


RE: Complete Streets Fund - Draft Text Amendment

bill.veronesi@gmail.com <bill.veronesi@gmail.com>

Sun 11/27/2022 4:35 PM

To: Yi, Grace <Grace.Yi@hartford.gov>

Cc: Owen Deutsch <Owen.Deutsch@hartford.gov>; 'Gannon Long' <gannonlong@gmail.com>

 1 attachments (27 KB)

Complete Streets Fund Text Amendment DRAFT 112022WAVedits.docx;

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact the helpdesk at 860-757-9411 if you have any questions.

Hi Grace,

Attached is a suggested revision of the Complete Streets Fund text. (I suggest you first look at it with no markup set in the track changes menu.)

The two main objectives of the revision offered are to clarify that the funds are to be used primarily for the benefit of non-automotive users and to introduce the idea that we have a long-term vision with a 10-year priority list. The long-term vision must still evolve and change, but it should explicitly exist and should guide the use of funds. As to assuring primarily non-automotive benefit, the original text seems to open the possibility that funds could be diverted for what should be routine road maintenance, arguably mostly benefiting automotive users.

The revised first sentence, I believe, will encompass appropriate projects not specifically listed, so I do not think we need to include the phrase “and more” when enumerating project types.

I introduced the hierarchy, “transit users, pedestrians, bicyclists, and micro-mobility users,” introducing micro-mobility at the same time to encompass scooters. Though not listed, automotive users are in the hierarchy but at the bottom of the priority list, and I believe there are plenty of other sources for funding improvements and repairs mostly benefiting automotive users.

Not meaning to impugn the integrity of our current director of Public Works and appreciating that expediency can be a good thing, I still believe, however, that the discretion of the current and future directors of Public Works should be limited in terms of allowing these funds to benefit private landowners without significant benefit to the public. So, instead of no explicit minimum, I am suggesting some specific minimum easement period or a requirement for further review beyond the director. I listed 5-years or Council approval, though there may be a better set of limits. There must be precedent for this kind of trade-off, but the public deserves an explanation of how using these funds benefits them if the resulting improvements will not remain in the public realm.

Let me know if you have any questions or if you would like me to comment on any further revisions! I would be glad to discuss the text.

Regards,

Bill Veronesi

(860) 805-4567 Cell – text if I do not answer

From: Yi, Grace <Grace.Yi@hartford.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, November 22, 2022 7:27 PM

To: Gannon Long <gannonlong@gmail.com>; Bill Veronesi <bill.veronesi@gmail.com>

Cc: Owen Deutsch <Owen.Deutsch@hartford.gov>

Subject: Complete Streets Fund - Draft Text Amendment

Hello Gannon and Bill,

Hope you both are doing well! Thank you for being willing to take the time and assist on the Complete Streets Fund. If you could review and provide feedback on the proposed draft Text Amendment, that would be much appreciated.

Again, many thanks, and wishing you a wonderful holiday,

Grace

Grace Yi

Senior Planner (Bike/Ped)

City of Hartford - Department of Development Services

Planning & Zoning Division

(she/her/hers)

260 Constitution Plaza, 1st Floor

Office: 860-757-9222

Combined Comments from:

Bill Veronesi - bill.veronesi@gmail.com

Gannon Long - gannonlong@gmail.com – Suggested edits below in RED and “Author” comments

[NEW] 1.7 Funds

1.7.1 Complete Streets Fund

Complete Streets Fund monies may be used to improve city streets for the benefit of non-automotive users, including transit users, pedestrians, bicyclists, and micro-mobility users. In the areas of safety, function, and aesthetics, the Complete Streets Fund may be used to fund improvements~~in safety, function, aesthetics, and more,~~ predominately ~~benefiting the aforementioned, non-automotive users, and~~ Relevant interventions ~~improvements~~ may include, but are not be limited to: striping; signage; quick, small-scale evaluation projects, i.e. tactical urbanism; storage; charging; other pilot projects; crosswalks; accessible curb ramps; new curbing; roadway repair; bollards, jersey barriers, or other equipment to protect bike lanes, or paving primarily benefiting non-automotive users; new sidewalks; streetscape improvements; maintenance of streets and public rights of way primarily benefiting non-automotive users; and design services associated with the direct implementation of any of the aforementioned items. In terms of safety improvements, allowable uses include projects that provide bicycle, pedestrian, and/or transit safety education and projects that encourage individuals to walk, ride, and/or bicycle more. Micro-mobility options such as scooters or other, emergent modes of sustainable transportation become more prevalent, alternative transportation options such as scooters may also be considered receive funding for safety education and encouragement programs. Grants may be made from the fund to entities who can fulfill any of the listed fund uses. In the event improvements are done on private property, an easement shall be filed on the relevant land records to preserve the area utilized for complete streets improvements for a minimum of 10 years, or as agreed upon by the director of Public Works or their designee but for no less than a minimum of 5 years in any case without council approval.

1.7.1.A Procedures for Budgeting Complete Streets Funds

Deposits to the Complete Streets Fund have been and will likely continue to be made in discrete lump sums. As such, it is challenging to predict when and how much will be deposited into the fund each year, thus the available funds shall be budgeted over 3 fiscal years at minimum to support continuity in implementation over time. Each year, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator in the Department of Development Services will develop and/or update a 10-year Complete Streets project priority plan, and a consistent, rolling 3-year budget for the Complete Streets Fund. This proposal will then be shared with the Department of Public Works for review and comment. Once reviewed at the interdepartmental level, the proposed budget and 10-year priority plan will be made available for public comment and shared with the Planning & Zoning Commission for recommendation; after which it will be made available and circulated for approval by the Office of Management, Budget, and Grants (OMBG), Finance, and the Chief Operating Officer. To account for the intermittent nature of the fund, the Department of Development Services may request as needed interim amendments to the budget consistent with the 3-year and 10-year plan. Interim budget amendment requests will ~~as needed, but must~~ follow the same approval process as stated above.

Commented [BV1]: "more" is too open ended

Commented [A2]: not "predominantly". "exclusively". None of these funds should be spent on cars or related infrastructure.

Commented [A3]: "primarily" suggests funds may/ will also be designed to benefit cars and drivers; this should not be the purpose of any of the funds

Commented [A4]: Big red flag - these funds should not go to planning firms. they should go to direct, quick action. Studies take many years and if they're not funded don't do much. The purpose of these funds is to act quickly, not to just subsidize "planning" consultants.

Commented [A5]: Red flag - language is very vague and can be used for all kinds of patronage - what types of groups are eligible? Who determines? What is the public engagement/ input process? How do we decide what uses are most important?

Commented [A6]: Is the current updated CS plan available? Where would we find it?

Commented [A7]: at what point does the public get to weigh in? Only before planning and zoning, even though all these other entities will review?