

# Minutes

---

*May 28, 2013*

1. Meeting began at 8:41 AM. In attendance Neil, Charlie, Rod, Ray, Joe, Sandy, Debbie, Francis. DOT staff. Al joined at 8:50. Joe left at 10:14. Al left at 10:25.
2. Motion made by Charlie, seconded by Sandy to add two items to the agenda:
  - a. Strategic Highway Safety Plan
  - b. Intersection of Park Rd and I-84 ramps
3. Interim vice chair nomination. Sandy Fry nominated, accepted.
4. Complete Streets policy review.
  - a. Ray. Need clarity. Is DOT working on similar document? (DOT staff unsure.) Municipalities unaware of demand for pedestrian/cyclist infrastructure and may decide to opt out. Appropriate facilities will generate additional demand.
  - b. Charlie. Two pages of high-level text. Then appendix with options or examples.
  - c. Rod. Exemptions from complete streets?
  - d. Neil. 3-4 page final document. Municipalities should not be able to exempt themselves.
  - e. Francis. Concern about lack of design standards. Need to make sure standards applied are appropriate to context (number of lanes, speeds, average daily traffic; existing and future non-motorized use). Shared space appropriate in some places; dedicated facilities in other contexts.
  - f. Deb. Monitoring of exemption requests. When municipalities use federal/state funds, should be forced to include complete streets (except in case of an exemption). Need to have personal understanding of location and challenges faced by pedestrians/cyclists. Review process to see how implementation of policy is working as a recommendation.
  - g. Sandy. Designers need to walk/bike projects. Designers currently drive projects. At least one person on team should walk/bike project. Focus on goal of accommodating all users in the transportation system. Projects cast long shadows; cheaper to build in now than retrofit later. Need design guidelines, emphasize context sensitivity: volume, speed, type of facility. May not need to build extra for low speed/low volume; as both increase, you need facilities. Annual training on complete streets.
  - h. Al. Need site walks. Do not overprescribe in policy.
  - i. Joe. Draft could be made succincter. Recognize that policy will go through iterations.
5. Edits to complete streets policy.
6. Strategic Highway Safety Plan discussion. Suggestions:
  - a. Push for strong countermeasures. Statewide "Share the Road" campaign that gets the message out in all media.
  - b. Dedicate part of HSIP to pedestrian/cyclist projects.
  - c. Document heavy on engineered solutions that accommodate sloppy driving; no focus on engineered solutions that change driver behavior.

- d. Pedestrian and cyclist only considered in pedestrian and cyclist chapter. Should not be confined to that but rather integrated throughout the document.
  - e. CTPAB was not consulted. Document has been signed. We should be involved in future; we look forward to early contact in the new process.
- 7. Putnam Bridge. Public hearing on access path is evening of June 18<sup>th</sup>.
  - 8. Meeting adjourned at 10:38.

Speed, volume, type of facility (inc. number of lanes), location, existing and potential future use

Involve pedestrian/cyclist persons and persons with local knowledge in project development; maybe send out to RPOs for review/comment?

Need to have people walk/bike project

Make sure people have training

Tie to funding

Development of performance measures under MAP21?