



Meeting Notes

Place: Plainville Public Library
Auditorium
56 East Main Street
Plainville, CT 06062

Date: October 6, 2016

Notes Taken by: Andrea Drabicki

Project #: 42201.00

Re: Steering Committee & Technical Team Joint Session
Workshops Report Out Meeting
Farmington Canal Heritage Trail Gap Closure Study and
CTfastrak Connection Study (Gap Closure Trail Study)

ATTENDEES

Steering Committee & Technical Team

Tim Malone, Capitol Region Council of Governments
Bruce Donald, East Coast Greenway Alliance
Jim Cassidy – Farmington Valley Trails Council / Plainville
Greenway Alliance
Pete Salomone – Plainville Greenway Alliance
Robert Lee – Town of Plainville
Mark Devoe – Town of Plainville
Garrett Daigle – Town of Plainville
Mark Moriarty, City of New Britain
Carl Gandza, City of New Britain
Grayson Wright, CT Department of Transportation (CTDOT)
Kevin Tedesco, CTDOT
Maureen Lawrence, CTDOT
Sue Jacozzi – Plainville-Southington Health District

Consultant Team

Dave Head, VHB
Andrea Drabicki, VHB
Chris Faulkner, VHB
Mark Jewell, VHB
Dan Burden, Blue Zones
Samantha Thomas, Blue Zones
Mary Embry, Mobycon
Lennart Nout, Mobycon

Guests

Bernadette Dostaler – Plainville, Citizen

- 1. Call to Order:** Mr. Tim Malone called the meeting to order at 10:14am and welcomes members of the Steering Committee and Technical Team.
- 2. Public Comment:** No one chose to speak at this time.
- 3. What We Learned:** Mr. Dave Head introduced the consultant team which will go into detail regarding the findings from the two public planning workshops held earlier that week on October 3 in Plainville and October

100 Great Meadow Road
Suite 200
Wethersfield, CT 06109-2377
P 860.807.4300

4 in New Britain, in addition to the workshop the Steering Committee and Technical team participated the morning of October 4.

- a. Ms. Samantha Thomas, Blue Zones, then described the process in which the consultant team used to gather information from the public using “informed consent”. Whereas citizens and stakeholders are active in the planning process throughout the duration of project schedule to determine where an alignment should be routed through their community; thus, creating enough political and social capital for decision makers to buy-in to the process and the final preferred alignment as determined by the citizen base in each community.
- b. Ms. Mary Embry, Mobycon, then reported on what the consultant team heard during the public workshops:

i. Town of Plainville – Challenges:

- Existing infrastructure networks, especially major intersections and at rail road crossings
- Existing traffic volumes and patterns
- Wayfinding through town and to destinations
- Destinations and residential areas are spread out, so a linear trail does not appear practical.

ii. City of New Britain – Challenges:

- Existing infrastructure networks, especially major intersections and at rail road crossings
- Existing traffic volumes and patterns
- Existing road conditions around industrially zoned areas

- c. Mr. Lennart Nout, Mobycon, presented the alignment routes that the attending participants of both communities developed at the public workshops (see Presentation Packet).

i. Town of Plainville – Opportunities:

- Several primary routes were identified as potential alignments
- Secondary routes or “loops” were identified with purpose to connect schools and shopping
- Need a stronger east-west connection though the community
- Norton Park was identified as an important destination
- Several alignments were routed through downtown, which was also identified as an important destination

- End user trip types tended to be more recreational than commuter oriented

ii. City of New Britain – Opportunities:

- Primary routes were identified along the Route 72 corridor
- Secondary looping routes were identified to provide a recreational experience for the end users
- Need a stronger north-south connection through the community
- Walnut Hill Park was identified as an important destination
- End user trip types tended to be more commuter oriented in nature

4. Next Steps: Mr. Dave Head then proceeded to explain the next steps in the process. They are:

a. Technical Evaluation Process

- i. Due to the large project area including a three (3) town area and two (2) neighboring communities the consultant team has developed a model to assist in calculating and assessing multiple variables
- ii. The consultants will take all the alignment routes that were developed during the October public workshops and Steering Committee/Technical Team workshop and run them through the Decision Matrix model and compare the alignments against each other
- iii. The alignments will be compared and evaluated by the consultant team by looking for the highest ranking alignment
 - Whereas, an alignment that receives a higher ranking is determined as having high benefit or low negative impacts and;
 - An alignment that has a lower ranking is of low benefit or high negative impact
- iv. Facility Types will then be voted on by the public through a series of on-going public engagement activities that are currently on the project website and located at public locations in throughout Plainville, Southington, and New Britain i.e. Libraries, YWCA, YMCA
- v. The consultant team will report back to the public and committees in early December the initial findings from the Technical Evaluation process

b. Criteria of the Decision Matrix

- i. The Decision Matrix criteria, vetted by the Steering Committee as definable and measurable, are the following:
 - Connectivity
 - Traffic Safety
 - On vs. Off Road
 - Personal Security
 - Environmental Impacts
 - Rights-of-way Impacts
 - Cost

c. Facility Types

- i. After ranking the alignments, appropriate facility types will be determined for each segment of an alignment, the facility types are (see Presentation Packet):
 - Separated Bike Lane
 - Buffered Bike Lane
 - Rail with Trail
 - Bike Lane
 - Multi-use Trail
 - Wide Shoulder
 - Shared Roadway (Sharrow)
 - Side Path

- 5. Conclusions:** Mr. Dan Burden, Blue Zones, then conducted a roundtable discussion with the committee members to receive feedback on what the consultant team “got right” and what “did we miss” or challenges moving forward:

a. What we got Right:

- i. The public engagement process – an overwhelming majority of committee members concluded that the engagement process and interactions with the public were inclusive, transparent, and made people feel empowered that their voices were being heard
- ii. The consulting team – Mobycon, Blue Zones, and VHB are observed by members of the committee being the right team to work with the public and stakeholders to solve the problem of closing the Gap.
- iii. Acknowledging that public transit is an important element of this project and included it early on in the process
- iv. Having the Department of Transportation involved and engaged early on in the process

b. What “Did we Miss” or challenges moving forward:

- i. Keeping the public engaged and involved and keeping the project visible during the winter months
- ii. Considering a connection of New Britain with Farmington and Hartford
- iii. Considering a connection to Bristol out toward ESPN
- iv. Articulating to the public the complexity of ranking a trail alignment
- v. Keeping in mind local transit modal options not just CTfastrak

- 6. Meeting Adjourns:** 11:15am

Next Steps

- The consultant team will perform the Technical Evaluation Process by ranking the alignments received by the public through the Decision Matrix model over the upcoming weeks
- The consultant team will report out these findings to the public and committees by early winter
- The consultant team will proceed with soliciting input from the public to weight user Trip Types through several mechanisms including display boards at public events
- The consultant team will continue to solicit input from the public to vote on the Facility Types they would like to see best in their community through several mechanisms including display boards located at public community locations and through the public website

Statement of Accuracy:

- We believe these minutes accurately describe the discussion and determinations of this meeting. Unless notified to the contrary within 5 business days, we will assume all in attendance concur with the accuracy of these notes.

Notes Submitted by:



David Head

Notes Approved by:



Tim Malone

Distribution: Attendees

Project File 42201.00