

Vision Zero Council

10.4.22 Meeting Minutes

1:00pm to 3:00pm

This virtual public meeting was hosted on Zoom

Meeting was called to order at 1:00pm

Council Members Present: Garrett Eucalitto, Jackie McMahon, Jon Slifka, Susan Logan, Kevin Manzolillo, Keith Norton, Katherine Grady

Council Members Absent: Sibongile Magubane, Kevin Manzolillo

Guests: Alec Slatky, Amy Watkins, Marissa Pfaffinger, Mark DiCocco, Ernie Bertothy, Shaun Formica, Charles Harlow

Other Attendees: Aaron Swanson, Diana Palmer, Shannon King, Mary Cockram, Terri Thompson, Patricia Miller, Marlon Pena, Gary Turco, Kathy Kennedy, Fatemeh Fakharmoosavi, Tammy Nuccio, Lindsay Naughton, Devin Clarke, Stacy Giscombe, Alycia Jenkins, Craig Yannes, Kaethe Podgorski, Neil Olinski, Jonathan Steinberg, Holly Schulz, Roger Krahn, Cara Radzins, Timothy Snyder, Richard Donovan, Bryan Pavlik, Anne Cournoyer, Adam Weber, Connecticut Network, Kate Rozen, Sabrina Xie, Aaron Goode, Gannon Long, Roland Lemar, Tim Sperry, Kiko Wong, Douglas Hausladen, Kate Rattan, Elliot Wareham, Robert Bell, Laurie McElwee, Judith Proctor, Josh Morgan

Meeting:

Aaron Swanson – Housekeeping

Garrett Eucalitto – intros and then adopt minutes

Motion to adopt the Vision Zero Council Meeting minutes from the March 22, 2022 meeting by Jon Slifka, minutes adopted

Garrett - Subcommittee have been narrowed down from 5 to 4 and background. They were asked to provide final policy recommendations prior to the December meeting of the Council

Starting with the Engineering Subcommittee - Marissa Pfaffinger and Chuck Harlow

Chuck - So just to recap the previous events of our engineering subcommittee, 2 meetings were held prior to the last VZ meeting- April 27 and May 2. We had just under 25 participants in both meetings, representatives across multiple state agencies, other public groups, municipals, or municipal representation from certain actual towns. And community based advocacy groups as well as some things consultant engineers as well. Our third meeting, really the important one where we discussed all the potential policy, was held this past Wednesday. We reviewed and discussed potential policies. We had approximately 15 people in attendance during the meeting. We recap the previous discussions, and really kind of talked through.

We as co-chairs had tried to distill down some of the discussions and ideas, and really refine that into potential policy recommendations. We've reviewed those policy recommendations with our subcommittee. We have some really good discussion, and some back and forth and feedback about where to go.

With these, we would do want to note that these policy recommendations do still need some refinement, and we'll talk about what some of those different points are as we do get to them. But the general concepts were very well received. As a part of this presentation.

We also want to recognize that some of the topics that came up during our September 11<sup>th</sup> discussions are not quite ready for a policy discussion. Our subcommittee has identified a number of different focus areas and different topics where we want to continue to really dive in and do some additional work in the coming months and as the Vision Zero Committee does continue forward into the future.

So just to recap we defined our purpose to recommend to the Vision Zero Council engineering related policy that eliminates transportation related fatalities and severe injuries and involving pedestrians, bicyclists transit users, motorists and passengers. And really that's because the data is really showing an increasing trend in road user fatalities and serious injuries. And again our discussion really focused on current engineering efforts that might be underway as well as potential possible engineering countermeasures.

One of the first things we first step we did was to look at the data of what kind of crashes we're showing out there and to get that data we use this recently completed strategic highway safety plan done by the DOT and in partnership with a number of other agencies. And we also looked at other resources there's a highway safety improvement program and a couple other different things the department has that are looking at crash data.

And so the top 3 focus areas based on the data are roadway departures which has about over the last 5 years which was studied, had 3,570 crashes. Total serious and fatal injury crashes, which is 24% of the total of those serious and fatal injury crashes. Then there was intersection related crashes which responsible for little over 3,500 crashes serious and fatal injury crashes, and that's 23% of that total. And then pedestrian crashes also came to the top, which is about 1,400 crash, serious and fatal injury crashes, which is 17% of the total serious and fatal injury.

So with that data and the groups getting together, we had a lot of very good discussion and brainstorming on, you know where we should go, and how we should drive down these serious and fatal injury crashes to meet the goals of vision zero, and there some of a lot of the discussion is kind of outlined here.

There's a there was a lot of discussion on bicycle, infrastructure and safety, and pedestrian infrastructure and safety, and the excess of speeds was raised as a concern and there's and then complete streets and road diets came up. And what are they, and where are they, and how do we do that?

There was some also minor discussion points on intersection, safety and roadway departure crashes, and I thought it was very good. I think the data lead is going to lead us to or let us to the following: The next policy recommendations that I believe Marissa is going to start off on.

Marissa Pfaffinger - Yeah, So with that, we'll go ahead and just jump right in and so just based on my understanding, we'll go through all of these, and then pass for comment at the end.

So potential policy recommendation number one so we're proposing that each municipality be required to have a complete streets plan in order to be eligible for certain state funding programs or opportunities such as the community connectivity program that is funded through Connecticut. This policy would rise to the level of the State legislature, and we feel the reason that it does rise to that level is because we recognize that really to ensure equity in opportunity to develop and implement such a plan funding should be provided by the legislature for global development and adoption, and in adoption. So because we do think that there is a funding component to this to ensure equal access to the resources that would be needed to develop a plan. This is a recommendation for the State Legislature.

As noted before. We do recognize that this is just sort of a preliminary recommendation that some work would still need to be done to identify some of those additional needs. For instance, we would really need to drill down on what the base level plan or the minimum level of that plan that would be considered acceptable statewide. The goal of that minimum level would not be to preclude plans that are above and beyond.

But to really set that baseline for what would be considered acceptable in order to be compliant with this policy, we also feel it's really important and a great opportunity to be able to engage in coordinate with the different councils the government around the State to really bring that regional involvement into this potential policy, as well, we feel it's important that we want to identify the world that they could play in helping to facilitate those whether or not it's staffing level or access to firms, or even just to provide regional context that each individual town could start to draw down on so for those that might not be familiar just sort of as a broad definition. complete streets is an approach to planning, designing, building, operating, and maintaining streets that enable safe access for all people who need to use them, including pedestrians bicyclist motorists and transit writers of all ages and abilities. And really the idea behind this is that having a complete streets plan can help define community ejet objectives around this concept and offers an opportunity to moralize and document the specific goals for each city in town. There are a number of towns and municipalities around the State that do currently have plans in place. The Connecticut dot has a complete streets policy as well.

But really bringing this out to be a more statewide goal, to allow every municipality the opportunity to have that documentation and divine define what their complete streets goal are again with the goal of providing you know a safer approach for all different users of the of the street network.

So that is number one, can move on to number 2. So this this came out of This policy recommendation came out of sort of a broader understanding, and was brought to our committee last week, and it was felt that this rose to the level of wanting to put forward as a recommendation. So the potential policy recommendation is to clarify Connecticut dots authority to acquire land for trails. So currently the legislation is such that Connecticut Dot may not have the legislative authority to condemn right away for off-road trails or bike fed facilities with the trail networks, continuing to grow and to support non-motorized travel.

This authority could help to facilitate the expansion of that network. And really we recognize that separated facilities have fewer conflict areas than onward facilities, and that again drives to the overall safety of the non-motorized community.

So for some background. Connecticut dot's authority to condemn private property for multi-use trail was proactively challenged as part of the right supply process of a of a project by a private party therefore. Connecticut has been advised. that we should not move forward until this legislation can be clarified or amended. Because we may not have the authority. So the purpose of bringing this forward will not directly in line with the engineering subcommittee is really to help bring advocacy and awareness to this issue and to help build a stronger stakeholder support for clarifying that language, and providing the dot with the authority to do so.

So with that we can move on to number 3. Yes. So this is a policy recommendation to and it was at the agency level of conduct, and it's for the adoption of an ice policy intersection, control evaluation. And so an intersection control evaluation is a data driven performance, based framework to screen all the different alternatives. When you're designing intersections and to get the optimal solution. And so the and the idea behind this and it's not.

