evaluation of transportation facilities in the study area. Traffic conditions in Southampton were studied by obtaining data for a total of 14 locations.
5.1.1 Traffic Volumes
Historical traffic counts performed by the PVPC and MassDOT were reviewed for this plan. This information was combined with the vehicle volume data collected at the 14 locations identified in Table 2 to present a summary of daily traffic volumes throughout the Town of Southampton. Daily traffic data along College Highway was compared to historic traffic counts performed in 2002. Traffic has increased significantly along College Highway (See Appendix 1, Table A-2).

Average Daily Traffic (ADT) volumes were compiled for typical weekdays and weekends at 14 locations within the study area using Automatic Traffic Recorders (ATRs). All ADT volumes were factored to represent Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) levels (See Appendix 1, Table A-1).
5.1.2 Vehicle Travel Speeds
Most motor vehicles in Southampton travel at or under the posted speed limits, according to fields data gathered for this plan. This finding is counter to the experiences and perceptions of many residents that there is a speeding problem in town. This could be a function of the placement of the traffic counting equipment. Vehicles were found to travel in excess of the posted speeds on Glendale Road north of Cold Spring Road, Route 10 (College Highway) north of East Street, and East Street west of County Road.

Travel speed data was collected at all of the daily traffic count locations (See Appendix 1, Table A-3). This data was used to establish “bins” of data to summarize the ranges in which vehicles were measured to be traveling. Speed data was also used to calculate the “85th Percentile” Speed for each direction on the roadway. The 85th Percentile Speed is defined as the speed that 85 percent of all traffic is traveling at or below. This method is typically used to establish the posted speed limit on a roadway. By comparing the 85th Percentile Speed to the posted speed limit a community can determine how well traffic is complying with the current posted speed limits and if increased enforcement of the posted speed limits is necessary.

5.1.3 Vehicle Classification
A significant number of larger trucks were recorded on College Highway, Glendale Road, and County Road south of East Street. Some residents who participated in the walking survey for this report expressed concerns about sharing the road with the large number of trucks using College Highway.

Classification counts were conducted at all of the daily traffic count locations. Vehicles are classified based on the number of axles and the distance between each axle. Two axle, six tire vehicles and vehicles with three or more axles are classified as a “truck” or “heavy vehicle” (See Appendix, Table A-4). The percentage of heavy vehicle traffic on a roadway is important, as large vehicles have different operating characteristics than normal passenger vehicles. This information is also an important factor in the pavement design of a roadway.

5.1.4 Safety
The crash history of Southampton was used to estimate the safety conditions in the Town. Crash information was gathered based on information provided by the MassDOT. The table below summarizes the number of crashes for a period of three years (2007-2009). There were a total of 163 crashes in the Town of Southampton from 2007 to 2009. There was one fatal crash over this same time period. The total number of crashes decreases from 2007 to 2008. Most crashes involved a vehicle striking a fixed object such as a utility pole or tree. Most crashes occurred during clear weather conditions and dry roadway conditions. The severity of most crashes consisted of property damage only. Approximately one third of all crashes resulted in a personal injury. The section of College Highway between Pomeroy Meadow Road and Lynn Drive experienced the highest number of crashes in the town. This intersection experienced a total of 8 crashes from 2007 to 2009.
Table 5-1: Crash Data for Town of Southampton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Crashes</th>
<th>Route 10 Crashes</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Weather</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Angle</td>
<td>Fatal injury</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Head-on</td>
<td>Non-fatal injury</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Wet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rear-end</td>
<td>Property damage</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sideswipe</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sand, mud, dirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Single vehicle</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>Slush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Snow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Angle</td>
<td>Fatal injury</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Head-on</td>
<td>Non-fatal injury</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rear-end</td>
<td>Property damage</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sideswipe</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sand, mud, dirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Single vehicle</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>Slush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Snow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Angle</td>
<td>Fatal injury</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Head-on</td>
<td>Non-fatal injury</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rear-end</td>
<td>Property damage</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sideswipe</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sand, mud, dirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Single vehicle</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Slush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Snow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MassDOT

