

Complete Streets Plan Comment Log

Commenter	Date	Comment	Action
Sandy Fry	4/15/2020	Page 9 and 43 discuss 0 car ownership households. The figures you have for Hartford are wrong. You say 17% zero car ownership, 2015 ACS shows 30.3%. 2016 shows 32.6%. I have never seen a figure of 17% for the City, it has always been 30 to 33%. This should be corrected. I think at one point later in the document it discusses a household survey, if that is where the 0 car ownership number came from it should not be considered valid when it differs so drastically from the census numbers.	This was an error and will be corrected CRCOG felt that percentages would be misleading in these cases. 100% of a low-population area is still a low number. We figured the number of households figure would show the magnitude of need better and better place it into context.
Sandy Fry	4/15/2020	Page 23, map of 0 car households – it seems odd that the map shows # of households and not %. % would be more meaningful.	Detailed town-by-town maps have been uploaded to the website to make reviewing the network easier.
Sandy Fry	4/15/2020	Page 28, I was unable to really review the network map to see if it matches City thinking. It was too small. Assuming that you have included all the comments that I gave you over time!	
Sandy Fry	4/15/2020	Page 29, trail map – the depiction of the East Coast greenway is confusing. It would be helpful to distinguish the trail sections from the interim on road route. Otherwise it looks like the trail is already complete.	Will revise
Sandy Fry	4/15/2020	Page 29 trail map – the unfinished segments shown are all part of the East Coast Greenway. There are many other trails that are being planned or that are funded, that are not depicted. If you intend only to show the ECG, as the priority trail in the region, make that clear in the labelling of the map.	Will note that the map is not exhaustive
Sandy Fry	4/15/2020	Page 31, discussion of the regional shelter program – this misses the mark. I may be the only one who remembers the sordid history! The shelter program collapsed for these reasons – it was developed on the basis that Ctransit or CTDOT would take over shelter maintenance if the towns participated in the program and allowed advertising. As the project moved to that implementation, CTDOT found that advertising revenue would not be equal to the investment needed to maintain the shelters so decided not to take over maintenance and no agreement for a different relationship between the towns and DOT/Ctransit has been developed.	There were many reasons that the bus shelter program did not work out, we focused on the advertising issue as that is a very common mechanism of funding.
Sandy Fry	4/15/2020	Page 32, you say that maintenance is primarily an education issue, the challenge is to let staff know how to do it. I think this is unfair and that the cost of maintenance should be addressed. That is a large problem here in Hartford	Will revise and add a note to that effect.
Sandy Fry	4/15/2020	Page 34 – discussion of bicycle education program – when CRCOG developed the program it was with the intention all along to hand off the program to BWCT and for them to carry it forward, which has happened. Take credit for it! BWCT’s curriculum (and the South Windsor curriculum) was developed from that CRCOG effort that was funded with National Highway safety Administration funding.	Thank you. We will.
Tony Cherolis	4/15/2020	Traffic Calming – I noticed that the term “traffic calming” wasn’t used in the plan.	Will include a brief discussion
Tony Cherolis	4/15/2020	Funding – In Hartford and many CRCOG towns, we don’t have Complete Streets because the funds aren’t there. Hundreds of millions for interstate projects, but we don’t have \$20 million for a bike route network in Hartford. Here are some funding concepts that you may want to mention, since they have a direct impact on VMT, mode choice, and active transportation (Complete Streets) infrastructure. o The Transportation and Climate Initiative – Multi-state process that the State of CT is participating in to reduce greenhouse gas emissions with a cap-and-invest approach. Enabling legislation is expected in 2021. The revenues from this program would be specifically invested in ways that would reduce greenhouse gas emissions, which would include Complete Streets infrastructure projects. o A registration and licensing fee on surface parking lots in Hartford’s downtown district - Transport Hartford, along with several city councilors is proposing this to regionalize infrastructure maintenance funds that could then be used on much needed infrastructure and improvements in the state’s Capital City. The city have for several years been operating on an austerity budget, and these local infrastructure funds would help implement the city’s 2035 Plan of Conservation and Development and the 2019 Bicycle Master Plan.	Will add a discussion of the need for further funding programs
Tony Cherolis	4/15/2020	The 2018 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Target – 45% by 2030 greenhouse gas reduction target and the ongoing efforts of the Governor’s Council on Climate Change. o You could mention in this plan that increasing active transportation and reducing VMT is an important enabler of reaching the state’s mandated 2030 greenhouse gas emissions reduction goals	Will address in the plan It is still too early to tell what sort of lasting impacts COVID will have. It would probably be worth addressing in a future revision or in the MTP.
Tony Cherolis	4/15/2020	COVID-19 and Telecommuting – It might be helpful to note in this plan that post-COVID, there will be much more telecommuting, which will reduce single occupancy vehicle trips and perhaps open up more opportunities for road diets and Complete Streets infrastructure.	Will fix
Tony Cherolis	4/15/2020	Pg 4, typo – “asked to hae a representative” Pg 6 & 7, This plan needs an equity and environmental justice statement up front when setting the tone – “It also recognizes that the trend over the past 100 years has been to prioritize the automobile, to the detriment of other users, this plan seeks to reverse that trend.”	Will address in the introduction.