This is not the first time this would ever happen in the region. Massachusetts has a pretty robust ice policy and I've we have a link down there. I'm unable to click on the links, but it is there and I went to what I have it on my screen. if but I you know it's there.

So when you get these slides later, and if you want to look it up, it does, and it gives definitions of what an ice policy is and one of the reasons we you would want these things is to identify what's the best practice. And sometimes people. they get stuck in ruts, and this will allow them to look at all the alternatives and come up with the best one. And also the thought is that even though it's like maybe the best for capacity, it might not be the best for safety.

So we really want to have this and that when this policy is developed from a connecticut standpoint, we would also require that there's going to be to address safety and capacity at the same time, and give equal or maybe even more benefit towards safety over capacity When you're design when We're designing what this policy will look like for Connecticut, there are a lot of facts with resources available. Under this, you know, under intersection studies, and the with this policy we would also introduce a significant amount of transparency to allow the public to understand where why the department or the designer of record made the decisions they did, and also to be able to defend those better.

I know the Department does do a lot of this, probably ad hoc, but this way would make it under. You know, a specific policy, and there would be make, and I think it would make it stronger and give better definition of which direction people want to go. So that's this I believe that's all we were looking at for this policy.

So Here's a here's a question we had for the Council, because we weren't sure whether we should make this a recommendation or not. You know, Speed control came up a lot in our discussions and We weren't sure, you know, that you know excessive speed seems to be a role plays a role in some of the crashes. Crashed data that we showed and speed enforcement. How do we understand? like speed enforcement cameras?

So the thought is, it came up in our group was, Should we support speed, enforcement cameras to drive down the crash, help, drive down the crash rates and reduce, and you know this obviously is going to help with pedestrian crashes and all crashes, and we understand the Enforcement Committee is making a policy recommendation on speed enforcement cameras. So we should just support. The question is, should we just support that, or should we also make, as the engineering group make an additional recommendation similar to theirs?

So these were the items that weren't quite ready for prime time, and but still we wanted we wanted to track them, and at least have keep these into discussion as we meet going into the future roadway departure crashes. So this is You know This there's it's the highest number of crashes showing shown out there with the most serious and fatal injury crashes. So we didn't want to you know so we decided to develop a working group by the committee, and I'm going to be the head of that a little working group with the intention of examining further looking into whether there's policies that may support crash reductions and I didn't want to give the imprint impression that the department or is not looking it's not it's ignoring this issue they've got numerous strategies that they've developed in their strategic highway, safety plan, and also under their h sip implementation plan. Recently submitted to the F. Hw. which are, do have ideas on how to drive these crashes down.

But the idea behind this is the crashes are occurring about a 50 50 split on state. I mean municipal owned roads and we're curious. We're trying to come up with ideas of how to help the municipalities, drive down the crashes on their own roads. So whether we're not exactly sure where that goes there's I'm Assuming there will be funding that will be required and maybe some requirements of them. But we don't wanna so that's some of the ideas behind what are moving forward a departure The roadway departure working group will be working on

Okay. So the other items again to Checks point are our discussion points that had come up as part of our group, and again, are not necessarily policies that were ready to put forward yet But felt. It was, it was important to review and talk about some of the different ideas that have been that have been put out from the group. So the next discussion item was continuing to research and look into the possibility of quick builds on state roads.

So quick builds are essentially, you know, quick projects that might be reversible or adjustable. Traffic, safety, improvement, type of projects that can be installed relatively quickly, and really provide the opportunity to test out. You know, a type of improvement before investing the entire capital expenditure of doing a full insight. It's similar to popup trials that might be submitted a seen in a limited duration, but the idea behind establishing a working group as part of our subcommittee which is something that our group has to do is truly look into the research that's been provided for.

Other States that have been able to successfully implement this type of policy on State Road specifically, where the you know, the type of traffic really should be considered. The actual volumes, the liability and potential maintenance aspects that go hand in hand with supporting such policy like this. We have seen a couple of municipalities around the State implement these quick build type of builds, but again that's been only on the local road system.

So the goal of the working group within our subcommittee would be to identify some of the more data driven reasons. For how these could be supported on state roads, and which roads they might be applicable for, and the type of quick build treatments that could potentially be explored. We also spent

a lot of a lot of good discussion. Really around the idea of Main Street as a state road. Really, that idea comes back a lot to a lot to the idea that you know, through many of the downtown areas in Connecticut. The Major street that is conveying traffic is a state road.

And so you know there's a lot of different policies instead, or excuse me studies that are currently employees to look at how to implement a good engineering practice that is consistent with the desire for walkable economically thriving downtowns with a strong engineering. and you know, State road focus for actually moving vehicles and cars through that downtown area. So for this, this is one element that we you know we recognize is not something that again we're ready to put forward as a State policy or any sort of recommendation, but really wanted to keep tabs on some of the put the studies that are currently underway. including the Connecticut dots enhancing pedestrian safety through speed management study that's underway We know I believe Patrick's a packet at our last council meeting gave a presentation on some of the Rsa possibilities.

So there's a lot of movement that's happening around this idea, and really just recognizing that because of the discussion that our subcommittee had this is an idea that stays relevant that we want to continue to pursue similarly the idea of raised intersections and crosswalks throughout the State.

Again. there's been some municipal adoption of the ability to do that, and there is one pilot location that's moving forward on a state road. But again, recognizing that that's sort of an established engineering policy or engineering practice that might not need a policy, but that we do want to continue to see how those are implemented across the State and from an engineering subcommittee point of view, be aware of the decisions that are made around those types of things.

And again, FHWA has a robust amount of information about you know, applicable roadways and roadway types. To see those safely implemented and that's very similar to the last item of road diets. Again. Our dot office of traffic safety has completely. a study to look at the possible implementation of road diets on all of our State routes, and I believe they're moving forward with a similar study for local routes as well, so no recommendation coming out of that. But really the sub can be wants to continue to track the process for those different for those different elements.

And I believe with that we can turn it over to the Council, and would welcome any feedback or questions.

Garrett- Thank you. Marissa and Chuck if any of the Council members feel free to chime in crazy and do whatever you you're comfortable with.

Question- I do have one question to start with, which was the one of the policy recommendations about requiring complete streets, plans for each municipality. You may have said this, and I may have missed those. But do any other States have a similar type policy in place? I mean. I personally think it's a fantastic idea of if Valley wants to receive funds to make improvements to the roadways to have that that should be a part of their action. But just wondering if any other States have similar types of policies, or would we be the first to do that? If you know if you don't know it's we can task someone with looking into that.

Answer- Sure. So I know that over 35 states around the country do have their own complete streets, policies at the State level, and that I believe it's as many as over 1,600 different complete streets policies exist at various levels, state and municipal. I am not sure whether or not it is a requirement in any other

state. And that actually is, would be interesting to see if we would be sort of cutting ground on that. But there are a number of different state resources that are available outside of just Connecticut's own that do provide guidance. for you know the best type of complete streets policy, or What each. municipality can do to help move that forward. So Massachusetts does actually require it for certain funding in their State. For you to have a complete streets policy I'm almost a 100% sure of that. And that's seems like we're stealing a lot of stuff from them. I mean borrowing things from them. but if somebody has a good idea to me. I think that's why start from fresh when you can at least build on something else.

Question - So and then one more piece for me was the second one on this slide. Here quick builds on state roads. Just wanna make sure it, for this may have come up in your subcommittee meeting. But for the public to the Connecticut, do you know if Connecticut was accepted into the Transportation for America smart North America's, complete streets Academy?

Answer- We're one of 3 States that were accepted, and part of the appeal of that is we're working with 3 municipalities. Middletown, Bristol, and Waterbury to and they will provide funding to do some quick builds on state roads at the end of that complete Streets Academy. So that's kicking off they just had the first kickoff discussion with smarter with America. And they plan to begin to have meetings with those municipalities and think Naugatuck Valley Cog is involved as well. And in CRCOG maybe but Anna Bergeron from Connecticut is the point person working on that. In case any subcommittee members are interested it's completely aligned with that recommendation. There. Yeah, we did make note of that as part of our committee.

Question from Jackie- Hi, everyone! So this might just be my day. But what is a road diet?