5.1.5 Pavement Management

Pavement inventory and distress data was collected via a windshield survey for all town accepted paved roadways in Southampton in the fall of 2011. The data were analyzed using the Cartegraph Pavement Management software. The Overall Condition Index (OCI) was derived to measure the serviceability of the road. The OCI ranges from 0 to 100 where an OCI value approaching 100 indicates excellent pavement conditions where no improvements are warranted and an OCI approaching zero indicates impassable pavement condition. Table 5-6 shows the pavement condition categories by roadway functional classification. Any roadway in good pavement condition may only require preventive maintenance treatments such as crack sealing. Any roadway in Fair pavement condition begins to require more substantial improvements such as resurfacing to improve the roadway. Any roadway in poor to failed pavement condition will likely require the complete reconstruction of the roadway. The overall condition indices for different segments of federal aid eligible roadways are summarized in Appendix 4 (too be included).
Table 5-2: Pavement Condition Categories by Functional Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good (69.5 to &lt;=89.5)</th>
<th>Fair (48.5 to &lt;=69.5)</th>
<th>Poor (25.5 to &lt;=48.5)</th>
<th>Failed (&lt;26.5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>&gt;89.5</td>
<td>&gt;69.5 to &lt;=89.5</td>
<td>&gt;48.5 to &lt;=69.5</td>
<td>&gt;25.5 to &lt;=48.5</td>
<td>&lt;26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>&gt;88.5</td>
<td>68.5 to &lt;=88.5</td>
<td>&gt;47.5 to &lt;=68.5</td>
<td>&gt;23.5 to &lt;=47.5</td>
<td>&lt;24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Through</td>
<td>&gt;87.5</td>
<td>&gt;67.5 to &lt;=87.5</td>
<td>&gt;46.5 to &lt;=67.5</td>
<td>&gt;23.5 to &lt;=66.5</td>
<td>&lt;23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Dead End</td>
<td>&gt;84.5</td>
<td>&gt;64.5 to &lt;=84.5</td>
<td>&gt;43.5 to &lt;=64.5</td>
<td>&gt;20.5 to &lt;=43.5</td>
<td>&lt;20.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5-1 displays the Town’s paved roadways by functional class. As seen and typical of any community, majority of the roadways are classified as “Residential Through.”

**Figure 5-1: Roadway Mileage by Functional Class**

![Roadway Mileage by Functional Class](image)

Figure 3 depicts the average pavement condition by functional class in Southampton. This figure shows that on average and regardless of functional classification, the roadways are in good condition. Figure 4 provides information on the number of miles of roadway by Functional Classification within each OCI category. As can be seen, majority of the town’s paved roadways are in fair to good condition.
Figure 5-2: Average OCI By Functional Class

Figure 5-3: Roadway Mileage by OCI and Functional Classification
5.1.7 Sidewalk Inventory
PVPC conducted an inventory of sidewalks for the entire Town of Southampton as part of the Master Plan process. The results of the complete sidewalk inventory show that the town possesses very few roads with sidewalks and there are few existing pedestrian connections in the town. The one exception is Pomeroy Meadow Road where the Town completed an extensive sidewalk project from College Highway to Glendale Road. This popular walking location is often crowded with young families and active adults and provides a strong statement in regard to community interest in walking. Table 9 shows the locations of existing sidewalks in the Town of Southampton.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Side</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Highway</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Highway</td>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>North of East Street to Town Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Street</td>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>East of College Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomeroy Meadow Ro</td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>North of College Highway to Glendale Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parc Place</td>
<td>Both Sides</td>
<td>North of College Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney Lane</td>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>West of Pomeroy Meadow Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin Lane</td>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>Connects Kylene Circle to Hillside Meadow Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kylene Circle</td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>East of Pomeroy Meadow Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES

Traffic along many roadways in Southampton is a mix of local and commuter traffic that is influenced by not only the development within the Town but also by growth and development in neighboring communities. The combination of increased vehicular volumes and higher speeds creates apprehension to bicycling or walking. The limitations in use of transit increased the necessity of passenger car trips. Despite these challenges, there are opportunities to foster a balanced and sustainable transportation system.

