**Minutes of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board**

**February 17, 2011**

Connecticut DOT Headquarters

Newington, CT

*Attending*: Ray Rauth (Chair), Tom Gutman, Charlie Beristain, Rod Parlee, Jason Stockmann (Secretary), Richard Stowe, Deb Dauphinais, Tom Harned, Alan Sylvestre (Vice-chair), Neil Pade

*DOT personnel*: Kate Rattan (new Non-Motorized Transportation Coordinator), David Head, Colleen Kissane, Robbin Cabelus

1.0 **Preliminaries**

1.1 **Chairman’s remarks**

* We are losing people to other states because of the quality of life. Cycling and walking can improve the quality of life in Connecticut.
* We wrote a letter supporting the Vulnerable Users Law
* Ray feels good about the changes that have taken place in the last year, particularly within the DOT.
* *“When one tugs at a single thing in nature, one finds it attached to the rest of the world”* – John Muir (sic)
* Welcome Kate Rattan, the new Non-motorized Transportation Coordinator at the DOT
	+ Kate says the DOT is pushing non-motorized transportation and livability. She is excited to being her new task of helping to improve bicycle and pedestrian design in the state. She will be coordinating with DEP, with the regions, and with the bike and ped board.
	+ Colleen says that Tom Maziarz and the Commissioner have made this a priority. Kate will also work with Safe Routes to School. David Balzer will be focusing his efforts on commuter parking lots.
* **Motion** from the board to thank David Balzer for his service for over a decade to bicycle and pedestrian projects in Connecticut. We look forward to working together with him in the future in regards to commuter lots and other relevant projects. **Seconded**. Motion passes by acclamation.

1.2 Approval of the agenda. Motion. Seconded. Agenda approved.

1.3 Approval of the January minutes. Motion. Seconded. Minutes approved.

2.0 **Reports**

2.1 **Kate Rattan & David Head**

* Highway Design Manual is being updated. The public and the bike and ped board will be included. Next month the board will hear about what is in the manual presently, and what will be added. What process do designers presently go through?
	+ It is currently available online under “Publications”
	+ Will the STC veto any bicycle design features that aren’t in the Highway Design Manual? Answer is that the STC also consults the Federal MUTCD, which does include bike boxes and other design elements.
* Women’s Transportation Center gave an award to Fitzgerald & Halliday and the DOT for the Bicycle Map and Accident Reporting Website. The award will be presented April 27 in Hamden, Conn.

2.2 **Report on legislative matters** (Pam Sucato)

* No report.

3.0 **Goals & missions** (Deb)

* Goals statement combines what we think is important with what is required in the statute.
	+ We included four priority goals which are not at all exclusive with the statutory requirements, but rather complementary.
	+ One of the reasons to weigh in on individual projects is to find out if our input has an impact. This can then inform our future interventions.
	+ Whoever brings a new issue before the Board should do their homework and see how the issue relates to our four stated mission goals.
	+ But we are all volunteers, so we need to bear in mind that individual users care about specific issues and projects, and are willing to invest time into them
	+ ***Proposal***: include our goals in our minutes, agenda, and on our website. Jason will add them to our minutes, to our agenda, and to our website.
	+ We shouldn’t do specific site reviews, but we should *understand* how site reviews are done so that we can do a better job advising.
		- Ray and Tom Gutman did play a part in the re-design of the East Haven hazardous pedestrian crossing.
	+ Compare to Public Transportation Commission, of which Alan is a member. On occasion there is a project that is representative of a project that is considered by the Commission to represent good policy. But generally, the Commission works at the level of broad policy.
	+ **Motion** to approve the goals document. **Seconded**. **Motion approved**.

4.0 **Old** **Business**

4.1 **Meeting Times & Dates**

* There doesn’t appear to be a time that works for everyone. Let’s postpone the discussion until summer and continue meeting the third Thursday at 1:00 pm.