Answer- Sure, Absolutely so. I apologize for not for not defining absolutely so. Across the State, and sort of seen in a lot of different places. There are roads that have you know, multiple lanes across it. So I think the most traditional that we think of is 2 lanes in each direction, but just a regular surface street. So you've got your double yellow center on and then there's, 2 lanes in each direction. So the idea behind a road diet is when conditions are appropriate. So when volumes are below a certain point, you can actually reduce the total number of lanes on that. You know, within that same footprint, and the goal is to actually provide better traffic operations. So if you can go from 4 lanes down to 3 lanes, is sometimes what you see where there'd be, one lane in each direction, and then possibly a two-way left Turn lane in between to help facilitate those turns onto those left turns onto different side roads, or if the volumes are actually able to accommodate it, actually dropping down to just one lane in each direction, and then providing additional room for either multimodal facilities, like a bike lane, or a larger parking lane, or just essentially reimagining how that expansive pavement can be better utilized. What we find with those 4 lane undivided roadways is that very often those center lanes. Often act as de facto turnlanes anyways because there's no place for cars to get out of the way while they're waiting to make that left turn so that causes the vehicles behind them to often queue up can lead to some aggressive driving behaviors, as people try to scoot around and get out of the way. And so the idea is really to repurpose the roadway that's currently out there. Make it work better for the actual type of traffic and then there's also a lot of potential opportunity for those different multimodal uses.

Question from Jackie- Within that same footprint Okay, thank you that's interesting to me. And then I have another question again, just being kind of unfamiliar with some of the terms, I think the complete streets plan. In theory it sounds great, but I have no idea what it means. So do you have any kind of example of what a plan like that would include, so that I can integrate my brain around that.

Answer - So Connecticut dot does have a complete street policy in place. And the policy is basically a listing of objectives. So the objective to improve the safety and mobility for pedestrians of all ages and abilities. For example, to develop and support transportation systems. And to accommodate active transportation to develop and support transportation systems. That accommodate you know livable communities it's really an opportunity to define and document how you want your roadway system to really be accessible for all users of all ages and all types and so it could be as simple as you know, identifying that. You know multimodal is a priority for town, and not taking it any further to add specifics, or a town could, if they were so inclined. You know, add, you know, specific focus areas that they wanted to pursue. The example that I always come back to is working with a town in a rural part of the State of Connecticut. They actually said, You know we don't want sidewalks, you know we want multimodal accommodations, but sidewalks are actually not something that we want because of the maintenance responsibility that comes with it So for them a complete streets. Policy might look like wider shoulders where people could feel, you know, safer walking, but not necessarily a sidewalk built into it. That's sort of one extreme example of that but what the plan allows them to do is to actually you know engage with different people within the town, and document what they're actually wants for all roadway users could be What they want their streets to look like. So that plan then exists and becomes a great reference document for anybody that is building the development in town. Or for project is coming through you know it's a sort of a pre-prepared plan to say this is what the town would like to see. if you're going to be touching our roadway network interesting Thank

Question- Hi, John, Thanks, Aaron. Just a couple of questions, and some of this you may have. You may have touched on when you reference your complete streets recommendation. You talked about the option of towns developing plans in order to receive funding. It seems to me that some towns might require funding just to investigate complete streets and research it and study it, and so forth. Is there currently funding available at the front end to look into to complete streets?

Answer - Currently so the idea behind the policy recommendation would be to ensure that that funding would be available as well. So without knowing this specifics of what would currently be available for a town. If a policy were to be put forward, it was felt very strongly that they're recognizing that the capability and the financials of every municipality across the State very widely to have that be incorporated into the adoption of that policy. so some funding of some nature being identified to allow towns to be able to tap into that, because it would then be a requirement for any, or you know, any type, of or any particular funding source that could be put forward for different types of projects so I don't know this specifics of what is currently available. But part of the policy would be that acknowledgment of from an equity point of view. Some funding would need to be made available in order to help ensure that that that policy could be or that plan could be developed for every single group within the State. Okay, thank you. And then just more, more, maybe more, of a comment than anything else, I would encourage. This group, Garrett, to make sure that if we're going to encourage a policy of towns looking into complete streets and creating plans that the groups that will be doing that work will comprised of people from the towns proper representation and of course I'm here, you know, representing the aging and disability communities. And given that recently the United States department of labor recognize that the disability community is now the single largest minority in the country. It's, and that the disability community be part of those discussions, and also we are the I think,



the sixth or seventh oldest state in the country by average age. So it's just important that those groups are represented in such discussions going forward.

Garrett-Next will be our enforcement Subcommittee. That's chaired by Sergeant Mark Mark DiCocco of Connecticut State Police of the collision, analysis and reconstruction Squad and Terry Thompson. Transportation planner greater hard for tim coalition chair of the Capital Region Council of Governments

Mark- Thanks everyone in a second. I'll turn it over to you, Jackie McMahon from the Dcj just a quick recap of what we discussed in our previous meeting and I can turn it over to Jackie.

But from our previous meetings so numerous enforcement proposals have been proposed, and in those meetings robust conversations took place regarding those enforcement strategies and from those discussions where our various stakeholders from across government our stakeholders from across the community, 5 enforcement proposals have been discussed.

Jackie from dcj today is going to do this analysis of those respective Oh, but, in short, number one be an active motorcycle helmet law for all drivers and enforce the statute number 2 or fatal collision reduction team, combined with regular high visibility enforcement. With this implementing automated enforcement cameras, and lastly, and active open container statute. And so, without further ado, Jackie, please take it away.

Jackie- Thank you, Mark and I have to just give kudos to Mark and Terry for just a very well run Subcommittee. The discussions were robust, to say the least. But very organized, and we got through some really dense topics and consolidated them down. and that's a Testament to their leadership. I am not a chair or co-chair of this committee. But in consultation with the Enforcement subcommittee we had presented. This, or Mark rather had presented this in our last meeting in June, and so we wanted to take a different approach to this and look deeper into these proposals. How they had been implemented, perhaps nationally. what the historical components were to them. And then what are some legal challenges that we may face? If those proposals are, in fact, acted on recommended by this Council, and put into effect, so that's kind of the approach of this presentation a quick caveat to that I do work for the division of criminal justice, just because I am presenting this doesn't necessarily mean that the Dcj is advocating for these positions. This is just kind of something that I looked at. From that legal perspective. So without that I'll get right into it.

So these are the 4 proposals. As Mark mentioned, we consolidated proposals, 2 and 3. Into the second category. and I will break them down next slide, please, there. So the first proposal being to enact the helmet law for all and this is something that would require legislative change. Next slide, Please, Arron. Currently, Connecticut, requires helmets for riders who are either under the age of 18 or just on an instructional permit. They do not require them for all, and it was interesting to me to take a look at this and to review some of the data that mark put together.

During some of our subcommittee meetings on the issue of motorcycle helmets, and tying this back to our overall goal as account of eliminating traffic, fatalities, there were Some numbers that were put out there, and in 2,021 the estimates are that there were 57 motorcycle crashes that resulted in a fatality. And of those 57 it's believed that 41 were unhelmeted.

So if we're talking about eliminating fatalities, this is really one that hits the nail on the head, so to speak. So I I looked at this from a historical perspective. Next slide, please. erin and just to give you a

brief synopsis. Connecticut did have a full helmet law, which is how it's referred to. But it was repealed in 1976, and this was this was an effort by the Federal Government through the National Highway Safety Act of 1966, to get States to implement these kind of full helmet laws Recognition the safety aspects of it. And to get Federal funding, which is always a desirable goal for States. they had to enact such a law. All States did except for California, which, as it turns out, had the largest motorcycle population.

And so, once California resisted the Federal mandate. a lot of States started to repeal their own laws as court challenges, for raised by motorcyclists, challenging the mandates in essence, though it all boiled down to most States, believe this is constitutional. Those that have these full helmet laws in effect, initially, Michigan and Illinois were the only 2 States to deem them unconstitutional. But then, later on, both of those high courts, you know, turned back on their original decision and decided: No. The State certainly has a rational basis. for these laws. They do not violate any constitutional provisions. Next, slide present

So the 2 arguments from motorcycle groups were: first, that these laws targeted them as a group, thus violating equal protection; and then the second was that it was really a personal liberty. Argument that they have a right to do what they wish. And neither of those were found to be successful. in court challenges. Next slide, please, and in deciding that these laws are ultimately constitutional, the courts that have reviewed them.

