



PUBLIC MEETING #3: Meeting Summary

Meeting Location and Time

Date and Time: Tuesday, November 29th at 5:30 PM – 7:30 PM

Location: Student Center, Eastern Connecticut State University, Willimantic, CT

Introduction and Presentation Overview

Anna Bergeron, the Project Manager for this project at CTDOT, welcomed meeting attendees and provided a brief overview of the project, including its background, purpose, and team. Anna asked attendees to introduce themselves before beginning the presentation. Anna then introduced Marcy Miller, the Consultant Team Project manager.

*The agenda and presentation for this meeting can be viewed at the following link: http://www.ctbikepedplan.org/meeting_materials.html

During the presentation, Marcy covered the following key ideas:

- Purpose of the Statewide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan and Map Update (2017 Plan Update)
- Statewide progress in bicycling and walking efforts since 2009
- Public outreach efforts for the 2017 Plan Update
- Updated vision, mission, goals, and action strategies
- Data collection for development of Draft Bicycle Network Map
- Methodology for development of Draft Bicycle Network Map
- Draft Bicycle Network Map
- Action strategies
- Next steps

Marcy stated that a key objective of this meeting is to gather feedback and input on both the Draft Bicycle Network and the action strategies for the 2017 Plan Update before opening up the meeting for questions and comments. The following bullets summarize the major points of discussion.

Discussion

Coordination between CTDOT, Regions, and Municipalities

Municipal and Regional Bike Networks

- An attendee from Columbia, asked if the state plan will include a “primer” for town leadership on how to get started on a local bike network. The attendee noted that a “how-to” section in getting buy-in from local residents and advocates, as well as a section with “best-practices” case studies for towns of different sizes would be helpful.

- CTDOT responded that next year the project team will be going to the regions to work with them to get buy in from the regions, towns, and elected officials there. CTDOT wants this to be a bottom-up process and wants to see these communities support the Plan, which will likely include examples that appropriate for urban, suburban, and rural communities.
- Another attendee suggested that CTDOT should begin these meetings with the Northeast and Northwest COGS, each of which are comprised of towns of that are relatively similar in character.

CTDOT VIP Repaving Program

- An attendee commented that they have noted the successes of the 11' repaving program, but that many roads' lane widths could still be reduced.
- Another attendee said that a simple fix for storm drains would be to have the longer opening span across the road to prevent bike tires from getting stuck.
 - CTDOT responded that this is currently the standard, and is included in the VIP program.

Community Connectivity

- An attendee from Bolton has noted that a proposal for a multi-use pathway along Route 44 has divided the town along issues relating to bicycle and pedestrian planning. She stated that there should be a mechanism in place to ensure that these routes aren't harmful to the communities that host them.
 - CTDOT responded that the Community Connectivity Program encourages communication between local officials and community members to work towards a shared vision for bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

[Draft Bicycle Network](#)

Strava Data and Other Source Data

- An attendee thanked the project team for the work thus far. He requested additional information on how the Strava data was used, He noted that Strava is limited because it only shows the routes cyclists ride today and does not include the desired routes.
 - Marcy responded that we are using the Strava as one tool among many, including suitability as well as input from members of the public during meetings such as this one.
- An attendee asked how the Preferred Local Alternatives were determined.
 - Marcy responded that these were selected with a variety of information, including suitability, Strava, and local knowledge.
- An attendee asked how many people had attended the other Public Meetings for the project and suggested that Strava be used as a communication tool to discuss ideas with other Strava users.
 - Ken responded that Public Meetings are one methods through which we are doing outreach for this project. Other methods include a project website where people can submit comments about the Plan or the Map, the development of newsletters, Steering Committee Meetings, as well as other stakeholder outreach.

“Missing Links”

- An attendee asked if CTDOT will be looking at adding bike facilities on state routes that are “limited-access” and where no reasonable alternative exists. The attendee noted Route 9 on the plan was highlighted as “Not Passable”. Will this mean that the state will look at including bike facilities on this section in the future?
 - CTDOT responded that these connections are being considered when possible, even if it goes beyond the project limits of an existing project. CTDOT also noted that the Intermodal Planning Office reviews designs at stages of completion (30%, 60%, and 90% completion) and that all staff members are working to integrate bicycle and pedestrian plans. Marcy also noted that unlike the suitability map that gave engineering an ‘out’ to not include bike facilities, this network plan will provide clarity.
- An attendee from the CT Bike/Ped Advisory Board reiterated the boards desire to focus on 1) critical links without adequate bike access (e.g. Rt. 187/189 connector, Rt. 2 pass in Glastonbury), 2) focus on the interconnectivity between transit (esp. fixed transit) and Bike/Ped facilities, and 3) should include a broad goal such as “X% of CT Residents should be within 20 minutes of a trail by the year 20XX”.

Recreational Routes on Bike Network

- An attendee asked if Bigelow Hollow or Mansfield Hollow would be included as a destination in the statewide bike network. The attendee noted that since recreation is a big part of cycling, there should be some significant recreational points-of-interests included as destinations. He also noted that in many parts of the state, there are more recreational riders than purpose-based riders, and they can’t be ignored as they are using the roads as well.
 - Marcy responded that the steering committee talked a lot about the recreational and tourism aspect, but many believed that these routes belonged on a different sort of network.

Routing of Recreational Trails

- An attendee asked what the process was for determining the routes of multi-use trails, and noted that she would like to see the East Coast Greenway routed on Main Street in Willimantic rather than behind the stores as is currently proposed. She noted that a Main Street facility would have greater impacts for tourism and have greater economic benefits.
 - Marcy noted that much of the decision making process for these trails lie with the stakeholder, East Coast Greenway in this case. CTDOT, the town, and ECG work together to determine the appropriate route of these trails.

[Bike Facilities and Design](#)

Signage

- An attendee said it would be helpful for bicyclists and motorists if warning signs appeared before an intersection with a steep downhill section of roadway where users of the roadway can pick up speed.
- An attendee asked why there are not 3 Foot Passing Law signs on state roads.

- The project team responded that it is not considered to be a legal sign by CTDOT as it is not included in the MUTCD manual

Bike Facilities

- An attendee asked if CTDOT and the project team are looking at other facilities besides shoulder width.
 - Marcy explained that the first step is to determine whether the routes that have been identified are the correct ones. The next step will be to determine what facilities will be appropriate for each segment by looking at each one in further detail. The facilities will be determined based on what is contextually appropriate and it is expected that many will include recommendations besides an adjustment to the shoulder width.