4.2 **Debriefing on 2nd Annual Report**

* We should include information on the Board members next year.
* Can we publish a few copies in print? We could apply for a grant to publish the report. It would be too complicated to funnel money through the DOT. Could we have our own EIN and bank account? Tom Gutman submits that running our own treasury would be too much work to justify its role in our Board’s activities. We should table the issue and assign someone to look into the topic. Tom Harned is willing to investigate.
	+ **Motion** to table. Topic tabled.

4.3 **Glastonbury Ferry**

* Ferry is heavily subsidized. The Rocky Hill Glastonbury is subsidized more than other ferry lines across the Connecticut River.

4.4 **CTB&PAB internal policies (social media)**

* Discussion postponed.

4.5 **Vulnerable Users Law, S.B. 720**

* We have already submitted an endorsement letter.
* Do we want to sign on to Ryan Lynch’s fact sheet.
	+ **Motion** to sign on to his fact sheet. We will ask Ryan Lynch to add the statistics on bicycle and pedestrian injuries. **Seconded**. **Motion passes**.
* Bills indemnifying municipalities from liability for injuries on public land. The MDC has been held liable in the past because they are essentially a municipality. Public hearing forthcoming. There are 13 bills circulating now; they will eventually get distilled down to one bill.
* Deb cites MDC land in her backyard that used to have lots of trails, but now has “No Trespassing” signs everywhere, ostensibly because of frivolous litigation.
	+ **Motion** for the Board to support all 13 municipal liability bills. **Seconded**. Charlie will prepare a letter for the Board’s approval electronically. **Motion** passes.

4.6 **Review of Complete Streets Law**

* Reporting on bicycle and pedestrian improvements throughout the state, in compliance with the 1% requirement of all transportation spending. What is considered a bike or ped improvement, versus landscaping, transit, etc.?
	+ David Head says that there are a lot of projects that are missed in the reporting, i.e., new sidewalks, pedestrian signalization improvements, etc. This is where the municipalities can help with reporting improvements. Is there a standard that municipalities can use for reporting?
	+ Should we have an addendum to our annual report with the municipal reporting, mentioning if a municipality has refused to report or refused to implement design measures in compliance with the Complete Streets Law. Danbury in particular gave an excuse for not spending 1% on bike and ped improvements because it didn’t fit in with their city plan, and there was a weasel clause in the Complete Streets Bill that seemed to permit this.
		- Danbury was repaving a street, and David Bonan requested that the city stripe it at 11’ instead of 12’ so that cyclists would have more space in the shoulder. The city responded saying that the community chose not to conform to the Complete Streets Law.
	+ Could we amend the Complete Streets Law to strengthen its language? Remove the weasel clause that seems to exempt municipalities from spending the 1% if it doesn’t conform to their city plan.
	+ **ACTION ITEM** to start a Google Doc letter asking the Legislative Transportation Committee to remove the weasel clause from the Complete Streets Bill, citing the Danbury refusal to spend their 1% transportation funding and to adhere to the spirit of the Complete Streets Law. Jason will start Google Doc letter. Dave Bonan may have info on the Danbury opt-out rationale.

4.7 **Bike Map/Trouble Reporting System**

* No discussion.

5.0 **New** **Business**

5.1 **Update** **on** **Route** **34** **Boulevardization** **& Tomlinson Bridge**

5.2 **State** **Traffic** **Commission**

* Tom Harned is filing a letter stating his potential conflict of interest as an employee of a transportation planning firm, and Board recommendations could impact the way the STC approves projects and imposes design processes. He has consulted an attorney, and since he does not have an ownership stake in the planning firm, it appears that he can continue his service to the Board.
	+ **Motion** to include Tom’s letter in the minutes. **Seconded**.

5.3 **US Bike Route 1 / East Coast Greenway**

* No discussion.

6.0 **Next agenda, meeting time, etc**.

Tom Harley’s designee will be here at 1:00 pm sharp for a report. Please arrive on time!

*Meeting time*: Thursday, March 17, 1:00-3:00 pm, DOT HQ