It's kind of touched on some pretty key points, and we seem to pop up in all of the opinions that I reviewed, and the first is, they do look at economic impact to the State in clear and crashes to the state in terms of financial losses to the rider to the rider's family. To the writer's employer I mean they really take a broad look at what the account impact is of a crash that results in a fatality.

They, of course, also we're considering the safety of others not simply framing this as a danger to the rider himself or herself, but taking a look at the fact that motorcyclists do not exist in a vacuum and that a crash could have ramifications for other people who are operating on that roadway. At the same time and finally, and I thought this was an interesting piece that came out of one of the decisions.

Arguments about the overall health of citizens and the right of the State to regulate the overall health of citizens, brought up this concept of unlimited paternalism, and one of the courts pointed out that if we were to allow a helmet law for all motorcyclists. Why stop there? And why not consider a helmet law for automobile drivers and automobile passengers? Because head injuries are not limited to simply motorcyclists.

So I thought this was an interesting group to laid that argument out to if we're really if the goal is really 0, that's how far can you stretch this this helmet law rationale? So next slide, please, So that that's a summary of our first proposal proposals 2 and 3 combined is the fatal collision reduction team, and regular high visibility enforcement blitzes Next, slide please. So the idea here is to gather traffic officers from State police and or municipal police, and you want to really have these. The traffic officers, including specially trained officers like dres I'm sorry for those who are unfamiliar dres or drug recognition experts and a ride Trained officers are advanced roadside and par driving enforcement officers and these are officers that receive special training on really impaired driving investigations and enforcement to want those to be involved in any kind of traffic team that you have. And these folks would gather together using data that would identify traffic violations that correlate with crashes. They would identify high frequency crash locations, and then they would engage in high visibility enforcement

efforts, targeting those traffic violations. In those areas, and the idea here would be to expand upon the high visibility enforcement efforts that we have in other for other infractions.

So we have click it or ticket. We focus on distractive driving. This would be an opportunity to look at other moving violations that maybe get a little less attention. But are still very involved in crashes, you know. A big one right now could be wrong way. Crashes right? I don't know how you would target that as a special team.

But that's a example of a traffic violation that is not the subject of high visibility enforcement, but that we're seeing a correlation at least right now with crashes. So draw on the data, Identify these and target those locations. Next slide taking a kind of broad look at this I don't think there's any legislation required per se I think sometimes it helps to have it. Depending on how complicated we wanted to make these arrangements. It may be necessary, but just at first blush I don't think there's any legislation that's required for this. I think State police and municipalities can and do team up for enforcement efforts.

Now this would be akin to that. I think those agencies would probably raise the issue of funding and there may be Federal funding sources. Dot grant funding sources available to them that they look into too. For that purpose. I think, from a legal perspective, this discussion can be brought me to a comparison to sobriety, checkpoints, and these kind of focused area enforcement efforts. And there are some standardized procedures. that have to be followed when you're conducting a sobriety checkpoint or a dui checkpoint some people refer to them.

So I think we would wanna make sure that if these were ever challenged, if the if the Enforcement efforts were ever challenged that we had done the appropriate measures before setting them up primarily, notice right, we want to put the note at the public on notice that these are going to be taking place.

Part of the benefit of high visibility enforcement efforts is people know them, and therefore don't speed or wear their seatbelts, or don't use their cell phone and it's that kind of deterrent effect. So I think notice it'll be a big one here to make this most effective, and then just a little tidbit at the end would be mutual. aid agreements between the agencies would be required if you're conducting this kind of joint agency effort. Next slide, please.

Okay. So the next proposal, which is technically proposal for would be to implement automated speed enforcement cameras. I did take a look specifically at speed enforcement cameras but often it's discussed alongside red light cameras, and so I just kind of did group some of them I'm gonna toss up there some data about both and how States are using both or not using both. But the policy recommendation is focused on speed at this point. So just wanna make that clear. next slide, please. So again.

Looking at this broad picture lies, Do we need specific legislation authorizing the use of automated enforcement cameras. It's unclear to me. I think again. sometimes it helps to have that clarifying legislation, but I put up on the screen for you. What our speeding statute currently provides, and it does offer us a part of a facial presumption of accuracy for certain equipment that police use.

So I think at a minimum we're gonna want to consider including these speed enforcement cameras into that provision. Allowing for that presumption of accuracy to minimize kind of extensive challenges to these, but it going back to its legislation required, There's actually a room for the Commissioner of

emergency services and public protection to add in additional speed monitoring devices to that presumption section of the statute.

So I don't know what I will say is and it was brought up by the engineering subcommittee. There is a pilot program that incorporates speed enforcement cameras right now. Specific to work zones. So next slide concern, just to give you an idea as of September of this year, just last month, 18 States had active speed enforcement. Cameras in place. Some were limited just certain areas like work zones or schools, zones, others not so limited, and they would apply throughout the State wherever they were implemented in accordance with their statutes a couple more just have pilot programs, and there are actually 3 that authorize or don't ban the use of these cameras.

But they have no cameras currently in effect, so those 18 States have active in effect Cameras? In effect, September 2022 interestingly, 22 States had active red light. cameras were seeing actually more States using red light, automated enforcement than speed enforcement. Right now, but there is a trend of late, with States actively banning the use of automated speed enforcement. So to date. 6 States have State laws that prohibit the use prohibit law enforcement.

Use automated cameras if you're interested in that you can take a look at that link. To the I. A. His website next slide, please there. So These have been challenged quite a bit largely unsuccessful. And really across the board unsuccessful. and these are just some are the arguments that have been made to try to undermine these laws and just run them through for you. Lack of rational basis, violate substance that due process, violate procedural due process, violate equal protection.

Some of those are the same arguments that we heard with the helmet laws as well. By like the right to enter our interest, State travel, privileges, and immunities. Clause, Fourth amendment, considering the creation for the ticket as a seizure, and violate State law by punishing the owner rather than the operator. That last one. is an interesting one, and I think it will be important to take a good look at if any type of legislation is proposed. Take a good look at the language, and make sure that the conduct that we want prohibited, whether it be speeding or red lights, whatever the case may be.

The that conduct is specifically targeted, and the person who is doing the negative action is targeted for that or as we see with our works on pilot program, the owner of the vehicle is actually subject to the penalties, and that's laid out in the statute very clearly. there is no presumption that the owner is the operator which has been found to be unconstitutional in some States. So really I think we can look at the pilot program that we have statutory authority for right now, as a guide for what might work, and those and Garrett can correct me if I'm wrong. But those have not actually been active yet. but they're close and so that will be a good test of palace will work in our state. And whether any challenges are brought to it. Next slide, please.

There are some open questions, and I will dive too deeply into this. But I think this is a fairly divisive issue. I think people have taken the opportunity to really challenge these laws across the State across the States, and there are still questions that remain about how these will work, and there are still some open challenges that haven't directly been addressed by course That's what this slide is but I think you can't you can't be so afraid of litigation that you don't make the effort. So I put this up here as fodder for discussion. Not necessarily to scare us away from making this proposal. If the Council is, is of the opinion that this is worthwhile. But I'd like to be cognizant of some of the things that we might face should this proposal be pushed forward Next slide. Consider. Okay. So I took out a highlight. The works on pilot just

a bit to explain to folks what is being covered by this. How is it going to work in practice? And I think the some of the challenges that we've seen across the States have been accounted for in our pilot? And so we really need to I guess from my opinion let this one of course. see how this works out. then if it does work, and we've seen works on pilots work particularly Pennsylvania was very successful in reducing construction. Is that work zone fatalities? since the designable goal.

But we have the framework that we need, and this is direct from the statutory language for our works on Pilot, and you can see that it imposes my ability on the owner of the drag of the owner of the motor vehicle involved in that's speeding violation and it's really it's this isn't a close call speeding the statute targets speeders who drive in excess of the posted speed limit by 15 or more miles per hour. so it's not a close call, right? So even if you were to challenge the capability of the technology, it's the capability of the technology is probably closer than 15 miles per hour over. So I mean, this is this is the idea of the works on Pilot Next slide, please, Aaron.