5.2.1 Expanding Transit Opportunities

Southampton currently has limited bus service. The Red Rock Plaza on College Highway is currently served by the Pioneer Valley Transit Authority’s (PVTA) Nashawannuck Express bus from neighboring Easthampton. The Franklin County Regional Transit Authority (FRTA) currently provides the town with paratransit (“dial-a-ride”) van service for seniors age 60+ Monday through Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM. The most recent paratransit ridership information from FRTA suggests there are about 50 people in Southampton who make a total of about 25 paratransit trips per week. Preliminary information from FRTA indicates that many of these trips are for medical appointments, many of which are in Springfield, and food shopping, with the Big Y at 10 College Highway (Route 10) cited as a frequent destination.

At the request of the Southampton Master Plan Committee PVPC has reviewed the concept of an expanding transit service on a route running between Northampton and Westfield via Route 10 through Southampton. Based on this assessment PVPC recommends the following:

- The development of any new fixed route bus service in Southampton should be carried out in coordination with the Franklin County Regional Transit Authority (FRTA), of which the town is a member. FRTA currently provides the town with a valuable service for seniors and is capable of providing fixed route service.

- Coordination with the cities of Westfield, Easthampton and Northampton, would also be necessary, as all communities through which fixed bus routes pass are assessed proportionally based on mileage within the municipality. Therefore, these three cities would also be assessed proportionally additional amounts for this new service if it were provided by the PVTA, as they are already PVTA members.

- Request a Transit Route Demand Assessment to understand whether sufficient demand exists or could be developed for a new bus route through Southampton. One likely source of future demand would be connections that a new route could offer with existing transit lines: seven PVTA routes in Northampton; one FRTA route in Northampton; two PVTA routes in Easthampton; and two PVTA routes in Westfield. Transit access to the city centers of these communities would also likely generate new trips.

- Develop a feasibility study in coordination with PVPC, PVTA and FRTA to identify a scope, cost and funding source for the new fixed route service. The study would identify the most suitable regional transit authority to provide the service, as well as the administrative and legislative processes involved. Paratransit service requirements under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and impacts to existing FRTA dial-a-ride van service would also be considered along with capital and operating costs.
5.2.2 Enhancing the Walking Environment

A “Walking Survey” was conducted for the Southampton Master Plan to provide public feedback. A total 76 residents participated in the survey providing valuable input on their experiences traveling by foot in Southampton. In addition to the survey PVPC consulted the Council on Aging, Police Department, School Officials, Department of Public Works, and Cultural Committee, and met with members of the Southampton Master Plan Committee. The information provided by this outreach was instrumental in defining the goals and strategies outlined in this report.

Some of the key findings from the survey related to the walking environment include:

- 44% of walk daily or at least 4-5 times a week.
- Fitness and health are the primary motivation for 90% of residents that walk.
- 85% did not feel comfortable walking on the section of College Highway south of Fomer Road. Other sections of College Highway were not any more favorable for walking.
- Pomeroy Meadow Road (has sidewalk), High Street, and Fomer Road were listed as the best roads for walking.
- Town Hall, Southampton Post Office, the Library, Norris Elementary, and Conant Memorial Park were identified as the most popular destinations although a large number of other destinations were mentioned.
- Some of the locations that people wanted to walk to but couldn’t include; Mahan Rail Trail on Coleman Road, Sheldon’s Ice Cream, the commercial area near Cumberland Farms, Opa Opa and Big-Y.
- The three largest deterrents to walking to these locations were; speed and volume of traffic, lack of sidewalks, or no roadway shoulder.
- 80% of those surveyed said they would walk more frequently if more sidewalks existed.

