

RECORD OF MEETING

Client: SECOG **Date:** 10/29/2025
Meeting Date: 10/16/2025 **Prepared By:** Srilekha Murthy
Meeting Location: Virtual (Teams) **Job Number:** 11584
Meeting Topic: Vision Zero Task Force Meeting 3

ATTENDEES:

NAME	ADDRESS / AFFILIATION	NAME	ADDRESS / AFFILIATION
Kate Rattan	SECOG	Austin Pszenny	BETA
Amanda Kennedy	SECOG	Srilekha Murthy	BETA
David Cook	SECOG	Danielle Chesebrough	Town of Stonington
Debra Pierce	SECOG	Natasha Fatu	CTDOT
Dominic Anziano	SECOG	Brandon McIntyre	Mashantucket Pequot Tribal Nation
Taylor Lussier	SECOG	Sal Tassone	Town of Colchester
Jeff Maxtutis	BETA	Brian Sear	City of New London
Anna Sangree	BETA		

RECORD OF MEETING MINUTES:

Example minutes outline (delete if not needed).

- I. J. Maxtutis began the meeting with an overview of the work that has been done so far on SECOG's Safety Action Plan. Notably, the project team has conducted a significant amount of public engagement over the summer, including convening the Vision Zero Task Force to discuss initial crash trends and high-injury network development, creating and distributing a survey, conducting an in-person and virtual public meeting, conducting interviews with nearly every SECOG community, and meeting with external stakeholders and partner agencies involved in road safety.
 - A. The survey received over 550 responses and represented nearly every municipality in the region
 - B. The in-person and virtual public meetings drew over 20 attendees and asked their opinions on safety issues and strategies in the region
 - C. The project team conducted interviews with 17 municipalities, 1 federally recognized tribe, and three external stakeholders (Safe Routes to School, Warch for Me CT, Department of Public Health)

This extensive public engagement effort provided insight into how people around the SECOG region experience road safety and helped shape the recommendations and countermeasures the project team is proposing.
- II. A. Pszenny discussed the results of the safety analysis previously completed in relation to some of the feedback received through public engagement and stated that both were used in the project development process along with the High-Injury network, previous plans, and the public input map.

Record of Meeting (Continued)

Vision Zero Task Force Meeting #3

October 16, 2026

Page 2 of 3

Overall, there are 88 projects proposed, with 65 focused on motorists and 23 focused on non-motorists.

- III. A. Sangree provided an overview of the types of infrastructure countermeasures proposed for each type of project. Infrastructure countermeasures were derived from a few key sources: NACTO's Urban Street Design Guide, the Federal Highway Administration's Proven Safety Countermeasures resources, and the Crash Modification Factors Clearinghouse, among others. Countermeasures were organized by crash type (e.g. single vehicle crash), potential contributing factors (e.g. wet road surface conditions or obstructions on the side of the road), solutions, and crash modification factor.
- IV. A. Sangree then led a discussion asking task force members about countermeasures they have seen and would like to see more of, as well as any challenges or successes they have had in implementing some of these measures. The conversation is summarized below:
 - A. Colchester has seen CTDOT installing curve ahead or chevron signs, also installed RRFBs (either town or DOT on state roads) by CTDOT, also speed feedback signs around town
 - 1. Note that these are effective when signs are up, but behavior reverts to bad behavior when the signs are removed (if they are temporary)
 - 2. 40 roads in Colchester received curve ahead signage
 - B. Amanda notes that she was surprised that lane narrowing has such a big impact on reducing crashes
 - C. Colchester shared that the town is installing shoulder line striping to narrow a 30 foot roadway to create safer walking areas for pedestrians
 - 1. E.g. Upton Road
 - D. Colchester developed a speed hump policy where 80% of residents must approve of the intervention. They have speed humps on Elm Street where there was a lot of speeding. It has been very effective
 - E. New London recently installed a raised crosswalk by Electric Boat campus
 - 1. Found this to be effective and would like to see them higher to slow drivers down more
 - F. New London tried to do lane narrowing but then ran into issues with zoning board (specifically related to curb bump-outs)
 - 1. K. Rattan noted that certain capital improvements go through Planning & Zoning
 - 2. D. Pierce noted that historic preservation groups sometimes get involved
 - 3. Colchester has done road reconstructions, streetscape improvements, etc. and all of those projects had to go through the Planning and Zoning Commission
 - G. Have they seen pushback from DPW with speed tables, raised crosswalks, curb extensions, speed humps, etc.?
 - 1. New London says it's never been a problem; just need operators that are aware of the new configuration
 - 2. Colchester says their operators are able to handle it
 - 3. Overall, have seen some successes with the raised crosswalks/speed tables
 - H. N. Fatu note that speed tables and raised crosswalks are allowed on state roads, there is one currently in New Haven
 - 1. CTDOT is developing the criteria but generally looking at lower volume roads without a lot of heavy vehicle traffic
 - I. Any challenges?

Record of Meeting (Continued)

Vision Zero Task Force Meeting #3

October 16, 2026

Page 3 of 3

1. Extending sidewalks – resistance from residents, maintenance of sidewalks
 2. Snow clearance, they get billed if they don't clear it. Boy Scouts sometimes help out
 3. New London has many renters who do not clear snow. Pedestrian Advisory Committee is trying to address this problem
 4. Need to make sure you have drainage for raised crosswalks
 5. DEEP grants are more flexible and can be used as match where possible/needed
 6. CTDOT takes a long time to review things
- V. S. Murthy presented an overview of the policy and strategy countermeasures proposed to address safety issues at the regional level. Strategies were derived from SECOG's 2022 Safety Action Plan, safety action plans from other COGs and cities, and recommendations from FHWA and CTDOT. Recommendations included existing CTDOT programs and were organized by facets of the Safe System Approach.
- VI. S. Murthy then led a discussion asking members' experiences engaging with existing CTDOT programs, and what policies and programs did they think would be most effect. The conversation is summarized below:
- A. Can TAR be a source for local match for federal grants? Something for us to look into
 - B. Colchester has requested an illumination study on Routes 149 and 16, requested in 2023 and have not heard back
 1. CTDOT had asked town to look into this, town got back to them to request a study
 2. They will follow up
 - C. New London has made requests to CTDOT for pretty basic things, have to build in a lot of lead time with them
 - D. If that turnaround could be shortened, it would help municipalities in their work planning
 - E. DEEP does provide some funding for matching, and are more flexible in their match requirements
 - F. SECOG is on year 2 of bike microgrant program and they are oversubscribed
 - G. New London has done some education campaigns around a new roundabout
 - H. Grants
 1. Active transportation microgrant program. Hard to measure behavior, but lots of interest
 - I. Education: training, League of American cyclist training
 - J. SRTS and Watch for me CT as additional resources.
- VII. J. Maxtutis concluded the meeting by outlining next steps, which include finalizing the project list, developing countermeasures for each project, finalizing strategies and policies, and developing a draft document by the end of November. The next meeting of the task force will take place during the public comment period and will focus on specific project recommendations.