And As I mentioned that last asterisk category of challenges, we do want to make sure that we're being consistent about who is being targeted for this conduct and here. Our works on pilot is really targeting the owner of the motor vehicle, and not providing a defense for that owner that they were not the operator at the time. We do have other statutes across the State that are post owner liability. Even if the owner was not the actor who committed any separate violation next slide!

These are alright. and finally, our fifth proposal is to enact an open alcohol container statute and enforce that statute. Next slide design. This does absolutely require legislation. Currently, Connecticut has legislation that prohibits drinking alcohol while operating a vehicle, and also, of course, driving well under the influence of alcohol. drinking wild driving is a classic misdemeanor, but there are no statutes that prohibit simply having an open container of alcohol in a vehicle, or in the passenger compartment of it of a vehicle. There are similarly no statues that prohibit a passenger's consumption of alcohol while in a vehicle next slide. Please what's the push for open containers it's actually a part of the transportation equity act in the 20 first century. And this was a federal statute that encouraged States to adopt prohibited, adopt laws that prohibited the possession and consumption of alcohol in the passenger compartment of motor vehicles generally Technically, the statue penalizes states. But really, what happens is it diverts funds. If the State does not have an open container law, so can I get right now, does not have an open container law. And so Federal funds that could be used for one purpose, or actually diverted and have to be used for a different purpose.

That's a little bit above my pay grade I'm sure if you can answer a few questions on that if press, but that's the idea it's diverting funds that we want to use for one purpose. as a kind of penalty for not having this open to our statute. That's 5, please, in order for states to avoid that kind of diverted fund penalty.

They have to comply with these 6 requirements and the one I'm gonna focus on is number 6, which requires that if you have an open container statute that you primarily enforce that statute it cannot be secondary enforcement must be primary enforcement of the law. This is again, rather than requiring That another violation has been committed Before allowing enforcement of the open. We are seeing secondary enforcement efforts across the state, and there's been some legislation placing new violations in this secondary enforcement category. example, for you on the next slide so I think what's important to consider here what might be some fodder for more discussion is these types of laws require a rational basis.

And so I think it's going to be important to clearly articulate what the Government's goal is in enacting an open container law. What is the impact that this open container law is going to have on roadway safety? This was an interesting study that I found in looking into this a bit. And NHTSA looked at 4 States before and after their open container laws and the percent of fatal crashes that were alcohol involved. There's no actual clarity on whether open containers were involved. But only this. this looked only at crashes where alcohol is involved. So I think that's an area that might need a bit more research.

But even looking at these numbers, aside from South Dakota, there appears to be a slight drop after the open container Law was put into effect. But I don't know how linked an open container is to safety on the roads. I think that's something that we really want to be able to present, and I heard from the engineering subcommittee. Also, people want to understand. My laws are being put into effect. They want to understand and be provided with the data that leads to decision making. And so I think that could be one where, if we get more data, this could be a great one, and this could make a lot of sense. But I think maybe we'd need to see more to convince folks that this is a worthwhile endeavor, and that this will ultimately lead to safer roads. You know the example being is this a distracted driving measure? Is the person distracted by consuming alcohol? Are we framing this as a more of an impaired driving? Type focus where the fact that a person is consuming alcohol is so inextricably linked with impairment that we don't want them doing that.

I think we have to be really clear about our goals. There and then. We also want to consider consistency with how we are dealing with other laws, and the example that this immediately triggered for me was consumption of cannabis in a in a motor vehicle and so the 2021 legislative session.

The legislature created a new misdemeanor offense for smoking cannabis in a motor vehicle for either the driver or the passenger of that motor vehicle, but it made him enforcement of that secondary. And so officers must observe another offense before they can stop that vehicle and enforce the mystery in our offensive smoking. cannabis and motor vehicle. So you know that's very closely linked to me in my mind with this open container law, so I think we'd have to be cognizant of some inconsistent applications with other laws on the book. I think that's all I have so I will take questions, and I'm sure I can volunteer either Mark or Terry to answer some about these proposals.

Garrett- Thank you. Thank you, Jackie. Any Council members feel third raise your hand. I think you bring up some really interesting points about the need for clarity around data to justify some of these proposals as well as what our goals are in advocating for some of these proposals. These. Some of these have long been Connecticut Dot proposals at the Legislature. Each year. motorcycle helmets, open container. Never advance far we keep doing the don Quixote tilting at windmills or sometimes it feels like Sisyphus. But I'll go to John first thanks Aaron.

Question from John- so just a question about the open container law with respect to Connecticut and you said that we don't have one. So if a if a policeman pulls somebody over for a stop of some kind, and they see an open container in the vehicle is the pre is the immediate presumption that the driver's been drinking I'm just curious as to we're sort of where that line is. They might see one in the car, and maybe not immediately, you know, smell alcohol in the breath, or smell it even in the vehicle. If, if, say the passenger was one legitimately drinking and the driver wasn't. But you know, in in the process of the routine traffic, stop in that sense is the presumption that that they haven't drink drinking because we you said that we do have a driving while drinking law, and unless you actually, unless the policeman's pulled him over seeing them you know. Take a drink. Is it their automatic presumption that they have

been? I'm just curious yeah and there isn't and you identify some of the issues that police officers have, and I'm sure mark chime in here but that's an issue with enforcement I mean the law about drinking. Well, driving right now requires drinking while driving and so, unless you actively see it, your hands are tied, and there is no legal presumption or that kind of automatic assumption that the person has been drinking and lesson arises to a level of probable cost, where the trooper officer physically see the operator consuming that all is beverage. Or we have witness data support that the powerful cause where we can't take it

Answer from Susan - Sorry. I'm just trying to show my video others It's only that. Actually, I do want to comment on this last slide here. This is showing I totally agree that looking at the data around some of these issues for evaluation purposes is important to do. I'm not sure how much of that is being done in order to validate policy, or to see if policies working around Some of these laws, so that's something to consider around open container or Some of these new cannabis laws that are being put into place. I know there's a group here. d ph that's looking at cannabis related injury and other effects of recreational cannabis law. I'm sure motor vehicle is one of the things they're looking at. so maybe more to come on that as far as you know, some of the data around that. So just wanted to think one just to appreciate the fact that you're thinking about that another thing that I was wondering about for proposal Number 4 when you were talking about the work zones because they were talking about you were talking about drivers being cited if they speed durant over a during a work zone over 15 miles per hour. so is there any onus on the work zone? setup, or the people who set up the work zone if it's not set up properly. If there is speeding, or an accident that occurs So I only and I know that Karen knows much more than I about this particular topic. But I only cut and paste it. portions of the very extensive statutory language. There are provisions for at least how you're supposed to alert folks, that this is a work zone.

And so in terms of the setup you know I don't know that there's anything in particular saying your equipment cannot be 3 feet over the line, or something as specific as that there are certain notice signage provisions. that would alert people that this is a work zone that they're heading into. This is the posted speed limit for that zone. the pilot to be implicated. Yes, every case of you know of the staff or at the work zone ever being found efficient. Yeah, I mean, I can kinda so right now on the books even before the pilot. There's been a statute about work zones and increase penalties for speeding and work zones. But you know officers are not able to chase someone. If they have been speeding through the work zone. But So there is very prescriptive standards for Connecticut staff to follow, and contractors to follow, and setting up those work zones compliant with osha standards, I mean and the employees out there contracts out there wanna have the safest place possible because it's their lives on the line. But for the camera proposal. It is very prescriptive in terms of providing signage that there will be cameras up ahead, etc. To make sure that they know it's coming

Garrett- Okay, thank you any other questions for Council members See? None. Okay, thank you. all. I appreciate it. Move on to education. Hi go ahead. Sorry no Go ahead and get right into it. We have Amy Watkins for watch from me our name Utility from Dmv and Shawn Mark DiCoccoalso from Dmv. Go right ahead.

Amy- Thank you. and I just I want to start by saying I'm applauding the work that has been presented so far it's clearly reflective of some robust and thoughtful conversations that you've all had, and it's just

been super interesting, and to see what you've all come up with so great child so I'm reporting for the Education Subcommittee next slide.