Based on the information received during the public outreach effort and field surveys of roads, a proposed sidewalk network was identified. This sidewalk segments are grouped into three categories based on a projected timeline and feasibility of implementation. Short term projects are capable of being completed in one to five years, medium term projects are six to ten years, and long term projects fall into a 10-to 15-year category.
Construction costs for the proposed sidewalks are not identified. Costs vary greatly depending on whether or not the sidewalk is included as part of reconstructing a roadway or if the sidewalk is being built as an independent addition to an existing roadway. Items such as grading, utility relocation, culverts and pipes, curb work, tree removal, and right-of-way acquisitions can affect project costs significantly. Including as part of a larger road construction project can be as low a $15 per linear foot while the cost of constructing a new sidewalk along an existing road can cost $70 to $120 per linear foot. While typically it is recommended to have sidewalks on both sides of major streets in certain circumstances, putting sidewalks on one side can be a significant cost saving measure. This decision can vary based on the level of pedestrian traffic, vehicular traffic, and land-uses along the roadway.
5.2.3 Southampton Walking Loops
In an effort to promote walking the Master Plan Committee worked with PVPC to identity a series of walking loops that would be attractive to residents with a wide range of walking ability. Three walking loops have been identified and preliminary maps of the routes for these walks are included as Appendix 4. The routes all include sections of roadway with sidewalks, roadways with adequate shoulders and segments scenic low volume roads. An effort was made to include loops that could be used year round and with a moderate level of ability.

Figure 5-5: Sidewalk on Pomeroy Meadow Road in Southampton

5.2.4 Safe Routes to School
The William E Norris Elementary School (Norris Elementary) in Southampton is a partner school enrolled in the Massachusetts Safe Routes to Schools Program (SRTS). This federal program is managed in Massachusetts through MassRIDES, a statewide travel options program. Total funding appropriated in Massachusetts since 2005 is around $13 million, with $3.8 million granted in FY11. As a SRTS participant Norris Elementary has completed a “Safe Routes to School Assessment” with the services of a paid consultant and is qualified to receive SRTS funding. At the time of this study, Principal Collins reported that Southampton is currently “in the queue” awaiting further notice from the SRTS.

While a copy of the draft recommendation for Norris Elementary was not available, the Town Engineer and School Officials reported to PVPC that they envision SRTS funding being used to expand and improve sidewalks in the vicinity of Norris Elementary and address midblock crossing issues on College Highway. Other specific design solutions that the school is interested in exploring include constructing a loop for drop-off and pick-up times and the possibility of turning Gunn Road into a one-way roadway during dismissal times, during which traffic congestion tends to increase dramatically.

Currently, every child enrolled at Norris Elementary is offered a seat on a public school bus. Only 4 students of 500 currently walk to school. There are few incentives for students to walk – “Even
if you can see the school from your home, you can still ride the bus.” With a significant number of students living in close proximity to Norris Elementary, it may be possible to eliminate the need for an entire school bus, given a favorable pedestrian environment. The annual maintenance and operation cost associated with one school bus would save roughly $20,000.

5.2.5 Address Access Management Issues
Access management consists of land use control measures and design standards to limit access points on high volume roadways. It improves traffic flow and safety through well defined access points that balance the movement of traffic over the length of the corridor. Proper spacing between access points along the corridor is also critical to minimizing vehicle conflict points. There are several locations in Southampton that could benefit from improvements to existing access driveways. The town should work with property owners to improve the definition of existing driveways. Long, undefined curb cuts should be defined with curbing to clearly identify the entrance and exit points from the parcel. Land uses with more than one driveway should have all driveways clearly marked. When practical, consideration should be given to limit turns to right turn in/right turn out only when there is a high potential for conflict.