Complete Streets Plan Comment Log

Tony Cherolis	4/15/2020	Pg 9 – Trends, Include Hartford’s low car ownership rates - This section should mention that seven neighborhoods in Hartford have zero-car ownership rates over 40% and that 32% of Hartford households don’t have a car. This must be a strong driver in prioritizing where Complete Streets investments will have the most impact, including addressing historic, ill-fitting car-centric infrastructure and resultant disproportionate health impacts	This is addressed in the discussion.
Tony Cherolis	4/15/2020	Pg 10, Highlight Inequity of Gaps in Hartford – It would be important to mention that cross city trail gaps in East Hartford and Hartford need to be of highlighted further due to the low car-ownership rate and low-income communities that would benefit from these non-car safe routes. The persistence of these gaps is an environmental and social justice concern, especially considering how well the progress has been going on suburban and rural recreational trails.	Will address.
Tony Cherolis	4/15/2020	Pg 10, P&W Blocking the ECG - I would also recommend mentioning that the East Hartford multi-use trail’s prior preferred route along Willow Street or Willow Brook has been blocked by Pratt & Whitney. When a company that received a \$500 million tax break is working against a regional transportation plan that would benefit their employees and the adjacent community, we shouldn’t be shy about putting that in writing. Pratt & Whitney’s obstruction put that trail gap completion back another 15 years, if not longer.	An alternative route is being explored.
Tony Cherolis	4/15/2020	Pg 10 – Walk friendly Harford? – The same year (2018) that Hartford received a surprising Silver Walk Friendly recognition, we experienced 9 pedestrian fatalities on city streets. With millions of dollars in ADA consent decree backlog, Park Street sidewalks in a Latino community that look like moon craters, and fatal crash numbers like that, one must wonder what the criteria were for the award?	No action.
Tony Cherolis	4/15/2020	Pg 11 / 12 – Bikeshare – While we figure out bike share, the BiCi Co. Community Bike Shop already offers short term and long term bike rentals, low cost up-cycled bicycles for purchase, and the “Bikes for Jobs” program. For many low income and zero-car households, bike share (docked or undocked) will not be a convenient or useful daily transportation solution.	The plan is not meant to be an exhaustive list of initiatives
Tony Cherolis	4/15/2020	Pg 14 – “...seek a representative, perhaps a public health official, to sit on the CRCOG transportation committee.” o Did this happen? Is there someone with a regional and urban public health expertise sitting on the CRCOG transportation committee? --- This is an important point of view for that committee. The transportation committee has more influence and priority setting ability than the bike-ped committee. o Who is on the CRCOG transportation committee representing equity and environmental justice issues? How was that person identified and appointed?	Regarding public health, this has not happened yet, but someone does serve on the Bike/Ped committee. CRCOG does have a representative from the CT Coalition for Environmental Justice.
Tony Cherolis	4/15/2020	Pg 17 – Walk Audits – Transport Hartford has organized and facilitated many walk and bike audits in Hartford and surrounding towns. We would love to collaborate with CRCOG on multidisciplinary walk audits around CTfastrak stations. o 2018 Walk Audits - http://www.ctprf.org/wpcontent/uploads/2018/11/2018_walk_audit_list_and_links.pdf o 2019 Walk Audits - http://www.ctprf.org/wpcontent/uploads/2019/06/06_21_2019_charter_oak_landing_coltsville_audit_summary.pdf (slide 20) - There are a few more audits that aren’t yet in that list, but I still need to update the summary sheet.	This is a great idea that we will coordinate on.
Tony Cherolis	4/15/2020	Pg 18 – “The state has also incorporated complete streets into their operations to a much greater degree than in 2008.” ☹ Really? (followed by a series of examples of anti-complete streets actions)	While CTDOT has made some mistakes, they have also funded a much greater number and variety of complete streets projects in the recent past.
Tony Cherolis	4/15/2020	Pg 20 – “Work with CTDOT to develop a process for ensuring that complete streets infrastructure is included in state-controlled projects” o It would be helpful if CT DOT attended the Hartford Complete Streets meeting (chaired by Sandy Fry) at least once a quarter to discuss projects that were being designed by or planned by CT DOT. When CT DOT had someone regularly attending meetings in 2015 and 2016, communications were improved. o Hartford is where Complete Streets design is most critical, and this meeting is the place for those multi-disciplinary discussions to occur. CRCOG already attends this meeting.	While such an approach may be helpful to Hartford, it does little for the other 37 municipalities served by CRCOG. We believe a regional approach is more appropriate.
Tony Cherolis	4/15/2020	Pg 20 – “Evaluate current funding scoring criteria on a regular basis” – Does this criteria account for zero-car households, social/environmental justice, or equity benefit?	Environmental Justice is a category in the scoring criteria for LOTCIP.
Tony Cherolis	4/15/2020	Pg 21, Legislation – Should this section specifically mention the proposed Road Safety Bill from 2020 that was unfortunately delayed by the COVID-19 crisis. – RHB-5324 Link	We will consider this legislation in our annual legislative agenda.
Tony Cherolis	4/15/2020	Pg 22 – “The top elements were equity (that the network serve those most in need), safety (that it provide safe travel for vulnerable users), and connectivity (that it increase mobility and access).” --- I am glad to see equity in this list.	agreed
Tony Cherolis	4/15/2020	Pg 32 – “This is primarily an education issue. Municipalities need guidance on the need for maintenance, the methods of maintaining infrastructure, and the tools that are available to assist with maintenance.” o It is not an issue of education in Hartford, it is an issue of budget and low levels of staffing in the Department of Public Works, operating for many years on austerity budgets. A best practice for bus shelter and light-maintenance / cleanup of sidewalks and bike lanes is the Downtown Business Improvement District. The city should work with Park Street, Farmington Ave, Albany Avenue, and North Main Street to determine if there are ways they could fund a similar program with visible ambassadors. One potential way to fund those “less dense” arterial corridors would be parking meters that pay a significant percentage of their revenue into funding the ambassador program.	This section has been revised to include a discussion of the need for additional maintenance and operations funds.