So we had a few meetings this is from the very start We've met what's that 5 times I can't count all of a sudden, and we might most recently on September the 20 eighth to finalize our policy proposals. We had a number of State agencies represented as well as some other community agencies, and also community groups. Representatives from advocate communities, such as a different bike walk, organizations, health departments. We've had some engineers so we've had quite a few great people contributing to our conversation. So next slide. Okay, So some of the themes that we heard while we were going through all of our discussions is one being the need for driver retraining once you're tested at 18 there's really no further update or education outreach even as laws change unless you're involved in a violation situation for say car seats, for example.

There's no other touch points to educate people, especially as we change the laws, or even as we change infrastructure to let people know you know what things like yield lines. Are We talked about the need for educating children, especially about being a safe bicyclist and pedestrian, and trying to get that information, and those good practices to them, while they're while they're young and growing and finally, that need to address current dangerous trends.

So, as people have mentioned, Jackie mentioned with the work crashes some of these emerging issues that we're, seeing that we need to address impairment specifically and not to discount all of the impairment issues that continue to be problematic in our state, but also with the recent legalization of marijuana, especially given that there's no current way to actually test for the current amount of intoxication. Like we do with other with things like alcohol impairment? So that's an issue that that we feel needs to be addressed.

Some other discussion points that that we talked about was the need for the Dmv. Training materials to reflect new laws in a timely manner. Again. It gets back to areas ways that we can reach drivers with new and updated information at different points as well as getting those new drivers trained with the most current information and child passenger safety came up a lot, and we know a lot of folks are working on that, including Dmv. Dot. Private agencies and other groups. So that is a continuous topic that comes up that people need to be educated about and we need to address.

So next slide. Okay, so and continue on. So our first area. So what we? we divided it up into sort. of umbrellas where we had some at sometimes more than one proposal idea that would relate to the overall goal. So what we're saying that that is we're flexible at this point, with what specifically we'd want to adapt as long as we're addressing this the main issue and in this case it would be to utilize schools to better educate children about road safety, and that rationale being that teaching children to be safe, bicyclists and pedestrians is a good starting point for a lifetime of road safety awareness. You children can also influence parent behavior. you know, when you have transitioning people into the buckling up.

When older folks were not used to buckling up, and we really educated children about the importance of buckling up, and they can serve as a reminder to their parents in the car. So that is another tool for reaching other folks, being just children.



So one of the ideas that was proposed by the group was to create an initiative between the DOT and the Department of Education to include transportation, education, and scholastic curriculums, and that would be teaching school-age children the importance of safety, as well as benefits of walking and taking public transit, and to educate them on the importance of their participation in the active transportation network in their communities.

Next slide. A second idea was to create a vision 0 schools program. So there's a similar there's a program in North Dakota. We could model something after it if we wanted to go this route, and where we would create a list of criteria for school to become a vision 0 school, which would include, you know, traffic, safety, education to students, peer-to-peer education, parent, outreach, safety messaging, and I ideally, the agencies would not have to do that. Education themselves, but that we would have enabled schools to do it. And with the help from community partners. So maybe having some kind of a voluntary way to sign up to be a vision 0 school and helping them along the way with that next slide.

Our potential recommendation number 2 is to utilize the judicial system in driver retraining, so driver retraining, came up a number of times. How can we reach people? And in this case, how do we reach them? If they are traffic offenders. And so maybe something like an offense specific retraining class.

So expanding, the operator retraining program to include an option for the judicial branch to offer class tailored to an offense as part of a plea deal which might reduce the amount of the fine for example, if they got a distracted driving ticket they could take a class on that, and why it's important and it could be similar. We have something in place already for child passenger safety if you're caught with a child that's not you know, secured in a car. Then you do take a pretty aggressive class. So they really get you in there, and they and they teach you. Why, that is dangerous. So this is something that would take some time to set up. But it we could use that traffic to get processed to as an education.

Touch point for folks next slide, please. So our third umbrella area is to increase options for driver retraining. So has previously stated. After you take your first test we don't have any other times where we are teaching folks about without safe driving reminding them about the best driving behavior and about anything that's new. So you know, for example, if you if you get your license when you're 1617, you know, you may go 30, 40, 50 years that you are driving, and a lot changes in that amount of time. The infrastructure changes. Laws change. And how are we in an organized way getting that information to people?

So we had sort of 2 dueling options, one being a mandatory retraining where possibly people are entered after, you know. After a certain threshold from when they got their license, they're entered into a sort of like a jury like a selection process, because we are aware that to train every single person in the State is a heavy lift. But maybe we have something where people are selected randomly for driver retraining.

Another option is based on the AARP model for the older, driving old, older, driving course that offers an auto insurance discount, and that is voluntary. And The AARP has reported very successful. They have more people attending those classes than any of the other New England States, and if we were to expand this inside-based driver education to people say you know 20 to 55 that may be really appealing to young male drivers who have the highest insurance rates, and who are the most frequent offenders.

So they are the people that we want to target. anyway. when you look at crash, statistics frequently offenders for impairment and for other things, our young male drivers. So if we are able to entice people with that monetary incentive and offer something for driver education. But they could get at any point in their life to get that discount. There would be further discussion about how often you can take it and I'm sure a Rp. Would be involved, would be able to tell us how they do that. How long does your discount last before you need to take another class, and so forth? You next page. Our next umbrella area is the utilizing the Dmv. To educate drivers on a more frequent basis. So the Dmv. Is very involved in probably the agency most involved with our with drivers on a regular basis. They you know there's many points where you need to interact with the Dmv. And so there may be opportunities there where education could be added.

One proposal was to empower dmv to have more thoughtful engagements with drivers at every opportunity such as when you're renewing your license or registration, Maybe if you're getting a new license. This could be in a form of a video that you have to watch. That could talk about new laws could focus specifically on certain topics that are were more concerned about.

For example, you know, bikes and pets, or things like wrong way crashes And this, for example, that could be something that we use for the wrong way, driving dust that we're seeing even more right now. So we could focus that and change it and allow those touch points to occur more frequently throughout a drivers life. And next slide, please. We also had a proposal around incorporating specific Connecticut driver training materials specific to Connecticut laws with any out of State license. Drivers who are trying to becoming Connecticut residents are playing for Connecticut drivers license. So you know this is again a point where we have certain laws that maybe another State doesn't have.

How are we reaching those people with what Connecticut's laws? Are the three-foot passing law and any of the other laws sick, for example, that were mentioned earlier. So we want to make sure that we are educating those folks about our law here in Connecticut. Yeah. next slide, please. This policy recommendation involves using Dp: or, you know, similar public health entities. And D. Ph. is a leading source of safety and health information, and so they may be able to play a larger role in traffic. Safety. education. proposal idea was very specific but you know it's a it's one of the ways that that this could be. This could be brought into effect, and of course there could be many other ways that they're involved in traffic safety. But, for example, about prescription drugs and driving, you know, as driving, that is also prescription drugs, also, including opioids over the counter medications, and maybe even marijuana medical marijuana. So D. Ph. could choose one or 2 local health departments or districts, and collaborate on an educational initiative around the dangers of driving under the influence of these drugs. and it could include outreach to pharmacies or hospitals, methadone clinics who could themselves communicate the information to drivers who are receiving those medications.

So we want to increase that education around impair driving specific to things that are deemed quote unquote safe that aren't illegal, but still can also impair your driving and next slide. So the Dmv. is at the top. Ignore that that is a typo that was supposed to be on a different page. That's our fault. But, anyway, so there are 3 Major points where that they kept coming up.

That we didn't have a real fleshed out policy recommendation around, and we recognize that this much of this work is being done by other agencies, and it you know it is It is happening for example, with child passenger safety there's a working group sponsored by the National governors, Governors association that's focused on so cps that's being led primarily out of the do team There's many people involved in

that initiative, and they are in the midst of their work. But we would hope that whatever recommendations and proposals they come out with should be reviewed and considered to back those if appropriate. Again, child, passenger, safety, fundamental things, something that came up frequently for people as an issue that we need to address.

Next would be back to Dmv. which is making sure those driver education materials are updated to reflect the new laws and also responsive to current traffic violence trends. So we were unsure. How, you know, with driving schools, what are the regulations around? How often they have to update the materials that they use who is checking on that? Who's doing oversight I know I personally when going out to traffic safety's, track driving schools to teach and talk to the instructors about bike and pedestrian safety. I had many, many times where the instructors did not know basic infrastructure things or basic law things. They did not know what sharks through yield lines were they didn't know about the 3 foot passing off.