5.2.6 Trip Generation
The local transportation system is partially driven by the various land uses in the community. Land use size and type has a direct impact on the number of trips it can be expected to generate over the course of an average weekday. Trip Generation is a publication developed by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). This manual estimates the number of trips that could be generated by a variety of land uses based on information collected at similar facilities across the country. ‘Trip Generation’ is routinely updated to incorporate new land uses and data. As a result, it is important to use the most recent version to estimate the potential traffic impact of a proposed new development. Table 6 presents an estimate of number of the trips that could be generated by a variety of land uses at different concentrations of development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>ITE Code</th>
<th>10,000 SF</th>
<th>20,000 SF</th>
<th>50,000 SF</th>
<th>100,000 SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini Warehousing</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/Fitness Club</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>659</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Office</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>1,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Center</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>2,147</td>
<td>4,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supermarket</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>1,022</td>
<td>2,045</td>
<td>5,112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy with Drive Thru</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>882</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive In Bank (3,000 SF)</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>739</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast Food with Drive Thru (3,000 SF)</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>1,488</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Station with Market</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>162.78 trips per pump</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Home</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>9.57 trips per unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Adult Housing (Detached)</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>3.71 trips per unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Trip Generation, 7th Edition, ITE
5.2.7 Improving Conditions for Bicycling
The Pioneer Valley Planning Commission completed a cursory evaluation of conditions for bicycling on the roadways in Southampton. The roadway characteristics that primarily impact the operation of bicyclists include lane width, vehicle speed and volume, the percentage of trucks, frequency of curb cuts and intersections, roadway geometry as it related to lines of sight, pavement condition, and parking turnover. Southampton roadways are generally favorable to experienced cyclist because of the gentle terrain, scenic views and low traffic volume. The vehicle speeds on portions of College Highway, narrow shoulders (primarily on College Highway) and poor lines of sight were the primary concerns expressed by cyclists interviewed. Several streets including High Street, County Line Road, and sections of College Highway, Russellville Road, Pomeroy Meadow Road, and Cold Spring Road have been identified by experienced cyclists as regionally significant cycling routes.

College Highway provides an example of a roadway that would attract more cyclists and even provide a regional bicycling connection if issues of site line, vehicle speeds, and consistent shoulder width were addressed.

5.2.8 Regional Bikepath and Multi-use Trail Connections
Southampton is strategically positioned to take advantage of a growing regional network of bikeway and multi-use trails. In 2012 the MassDOT will complete construction of the Manhan Rail Trail from Northampton and Easthampton ending at Coleman Road in Southampton. Addition off-road and on-road connections to the regional bikeway network are in place (or being developed) in Westfield and Southwick with inter-state connections along the New Haven to Northampton Canal Line Trail and the Farmington Canal Heritage Greenway. The Southampton Greenway corridor has been identified as a component of the Massachusetts Baystate Greenway and as such is eligible for special consideration in some federal aid programs should funding become available.
The Town Southampton recently completed a feasibility study and a certified appraisal for the Southampton Greenway. The feasibility study for the “Southampton Greenway” was completed by PAR engineering in 2011 and provides a detail analysis of the opportunities and challenges that the rail corridor provides. The feasibility study outlined a range of costs and design considerations including access to the corridor, potential wetland resource areas in the vicinity of the corridor, and long term maintenance costs. While several significant hurdles were identified in the study the report found no overwhelming obstacles. The study outlined a number of significant benefits to that trail could provide to residents of Southampton including the access to open space, opportunities for recreation and a safe place to walk.

Southampton Section of the Manhan Rail Trail to Coleman Road

5.2.9 Complete Streets

The Town of Southampton currently does not have an adopted “Complete Street” policy. Complete Streets is an effective tool for viewing transportation infrastructure needs from the larger perspective of all modes. Complete Streets considers the needs of residents of all ages and abilities to travel to work, to school, to the grocery store, and to visit family by mode of choice. In contrast, an “incomplete street” is designed with only cars in mind, limiting transportation choices by making walking and bicycling inconvenient, unattractive, and even dangerous. Communities that follow the principals of “Complete Streets” typically benefit from the following:

- Communities with Complete Streets are healthier. Forty three percent (43%) of people with safe places to walk within 10 minutes of their home meet recommended activity levels compared with twenty seven percent (27%) of individuals without a safe place to walk.
- Communities with Complete Streets spend less on transportation. Nationally households spent and average of 18 cents of every dollar on transportation. When
residents have the opportunity to walk, bike, or take transit, they have more control over their expenses by replacing car trips with these inexpensive options.

