

Roads

Ref	Checklist Item	Measurement Criteria	Comments	Points
C.1	<b>Congestion Relief &amp; Reduction of Vehicles Miles Traveled</b>			
C.1.1	Does the state charge tolls for the use of roads and/or highways?	<p><b>Mitigation Score:</b></p> <p>5 - The state charges tolls for the use of roads and/or highways; the state toll program includes all 5 of the strategies listed to the right.</p> <p>4 - The state charges tolls for the use of roads and/or highways; the state toll program includes 4 of the strategies listed to the right; must include the equity strategy (in green).</p> <p>3 - The state charges tolls for the use of roads and/or highways; the state toll program includes 3 of the strategies listed to the right.</p> <p>2 - The state charges tolls for the use of roads and/or highways; the state toll program includes 2 of the strategies listed to the right.</p> <p>1 - The state charges tolls for the use of roads and/or highways; the state toll program includes 1 of the strategies listed to the right.</p> <p>0 - The state does not charge tolls for the use of roads and/or</p>	<p>Tolls are considered a useful strategy to reduce vehicular miles traveled, a source of financing for sustainable transportation system investments. Electronic toll collection provides a safer and more energy efficient means of toll collection than traditional toll booths.<sup>i</sup> A potential problem from tolled roads or highways are the resulting congestion of local roads neighboring the toll roads as vehicles seek alternative non-tolled routes. Tolls are often judged as unfairly burdening certain drivers, such as those who live close to the toll sites and rely on the tolled roads or highways for daily commutes or transport, versus those who live elsewhere in the state and whose commute does not require the use of tolled roads or highways. To ensure road pricing that addresses equity, states should address equity transparently early in the planning process, engage the public through community outreach, and build confidence that road pricing income will be spent as planned.<sup>ii</sup></p> <p>A successful toll program varies from state to state, depending on road and highway qualities, volume of usage, and type of usage. Despite differences, a successful state toll program often has the following qualities:<sup>iii</sup></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The toll is priced to cause a reduction in single use occupancy vehicles in favor of carpooling and public transit, as determined by research, monitoring programs and data analysis.</li> <li>Data collection and analysis is performed regularly on scope and impacts of program, and effectiveness in decreasing congestion and vehicular miles traveled is demonstrated.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Mitigation Score: 0/5</b>  <b>Equity Score: N/A</b>  <b>Public Health Score: N/A</b></p> <p>Connecticut does not currently charge tolls for use of any roads or highways. In 1985, Connecticut eliminated toll booths from all state roads and highways in order to increase highway safety.<sup>iv</sup> With the advance of technology to electronic toll collection technology, toll booths are no longer needed for toll collection. The Department of Transportation developed a 2018 report on state electronic tolling.<sup>v</sup> In addition, Connecticut performed two studies in 2016, on state highway congestion on I-95 and I-84, that include a discussion of tolls.<sup>vi</sup></p>

		<p>highways, and is not studying tolls as a congestion relief and financing strategy.</p> <p><b><u>Equity Score:</u></b></p> <p>1 – The state toll program includes criterion ‘e’ listed to the right.</p> <p>0 – The state toll program does not include criterion ‘e’ listed to the right.</p> <p><b><u>Public Health Score:</u></b> N/A</p>	<p>c. The toll income is designated for use, in large part, toward sustainable transportation system investments.</p> <p>d. Impacts of tolls on roads neighboring toll sites is studied and strategies are put into place to minimize congestion from vehicles seeking alternative non-toll routes.</p> <p>e. Toll waivers or reductions are given to certain drivers or communities on whom the tolls create an unfair burden, as determined by research and data analysis. [EQ 2.1]</p>	
C.1.2	<p>Has the state implemented congestion pricing in high traffic areas? [PH.1.1, PH.1.2, PH.5.1]</p>	<p><b><u>Mitigation Score:</u></b></p> <p>4 - The state has implemented Congestion Pricing in high congestion areas; the state program includes all 4 of the strategies listed to the right.</p> <p>3 - The state has implemented Congestion Pricing in high congestion areas; the state program includes 3 of the strategies listed to the right; must include the equity strategy (in green).</p> <p>2 - The state has implemented Congestion Pricing in high congestion areas; the state program includes 2 of the strategies listed to the right.</p> <p>1 - The state has implemented Congestion Pricing in high</p>	<p>Congestion pricing is a strategy to reduce cars on the road during high traffic hours, particularly in congested urban locations, by implementing a toll, or increased toll, for use of certain roads during congested hours. Climate change mitigation benefits include fewer hours of vehicular travel and improved auto efficiency at constant speeds.<sup>vii</sup> Congestion Pricing provides a source of financing for sustainable transportation system investments. Congestion Pricing is often judged as unfairly burdening certain drivers whose livelihood depends on frequent travel in congested areas. To ensure road pricing that addresses equity, states should address equity transparently early in the planning process, engage the public through community outreach, and built confidence that road pricing income will be spent as planned.<sup>viii</sup></p> <p>Successful Congestion Parking programs often include the following:<sup>ix</sup></p> <p>a. Congestion Pricing is priced to cause a reduction in single use occupancy vehicles in favor of carpooling and public transit. [PH.1.1, PH.5.1]</p>	<p><b><u>Mitigation Score: 0/5</u></b>  <b><u>Equity Score: N/A</u></b>  <b><u>Public Health Score: N/A</u></b></p> <p>Connecticut does not currently have any Congestion Pricing in place, but, in 2016, Connecticut performed two studies on highway congestion on I-95 and I-84, that include a discussion of Congestion Pricing.<sup>xi</sup></p>