So it's definitely not all driving education instructors but it should there shouldn't be that great of a percentage of our important. There's just such an important role in teaching young drivers they should know all the latest and greatest. and you know things. So what? what is our process for making sure that is happening?

And then we may think about. We talked a lot about messaging and campaigns and things like that, you know, being an education subcommittee. You know what kinds of things, what kinds of messages would we want out there? And how can we coordinate among agencies to maybe release information at the same time together, focusing on certain issues at the same time? Just for message, saturation and coordination. So that is another option that came up a few that came in after we submitted this. The slide deck one is to increase public announcements and promotions regarding changes in driver safety laws.

So, as I've mentioned people are often not aware of changes, and we need to do a better job making them aware and actually think that's it for our final discussion items. And this might be our last slide. so happy to answer questions about anything that we presented.

Garrett- Thank you, Amy. Any Council member set One thing that stood out to me was that the idea of the video being shown? I think it. the concept of the reeducation came up both under the judicial as well as the Dmv. I think maybe Jackie knows this but isn't there a there's unrelated. But there's for certain infractions that occur you have to watch a video in order to get rid of your citation. I think it's through this central fractions bureau runs that program. But it could be based on the similar type of concept where you have to watch the video. It's about certain traffic laws in order to get rid of that citation. But I actually don't know about that then I'm gonna look into it because it's interesting. I actually just as an aside since you called on me there I think that's a great idea. I think having I love it to be in person. but I think the last few years have taught us that video options are always a good thing to keep in your back pocket.

But this idea of almost diversionary programs on a much smaller scale, specific to those types of moving violations, would be a great option for prosecutors to take advantage of, and resolving these tickets in a meaningful way. it feels like we're really addressing the conduct So I will look into that that video.

Amy- Thank you, Garrett. and I know the technology exists where If you try to do like, Turn it on and turn off the volume and change the tab. So you're not looking at it it'll stop so you can't like, ignore the video. So the technology exists to force you to actually watch it.

Susan, and I know you have to run so I'll let you go.

Susan- Yes, I just wanted to bring up the point about when Amy was talking about. how d ph can be involved with local health departments.

One of the things that we've been doing with the department of mental health and addiction services is we've helped them target or find high risk local health departments to work with, and fund to around opioid overdoses and prevention and awareness. So one of the things I was thinking of as I was listening to Amy was that if Dot has funding, we could help them actually find high risk areas or local health departments in high risk areas that would want to be funded or apply for funding So you know that's how I think at this point we can be involved, because we don't really have any funding on our end for prevention around a motor vehicle safety red reduction of injuries so do t, I believe, could work with local health environments. so long, you know, is and get partner with them on that And you raise a really great point about working off of some of the things that are already occurring. You know you're already got those connections you're already working on another aspect of the same issue. So knowing what is happening, in what agencies are working on and building on. It is a great opportunity if we could find that extra support to expand what some of the departments are already doing. Yeah, no, I agree. Alright, I got a head out. But thank you very much.

This is great meeting. Thanks. Any other questions from Council members.

Thank you all for the hard work on this I mean it's I know you, said Dmv wasn't supposed to be at the top of the slide here, but I know Dmv is key they are like the main the government entity that most people have most interaction with in State government. Right when you're renewing so that renewal of your license or registration is a great touch.

Point to re-educate people. Okay. Final subcommittee, Alright, we see it save the best for last. This is our Equity Subcommittee. Please forgive me for the time over there.

Commissioner, being represented by Catherine Greedy today, and Alec Slasky from triple a northeast. Alec.

Alec- I believe this is new. Thanks so much, Aaron and my presentation. Will the a little bit briefer than some of the others because I think they covered some of the initiatives that we're gonna talk through and in the presentation, But I think in terms of the mandate of the equity committee and this is something that we've been talking about since the first time we met.

We want to look at equity specifically in traffic safety and there's equity throughout there's inequity throughout the transportation system, both here in our state and around the country, whether based on race, or income or gender or age or disability status. We want to focus specific specifically on the things that are related to traffic, safety.

And things that are in Connecticut's purview like things related to Federal motor vehicle standards, and how there's inequity based on crash test dummies are really designed for people that that look like me, and not for folks that are younger children are overweight, or women. That's something that is definitely

inequity definitely some that should be addressed, not quite within our purview here within Connecticut.

So just a quick recap of some of the things we've done since the June meeting we had a subcommittee meeting, we working groups that that were going to be doing the work over the next few months and curious to hear any feedback on those wanna dive deeper into issues. Relate to individuals with disabilities, pedestrians, bicyclists, and low income individuals who are all, in one way or another, especially vulnerable or disproportionately impacted in a in a native way by our transportation system, and, of course we've had further discussion of some of the possible recommendations.

So we can move on to the first one and I think all of these, as mentioned as has been mentioned by some of the other co-chairs, for, taken as preliminary. And of course we're going to be coming back in a couple of months the finalized recommendations. But this is something that Amy alluded to. just in the last slide. From the last presentation a car seat distribution program for needy families.

And this is something that certainly Dot has been taking a lead on with a variety of different agencies and outside stakeholders as well, including the National Governors Association. But one of the reasons that this is such a priority is, hey? We know there is disparity in who uses car seats correctly, and who has access to car seats. And we also know this is a Federal priority de the bipartisan infrastructure bill. Known as the infrastructure investment in jobs, states highway safety plans to include actions that encourage among underserved populations and that's the that's the stick but they also have a carrot, and the Ij does have grants. That allows States to recruit technicians and train them to educate caregivers, and to purchase and distribute low, low income and underserved population.

So this is clearly a priority of the Federal Government for until we get another highway bill, and who knows how long? So this is something that the state has taking an interest in and I We've always had a pretty robust car seat program. We can go the next slide. But I think this is something that we want to try to formalize. And there are a couple of States we can. There you go. There are a couple states that have formal programs based on you know. The eligibility could be based on enrollment in some other Program I think it has to be determined. But I think there's certainly agency buying and buying from outside stakeholders that this is something that's worth pursuing. And is an important initiative to make sure that we get at the hands of the folks who need it, and ultimately under the kids who need it. So I think this is A is a great initiative.

I think. Yeah, I know a lot in some of my colleagues at Triple A and at your agencies, too. Probably our child passenger safety technicians, and they see folks coming in who have seats that are years old and, you know, are out of date expired, and we want to make sure that everyone has the ability to Into the next slide, and this is something that was mentioned by both Well, Jackie and Amy, in terms of optimizing the traffic, they get processed for safety. So any kind of cover this I don't want to get into it too much detail. But I will say we are in Connecticut blessed to have one of the best traffic ticket systems in the country, both in terms of the access to justice and in terms of the racial traffic. stop selection.

Did you do the judicial branch has an online address education system that has one awards from the Governor's Highway Safety Association? And not every flea offer necessarily includes the requirements for safety education. Some certainly do. But the other ender programs that are out there are only required after multiple tickets. and so that's a requirement at that point. We want to make something

that hey? If you want to fight the ticket, and can test it entirely. That's certainly still your right but if you're gonna take a plea deal for certain offenses you should have to have some robust education. So, Amy kind of cover that we got the next slide.

But classes. So whether for a speed distracted driving this has been, you know, piloted in some courts around the country as well. So this is something, you know, that that has been done, that we can learn from others about how to best do it.

The third recommendation I think something that's really important to the Equity Committee, and I know it's so. A lot of your agencies as well is to make sure we tailor the educational outreach that we're doing as much as possible to the folks we're trying to connect with. And to try to reach the underserved or vulnerable communities where they are. And so some ideas that we have in all of these, I would say, are things that grains of an idea, maybe more than grains of an idea, but not necessarily so. so formalized in the way that we're doing them just yet. But we want to partner with organizations that work with immigrants or refugees to provide safety education to folks who are new to the Us. You know, Yeah, may come from countries where the transportation system was very similar to the Us. And that make them from countries where it looks very different. And we want to make sure everyone has the opportunity to learn our laws, to learn our culture. Not in our traffic safety culture, and in particular and It's not always necessarily a good thing. We've got a lot of work to do in our traffic safety culture. But I think we wanna learn. We wanna make sure folks are learning that information.