- Communities with Complete Streets are strong, livable communities. Safe walking and bicycling environments are an essential part of creating friendly, walkable communities. People who live in walkable communities are more likely to be engaged socially, engaged civically, and happier.

A good first step in embracing the “complete streets” philosophy is to adopt a “complete streets policy.” The policy development process defines priorities and establishes a new ideal for how streets should operate. Residents and Town officials can benefit from training on how to balance the needs of all users, and develop and implement an effective policy. Training on “Complete Streets” is available through a number of resources including the Baystate Roads Technology Transfer Program based at UMass Amherst.

5.2.10 Increase Compliance with Speed Limits

Town officials and residents of Southampton that participated in the public engagement phase of the master plan, expressed concerns regarding excessive travel speeds along several roadways. Participants in the “Southampton Walking Survey” frequently indentified “speeding vehicles” as the principle deterrent to walking. Statistics exist to support this concern as speed is a major factor in pedestrian fatalities. A pedestrian hit by a vehicle traveling 45 miles per hour has an 85% likelihood of being killed. At 30 mph it is 40%; at 20 mph it is 5%. Of major concern in Southampton is College Highway. College Highway was singled out by residents in the “Walking Survey” as one of the most unsafe for pedestrians with “speeding vehicles” listed as a the primary deterrent on sections of the roadway with no sidewalk. Even roadway segments with a wide paved shoulder were not perceived as safe by the majority of those responding to the survey. Traffic speed data that PVPC collected for this report may justify these concerns. College Highway report average travel speeds in excess of the posted speed limit at several key pedestrian locations including; College Highway southbound approaching at East Street (approaching the crosswalk), College Highway northbound approaching Pomeroy Meadow (near Norris Elementary School), and College Highway northbound approaching Fomer Road (at Conant Park). Each of these locations is of critical concern with respect to pedestrians.

5.2.11 Opportunities for Park and Ride Lots

There are currently no formally designated Park and Ride facilities in Southampton. Park and Ride lots provide opportunities for commuters to carpool and reduce single occupant vehicle travel. The Town should explore opportunities with the owners of underutilized parking areas and work on the development of a mutual agreement to allow public parking. All park and ride lots should be well signed to encourage ride sharing and to reduce the traffic volume and congestion on local roadways.
5.2.12 Anticipate and Plan for the Needs of Seniors and the Mobility Impaired

Longer life expectancy is rapidly expanding the number of residents over the age of 60 in Southampton. The population is age 60 years old or older in is over 21 percent and has doubled in size since 1990. The transportation challenges of an aging population are unique in several ways. Older residents are more likely to spend significant portions of their lives without the ability to drive, or access to a car, or to live alone. Exercise and mobility are important factors in everyone’s health and especially critical as we age.

These mobility challenges for seniors will need to be addressed with greater resources in the years to come. More residents seek housing “in town” locations to benefit from the close proximity to grocery stores, libraries, health care and social connections. The demand for wheelchair equipped vans and other Para transit services provided by FRTA and the Council on Aging will grow. Safe walking routes and opportunities for positive social engagement will be an important factor in the quality of life for a significant cross section of this older population.

5.2.13 Practice Sustainable Roadway Maintenance

The Southampton Department of Public Works (SDPW) also utilizes the principles of pavement management for all roadways by seeking assistance from the PVPC staff. The PVPC staff is currently preparing a draft Pavement Management report for the town in cooperation with the SDPW. The report will provide a tool to the Town for prioritizing the roadway improvement projects and allocating the available pavement management funds. The Town of Southampton should continue to seek further opportunities that can advance its pavement management program and update the pavement condition inventory on a regular basis in order to achieve the goals of an efficient pavement management system.
5.3 GOALS AND STRATEGIES

Goal 5-1: Utilize the principles of access management to control entrance and egress points for land uses on priority roadways.

