



CT Statewide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Update Steering Committee Meeting #2

June 17, 2008

*10:00 AM – 12:00 PM
Greater Hartford Transit District*

Attendees:

Sandy Fry – Capitol Region Council of Governments
Mark Paquette – Windham Region Council of Governments
Dan McGuinness – Northwestern Connecticut Council of Governments
Robert Haramut – Midstate Regional Planning Agency
Mark Nielson – Greater Bridgeport Regional Planning Agency
Dick Guggenheim – Southeastern Council of Governments
Chris Squires – Connecticut Bicycle Coalition
Ray Rauth – Sound Cyclists Bicycle Club
Eric Weis – East Coast Greenway Alliance
Sam Gold – Council of Governments of the Central Naugatuck Valley
Joe Perrelli - Council of Governments of the Central Naugatuck Valley
Bill O'Neill – East Coast Greenway
Alex Karman – South Western Regional Planning Agency
Mary McCarthy – Uconn – Connecticut Transportation Institute
David Balzer – Connecticut Department of Transportation (ConnDOT)
Sharon Okoye – ConnDOT
David Fabry – ConnDOT Traffic
Ken Livingston – Fitzgerald & Halliday, Inc. (FHI)
Marcy Miller – FHI
Owen McGaughey - FHI
Keith Beaver – Didona Associates

Meeting Summary:

Welcome / Introductions

Ken Livingston, of FHI, welcomed everyone and each participant then introduced him or herself.

Work Update

Ken distributed the first project newsletter and stated that an email distribution would be sent later in the day. He stated that those requesting a mailed, hard copy newsletter can receive one. The feedback on the look and content of the newsletter was positive.

Marcy Miller, of FHI, next provided a summary of the existing planning documents. She provided summary information of statewide planning, regional planning agency, and special interest planning resources. The purpose of the memo is to not only summarize the documents, but also begin to consider how this information should be rolled into the Plan Update. She explained that Chapter 5 of the existing plan summarizes the existing bicycle and pedestrian planning efforts of each of the 15 regional planning agencies. There has been some critique of this detailed chapter. She asked the group to comment on whether their region's information is accurate, and if the information and format is useful to potentially be used in the Plan.

Many were in agreement that Chapter 5 in the 1999 Plan is not particularly useful. Sandy Fry stated that she would like to see a statewide effort to identify facilities (existing and/or future) that are of statewide significance in each region. She suggested that this list obviously be less detailed than the regional lists. Others agreed with this.

Ken next provided a summary of outreach activities. He stated that Marcy, Ken, and possibly Keith Beaver, Didona Associates, will be meeting with each of the RPAs in June and July. In addition, he stated that the study team planned to meet with key stakeholder groups. It was suggested that CT Greenways Council and CT Bicycle Coalition should be including in these meetings.

Ken proposed eight different public meeting locations. He proposed holding the four meetings in September at different locations than the four meeting held in Spring 2009. There was a suggestion to replace the New Milford meeting location with one in Torrington. Mary McCarthy suggested UConn-Torrington as this location. Dick Guggenheim suggested Groton instead of the Norwich location. There was a suggestion to contact the Chambers of Commerce, Heritage Areas, and Green Valley Institute to notify them of the meeting. Alex Karman asked about the format of the public meeting. Ken stated that the meetings will be in an open house format, followed by a formal presentation.

Mark Neilson asked if the issue of funding was going to be addressed in the Plan Update as he had a number of comments related to this topic. Ken said bicycle and pedestrian funding was a component to be included in the Plan. This component has not begun to be developed yet but will be a topic for discussion at a forthcoming SC meeting.

The next item discussed was crash data. Ken stated that the format of the data was not conducive to GIS applications. He questioned how the data should be used and if it made sense to simply have a general discussion with summary tables. Mark Neilson stated that he had reviewed this data as well and that it did not show high crash locations in his region. There was additional discussion as to how to discuss crash and safety in the Plan Update. Many of the problems related to tracking bicycle and pedestrian crashes were raised, including such issues as bicycling while under the influence of drugs or alcohol and the number of pedestrians that dart out into traffic unbeknownst to a motorist. There was a suggestion to discuss common types of bicyclist and pedestrian crashes and countermeasures to those problems.

Benchmarking Review

Ken stated that the team hoped to have a more detailed report to provide to the Steering Committee at today's meeting. However, few questionnaires have been returned and phone discussions with each of the states have been planned for next week. A detailed summary of the benchmarking analysis will be provided prior to the next Steering Committee meeting.

Mapping Working Group Meeting #1

Ken asked Mark Paquette to provide a brief summary the June 10th discussion of the Bicycle Map Subcommittee. Mark described the bicycle facilities ranking system that was recommended, as well as some of the other base layers that were recommend for inclusion. Other suggestions for the map included:

- Sam Gold suggested that a more detailed map (than the statewide level) should be produced. Ken said that the creation of a second map layout was under consideration.
- There was a suggestion to review the Center for Land Use Education and Research maps.
- The question of sponsorships for map publication was raised, and Ken stated that this is still being evaluated.

Vision and Goal Development

Ken distributed a revised vision and goals based on the working group sessions of the first Steering Committee meeting. The group was satisfied with the revised vision; however, Park & Ride locations should be included in the second paragraph. The most prevalent comment related to the goals is that the language should be more proactive and less weak. There were a number of goals that use the word "support" that could be much more effective without that language. Other comments on the goals and objectives include:

- The objectives under Goal 3 should be more general, therefore, more inclusive of other programs.
- Goal 3 should be reworded so that it is clear that it is an educational goal.
- There should be an additional objective under Goal 3 stating, "Amend STC process to include bicycle / pedestrian access/egress and bicycle storage." This could be included under Goal 3 or Goal 1.
- There was a request that FHI distribute goals and objectives from a few other state plans for comparison.