I know Dmv is working with a variety of stakeholders to partner with folks that are re-entering society, leaving incarceration for a cdl program and I think That's. A great idea I know that was part of recent legislation, and I think this could also include, or maybe separately include, traffic safety refers, depending on how long folks have been incarcerated not want a cdl but if they've been in the penal system for long enough they may benefit from reeducation about new laws new technologies and vehicles. Additionally, we wanna that are having culturally competent safety campaigns that are tailored to minority and or low-income communities when it comes to mind, is seat belts where we know racial minorities specific Men in particular, have lower rates and seatbelt usage. These are based on national statistics, but I think some looking at the ura space.

Similar statistics as well. So we want to make sure that we're meeting folks where they are and that we're really trying to target the dangerous behaviors and get posted, and you can go to the next slide. And this is these are some areas where we're trying to get a little bit of a better understanding of the problems that are out there.

So no concrete policy recommendations. Just yeah, they said that we wanna get the information where we might be able to do that. But we want to analyze injury data by race and sex, and I know that there was the UCONN Crash data Repository is as a gold mine. for me it on a personal level.

But I think there, there's a lot more that can be done in terms of looking at injury data as well from hospitals that might have racial data. So we want to try to pinpoint if there are any behaviors that disproportionately affect certain groups. And again, you know, really make edges. the number one way that we're trying to reach out to folks We wanted to take a look at driver education which I think Amy mentioned in in the last presentation. Quality driver education all across the state, so whether you're in an urban community or in a real world community. We wanna make sure that you have the ability to take a good driver. Education, and that folks can afford it as well and then we also want to study

disability access Both you, you know we know there's been work done on state roads, local roads as well, making sure there are about pedestrian signals and curb cuts where they need to be provided that we're following all these engineering guidelines.

Of course, I think you know we're not ready to put forth a recommendation that says, you know these have to be everywhere, for every single corner. We know that there are funding constraints, and we know, of course, the ADA does have requirements for you. New construction or new traffic bytes. But we just want to get a better sense of the conditions that are out there today.

So you know that's, some of the things we've been talking about. Happy to hear any suggestions or taken to account any thoughts that anyone else might have, and certainly more to come over the next few months.

Garrett- Thank you, Alec, and thank you to all the subcommittee members on the Equity. One quick question for me, and then I'll if any other Council members have their hands up on the child passenger safety. Did you all have a chance to meet with Juliet Little from Connecticut, DOT, who runs that program? And so is the proposal to like refine the current program. And okay?

Alex- yeah. So I mean Catherine I don't know if you want to jump in here. But I know that I you know I've talked to Juliet myself about that from you know not necessarily from the Equity Committee standpoint, from a triple A standpoint. But I know that those there are conversations that that DMV has had with Julia. They can work together to implement it. So I think it's just the recommendation to keep moving forward with that work. Meet with her, and maybe the recommendation could be ways to adjust the program, because we do expend a lot of Federal funds on that program today. So if there are specific changes to the program that exist today, maybe that could be delineated out in the in the recommendation.

Thanks, Garrett. Alex going back to policy recommendation. 3. I think if we could just go back to that slide. The tailored educational outreach I'd like to see an accessibility component in there, because with a lot of educational materials, there's oftentimes and actually an equal access issue for persons with various disabilities that make those materials challenging to educate those folks or to train them, test them out, and so forth. So you know I noticed that you mentioned minority and low income communities, but I'd like you to see I like to see a in accessibility and disability component in that as you guys continue your work. So just one of add that comment. Thanks

Aaron- that's great John and really, really appreciate that. And I may reach out to you. offline to try to chat a little bit more.

Garrett- Any other Council members see none. Okay. So what do we talk about? Next step for subcommittees. So I want to start first of all by thanking everyone who presented today, and everyone who's participating in subcommittee is clearly a lot of work effort has gone into this and you know we on the Council appreciate everything you've done to bring it this far. I think, from my perspective, what we what I'd like to see is no wait. You all in the subcommittee is deem your final proposals. Probably 2 weeks before our December thirteenth. Meeting that'll give the council time to receive it and renew them. Because you know what we're going to want to do is in is transmit our final like our annual report to the Legislature. Early in January to get to legislature, and I think we'd want to include as many proposals as the Council can reach. Consensus on based on the subcommittee work. So giving us a at

least 2 weeks time before our meeting I think we'll give us that and then we can all review that before our meeting. And I think also one of I think engineering raised a question about endorsing. Another subcommittee's, proposal I think that'd be great if you include that in your recommendations as a subcommittee like if engineering says we and we support, also support recommendation on automated traffic enforcement. you know, including that type of acknowledgement, can help us. when we're writing our report, saying, like you know, X committees made this recommendation, or this was supported by all the other committees, or, at least one other committee so I think that's helpful.

Any questions for and it doesn't need to I guess I'll make it easier for all of you, too. So you don't need to reinvent the wheel but just taking your slide deck and maybe just for finding the slide deck. So you don't have to like do a word document or transpose anything if you just wanna keep what you have prepared already, and just refine with your final proposal to make your life easier. May not make it easier on me and Aaron. But make your life easier, and you've put all the hard work into it already.

So any questions from the subcommittee chairs to us on the Council before we go to public comment. Okay, and I'm available. Aaron and I are available. If you if things something comes up and you're like way I wanna ask about this, or what do you want for that? Just feel free to reach out where Great. So Yep. next meeting December thirteenth, and then we will work to lay out a full schedule for 2023 Prior to the end of this year, as well, I think that's all the administrative task right Aaron before we turn to public comment.

Aaron- Yeah, I believe so nobody I didn't have anything from anybody else this time.

So I think we're ready to move on just a quicker minor going into public comment. Please raise your hand. Use the Q. A. box dude foia and public access loans. Please refrain from using the chat. we want you to enter questions into the Q. A. Box. so if I see any raised hands I'll get to those first we did have a question in the Q.

A. Q. A. box come in from Kate Rattan regarding work, zone, safety.

Q: Is it within your purview to study whether uniform flaggers are as effective as municipal or state police in maintenance and protection of traffic activities? The cost of police is significantly higher than that of uniform flaggers, and it is unclear. If there is a clear benefit of police overflowers. This adds not only to project cost, but also long term municipal liability to an increased overtime for pension officers.

A: So. I'm not sure exactly. be able to answer that Karen Do you have an answer? Or does anyone know Kate that's a good point I don't have a specific answer? But I think it's something. maybe We can do maybe we can have someone at the do a lit review and see if anything has been published on this and Then maybe the enforcement committee If you've come across anything in your review as Well, and we can just have an update at the next meeting, but I can see if someone in the Dot can do a little review on that, as well maybe transportation research board or Ashton might have done something on that just one thing to add on the State police side. I can't speak for municipal side but it those jobs are not calculated into our pensions.

Good point. Terry Thompson, you should be able to go ahead and pose your question.

Oh, on the work zone. That study has taken place already. And, like Kevin, is mentioning that unlimited access highways. There is not ability to use a uniform flagger for traffic control, but they can do the



maintenance protection a traffic setup. I know this because I was the work, sound safety chair, and very involved in the department of transportation. And all of this so garret there was a lot of study work done on that already, maybe able to defer over to the office construction on that. I don't know if that would be and I don't know if Mark is on or he got called away I don't know if that would be under our purview to really be part of what we're discussing on the work zone enforcement side on the I assume she's talking about the automated works on enforcement yeah I'll talk to John Dunham, for in construction and see if he anything also check with Maybe Joe let You might have an idea of where that might be located as well. So that's a great point.

Garrett- Not seeing any more raised hands or questions in the Q. A. We can just give one more minute in case folks I want to have the opportunity to ask the question. Aaron what's the email? address for vision, 0 again? account again? Because if people wanna maybe submit comments on some of the proposal proposals that have been submitted, I'll get that right now,

Aaron- [CTvisionzero@ct.gov](mailto:CTvisionzero@ct.gov)

Garrett- Well, then, I'm gonna move to recommend we wrap up for today. Appreciate everyone spending the past couple of hours with us. Any objections to adjourning the meeting. No, okay, thank you. Everyone appreciate the time today, and thanks for all our work.

Adjourned at 1:53