**Strategy 5-1A:** Plan for the impact of future growth along the Route 10 corridor by developing an access management plan in cooperation with MassDOT District 2, the Southampton Highway Department, local emergency responders, and other appropriate local agencies.

*Type: Non Regulatory*
*Responsible Party: Southampton Planning Board, Southampton Highway Department, MassDOT*
*Resources Needed: Sample Access Management Plans, Local Review Committee*
*Target Date for Completion: Ongoing*

**Strategy 5-1B:** Work with MassDOT District 2 and property owners to request easements for exclusive turn lanes and shoulders, where appropriate, for driveways and entrances to new and existing developments along the Route 10 corridor.

*Type: Regulatory*
*Responsible Party: MassDOT, Southampton Planning Board, Southampton Highway Department*
*Resources Needed: Appropriate funding*
*Target Date for Completion: Ongoing*

**Strategy 5-2C:** Conduct reviews of local bylaws to ensure that appropriate regulations are in place to require site plan review and traffic impact studies for future development. This would identify land uses and traffic volume levels that would require a Traffic Impact Study as well as establish thresholds for peer review.

*Type: Regulatory*
*Responsible Party: Southampton Planning Board, Conservation Commission, Southampton Highway Department, Southampton Fire Department, Southampton Police Department*
*Resources Needed: Sample Bylaw*
*Target Date for Completion: Mid-Term*
Goal 5-2: Increase pedestrian safety and access.

**Strategy 5-2A:** Work with MassDOT District 2 and the Safe Routes to School Program to incorporate sidewalks in the vicinity of Norris Elementary School including the Route 10 corridor as proposed in the Safe Routes to School Plan. It will also be important to identify opportunities to improve midblock pedestrian crossing locations in the vicinity of Pomeroy Meadow Road.

*Type:* Regulatory  
*Responsible Party:* MassDOT, Southampton Highway Department, Southampton Planning Board, School Committee  
*Resources Needed:* Appropriate Funding  
*Target Date for Completion:* Short-Term

**Strategy 5-2B:** Develop a plan to construct a comprehensive sidewalk system that connects residential, commercial, agricultural, institutional, and recreational areas.

*Type:* Non Regulatory  
*Responsible Party:* Southampton Highway Department, Southampton Planning Board, Conservation Commission, Southampton Agricultural Commission, Southampton Parks Commission, MassDOT  
*Resources Needed:* Appropriate Funding  
*Target Date for Completion:* Long-Term

**Strategy 5-2C:** Incorporate “Complete Streets” elements in local roadway projects to encourage a multimodal transportation system.

*Type:* Non Regulatory  
*Responsible Party:* Southampton Highway Department, Southampton Planning Board, Conservation Commission, Southampton Greenway Committee, Police Department, Southampton Fire Department, MassDOT  
*Resources Needed:* Appropriate funding and staff time  
*Target Date for Completion:* Long-Term
Goal 5-3: Develop a safe, interconnected bicycle network.

**Strategy 5-3A:** Work with MassDOT District 2 to incorporate consistent shoulder width along Route 10 corridor.

*Type:* Non Regulatory  
*Responsible Party:* Southampton Board of Selectmen, MassDOT, Southampton Planning Board, Southampton Highway Department, Southampton Greenway Committee, Southampton Conservation Commission  
*Resources Needed:* Federal Funding, local maintenance funds  
*Target Date for Completion:* Long-Term

**Strategy 5-3B:** Continue efforts to advance the Southampton Greenway multi-use trail along the rail corridor and work to preserve and enhance access to the corridor from neighborhoods and public rights of way.