Complete Streets Plan Comment Log

Tony Cherolis	4/15/2020	Pg 33-34 – Tactical Urbanism – Mention that some tactical urbanism and demo projects could be left in place and maintains for 1 to 5 years (or longer), while more permanent infrastructure is considered, designed, and implemented. Repainting and replacing flex bollards at a bump out are rather inexpensive when compared to fully reconstructing a road and sidewalk.	Good point. Added note to that effect.
Tony Cherolis	4/15/2020	Pg 34 – Educational Opportunities – You could mention CRCOG’s involvement in both the 2018 and 2019 Northeast Multimodal and Transit Summits. The 2020 summit has already been scheduled for Nov 23rd at UConn Hartford.	Added
Tony Cherolis	4/15/2020	Pg 35 – “Census data, while helpful, is limited to work trips and thus does not capture all bicycle activity.” o The census work trip question in the American Community Survey misses the majority of bicycle trips and significantly underrepresented bicycle mode share as demonstrated in other cities that did a more comprehensive survey of all trips.	Agreed.
Tony Cherolis	4/15/2020	Pg 39, Online Surveys – You could mention and link to the CT’s Transportation Future Survey from Oct 2019. CRCOG helped share that survey with their network. o CT’s Transportation Future Survey Results - http://www.ctprf.org/wpcontent/uploads/2020/02/CT_Transportation_Future_Survey_Results_2019_Dec_u pdate.pdf	The section is in reference to surveys we conducted as part of this plan.
Tony Cherolis	4/15/2020	Pg 41, Demo Projects – There is a photo of the Hartford demo project at Main and Charter Oak, but the two demo projects from 2019 aren’t mentioned in the text. It would be educational to note that the two Hartford projects were removed for the winter because they didn’t set up a winter maintenance plan. The best practice from New Haven is to work with adjacent property owners on winter snow removal, as it benefits that property owner and tenants	Added a reference to the picture. Added a note about New Haven example.
Tony Cherolis	4/15/2020	Pg 45, Crash Fatality Metrics – It is helpful to look at a best fit line plot through pedestrian crash fatality totals for each year (3 yr avg). The state is adding about two pedestrian deaths each year to the total.	Agreed.
Tony Cherolis	4/15/2020	Pg 46, Targets - Setting the target that accepts vulnerable user fatality levels at the current rate is ridiculous. Can stronger words be used here? Why does CRCOG have to use the CT DOT state level target for pedestrian fatalities in the region? Vision Zero is only mentioned in the abstract and at the very end of the section.	As noted in the text, FHWA requires realistic targets. At this time, CRCOG does not believe that zero fatalities is achievable with current resources.