		<p>congestion areas; the state program includes 1 of the strategies listed to the right.</p> <p>0 – The state has not implemented congestion pricing in high traffic areas.</p> <p><b><u>Equity Score:</u></b></p> <p>1 – The state’s Congestion Pricing program includes criterion ‘c’ listed to the right.</p> <p>0 – The state’s Congestion Pricing program does not include criterion ‘c’ listed to the right.</p> <p><b><u>Public Health Score:</u></b></p> <p>2 – The state’s Congestion Pricing Program includes items ‘a’ and ‘b’ listed to the right.</p> <p>1 – The state’s Congestion Pricing Program includes either item ‘a’ or ‘b’ listed to the right.</p> <p>0 – The state’s Congestion Pricing Program does not include items ‘a’ or ‘b’ listed to the right.</p>	<p>b. Data collection and analysis is performed regularly on scope and impacts of program, and effectiveness in decreasing congestion and vehicular miles traveled is demonstrated. [PH.1.2]</p> <p>c. Impacts of Congestion Pricing on various types of drivers are studied and strategies are put into place to minimize unfair impacts. [EQ 1.1, 2.1]</p> <p>d. Congestion Pricing income is designated for use, in large part, toward sustainable transportation system investments.</p>	
C.1.3	Has the state implemented a Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) fee?	<p><b><u>Mitigation Score:</u></b></p> <p>3 - The state has implemented a Vehicle Miles Traveled fee program that includes all 3 of the strategies listed to the right.</p>	<p>Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) fees are seen as an alternative to a Fuel Tax to fund transportation, as increasing fuel efficiency and alternative fuels generate a decline in Fuel Tax income.<sup>xiii</sup> While Vehicle Miles Traveled fees more fairly distribute the costs of vehicular use based on mileage driven, the fees do not incentivize the use of more fuel-</p>	<p><b><u>Mitigation Score: 0/5</u></b>  <b><u>Equity Score: N/A</u></b>  <b><u>Public Health Score: N/A</u></b></p> <p>Connecticut does not have a Vehicle Miles Traveled fee program. Connecticut conducted a</p>

		<p>2 - The state has implemented a Vehicle Miles Traveled fee program that includes 2 of the strategies listed to the right.</p> <p>1 - The state has implemented a Vehicle Miles Traveled fee program that includes all 3 of the strategies listed to the right.</p> <p>0 - The state has not implemented a Vehicle Miles Traveled fee program.</p> <p><b>Equity Score:</b> N/A <b>Public Health Score:</b> N/A</p>	<p>efficient vehicles. In comparison, a fuel tax less equally charges for the miles driven but penalizes drivers of less fuel-efficient vehicles.<sup>xiii</sup></p> <p>Vehicle Miles Traveled fees, as demonstrated by an Oregon Department of Transportation trial, are based on the actual individual vehicular miles traveled as measured by on-vehicle mileage devices from either vehicle speed sensor data, or location data from Global Positioning Systems (GPS). Vehicle Miles Traveled fees can be paid to service stations at time of fuel purchase, and can be combined with a fuel tax. Vehicle Miles Traveled fees are seen as a more direct way of charging for driver use of roads and highways than a fuel tax.</p> <p>Based on the Oregon trial study, a successful state Vehicle Miles Traveled fee program should include the following strategies:<sup>xiv</sup></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accurate street map base data</li> <li>System flexibility for use in a variety of vehicles, and for adoption to future technology</li> <li>Flexibility for coordination with other state VMT programs</li> </ol>	<p>study in 2012 to learn more about Vehicle Miles Traveled fees as a funding source for transportation initiatives.<sup>xv</sup> In 2021, Governor Lamont directed the CT DOT to establish a 2030 VMT reduction target and to develop a plan to achieve such VMT target.<sup>xvi</sup></p>
C.1.4	<p>In order to reduce commute times and encourage affordable housing, does the state have inclusionary zoning policy? [EQ.2.1, EQ.3.1, EQ.4.2]</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Score:</b></p> <p>1 – The state has an inclusionary zoning policy.</p> <p>0 – The state does not have an inclusionary zoning policy.</p> <p><b>Equity Score:</b></p> <p>5 - The state’s zoning policy includes all five of the green-colored criteria listed to the right.</p>	<p>Inclusionary zoning is the inclusion of affordable housing in municipal zoning to ensure that all people have a place to live in every community. Inclusionary zoning is a strategy for smart growth which reduces highway congestion by housing people closer to their places of work.</p> <p>Inclusionary zoning policies require a percentage of affordable housing units based on median income as compared to an income level. State inclusionary zoning programs can include the following:<sup>xviiixviii</sup></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mandatory municipal participation for affordable housing incorporated into all new development. [EQ 2.1, 3.1, 4.2(?)].</li> </ol>	<p><b>Mitigation Score: 1/1</b> <b>Equity Score: 5/5</b> <b>Public Health: N/A</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In 1990, Connecticut mandated a minimum of 10% affordable housing in all municipalities in CT Gen. Stat. § 8-30g.<sup>xix</sup> Non-compliance permits developers of a minimum of 30% affordable housing units freedom from some local zoning ordinances.<sup>xx</sup></li> </ol>