*Type:* Non Regulatory  
*Responsible Party:* MassDOT, Southampton Highway Department, Southampton Planning Board, Southampton Greenway Committee  
*Resources Needed:* Appropriate Funding  
*Target Date for Completion:* Long-Term

**Strategy 5-3C:** Promote the installation of bicycle racks on all publicly owned properties. Encourage local business to also provide bicycle racks.

*Type:* Regulatory  
*Responsible Party:* Southampton Board of Selectmen, MassDOT, Southampton Conservation Commission, Southampton Greenway Committee, Southampton Planning Board, Southampton Highway Department, Southampton Chamber of Commerce, Town Clerk  
*Resources Needed:* Funding for Bicycle racks, staff time for installation  
*Target Date for Completion:* Ongoing
Goal 5-4: Pursue opportunities to expand transit service in Southampton.

**Strategy 5-4A:** Work with PVPC, the Pioneer Valley Transit Authority, and Franklin County Regional Transit Authority to identify a scope, cost and source of funding for a feasibility study that identifies the potential for expanded transit service (fixed route or flexible) to better serve the residents of Southampton.

*Type:* Non Regulatory  
*Responsible Party:* Southampton Board of Selectmen, PVTA, FRTA, PVPC, Council on Aging  
*Resources Needed:* Appropriate transit funding, staff time.  
*Target Date for Completion:* Ongoing

Goal 5-5: Reduce and mitigate traffic impacts on local streets.

**Strategy 5-5A:** Consider developing a local policy on traffic calming for roads that have higher travel speeds or volumes of “cut-through” traffic.

*Type:* Non Regulatory  
*Responsible Party:* Southampton Board of Selectmen, PVPC, Southampton Police Department, Southampton Fire Department  
*Resources Needed:* Appropriate transit funding, staff time.  
*Target Date for Completion:* Short-Term

**Strategy 5-5B:** Work with PVPC to develop a systematic process to monitor traffic counts and observe the change in traffic volume on regular basis to detail the true impacts of growth in the Town and in surrounding communities.

*Type:* Non Regulatory  
*Responsible Party:* Southampton Board of Selectmen, PVPC  
*Resources Needed:* Staff time, Request from Community  
*Target Date for Completion:* Ongoing

**Strategy 5-5C:** Identify parking area on municipally owned property for us as park and ride lots. Develop partnerships with property owners of underutilized parking areas to increase carpooling opportunities with park and ride lots along the Route 10 corridor.

*Type:* Non Regulatory  
*Responsible Party:* Southampton Board of Selectmen, PVPC, Property Owners  
*Resources Needed:* Sample Agreements, Appropriate Incentives for Property Owners  
*Target Date for Completion:* Ongoing
Goal 5-6: Maintain a safe, reliable and user friendly transportation system.

**Strategy 5-6A:** Continue to utilize a local pavement management system to determine pavement condition of all local and federal aid eligible roadways, to prioritize and initiate new projects and new cost effective repair measures to maintain the quality of the pavement and prevent further deterioration.

*Type: Non Regulatory*
*Responsible Party: Southampton Board of Selectmen, PVPC, Southampton Highway Department, Southampton Police Department*
*Resources Needed: Appropriate funding, staff time.*
*Target Date for Completion: Ongoing*

**Strategy 5-6B:** Develop a maintenance program that addresses the new minimum sign retro-reflectivity requirements as defined in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (2009 Edition and future update).

*Type: Non Regulatory*
*Responsible Party: Southampton Board of Selectmen, PVPC, MassDOT, Highway Department*
*Resources Needed: Sample Agreements, Appropriate Incentives for Property Owners*
*Target Date for Completion: Ongoing*

**Strategy 5-6C:** Maintain Roadside vegetation to ensure safety and visibility.

*Type: Non Regulatory*
*Responsible Party: Tree Warden, Southampton Board of Selectmen, PVPC, MassDOT, Southampton Highway Department, Police Department*
*Resources Needed: Appropriate funding, staff resources*
*Target Date for Completion: Ongoing*