		<p>4 - The state’s zoning policy includes four of the five green-colored criteria listed to the right.</p> <p>3 - The state’s zoning policy includes three of the five green-colored criteria listed to the right.</p> <p>2 - The state’s zoning policy includes two of the five green-colored criteria listed to the right.</p> <p>1 - The state’s zoning policy includes one of the five green-colored criteria listed to the right..</p> <p>0 - The state’s zoning policy includes none of the five green-colored criteria listed to the right..</p> <p><b><u>Public Health Score:</u></b> N/A</p>	<p>b. State requirement for municipalities to incorporate inclusionary zoning into Comprehensive Plans based on providing an equal and fair share based on regional needs. [EQ 2.1, 3.1].</p> <p>c. Requirement that units must remain affordable for an established period of time. [EQ 2.1, 3.1].</p> <p>d. Provision of incentive(s) to developers, such as a density bonus, to build affordable housing units. [EQ 2.1, 3.1].</p> <p>e. State authorizes developers of affordable housing to appeal to higher courts proposal denials or burdensome conditions set by municipalities. [EQ 2.1, 3.1].</p>	<p>b. <b>In 2017, Connecticut adopted CT Gen. Stat. § 8-30j, which requires that each municipality must amend or adopt an affordable housing plan.</b><sup>xxi</sup></p> <p>c. <b>CT Gen Stat § 8-2i permits municipalities to set aside certain units as affordable for a long-term period.</b></p> <p>d. <b>CT Gen Stat § 8-2i permits municipalities to offer density bonuses for affordable housing inclusion, and to allow developers to make payment into a housing fund for construction of affordable housing in lieu of inclusion of affordable housing in development.</b><sup>xxii</sup></p> <p>e. <b>To support inclusionary zoning, Connecticut allows land use appeals, where developers of affordable housing can appeal town denials of projects where less than 10% of the town housing is affordable, placing the burden of proof of denial of the development proposal on the town.</b><sup>xxiii</sup></p>
C.1.5	<p>Does the state address public health issues related to road and highway congestion? [PH.1.2, PH.1.3]</p>	<p><b><u>Mitigation Score:</u></b> N/A</p> <p><b><u>Equity Score:</u></b></p> <p>2 – The state’s public health approach for issues related to</p>	<p>Co-benefits of traffic congestion reduction measures include improvement of public health concerns related to vehicular road and highway travel: better air quality, a reduction of noise, and a decrease in auto accidents.<sup>xxiv</sup> Health issues due to congestion disproportionately impact communities</p>	<p><b><u>Mitigation Score:</u></b> N/A</p> <p><b><u>Public Health Score:</u></b> 1/5</p> <p><b><u>Equity Score:</u></b> 0/2</p> <p>a. <b>Connecticut has an Environmental Public Health</b></p>

	<p>[EQ.4.1, EQ.4.2]</p>	<p>road and highway congestion uses strategies ‘d’ and ‘e’ listed to the right.</p> <p>1 - The state’s public health approach for issues related to road and highway congestion uses either strategy ‘d’ or ‘e’ listed to the right.</p> <p>0 - The state’s public health approach for issues related to road and highway congestion does not use strategy ‘d’ or ‘e’ listed to the right.</p> <p><b>Public Health Score:</b></p> <p>5 – The state’s public health approach for issues related to road and highway congestion include all 5 criteria listed to the right.</p> <p>4 – The state’s public health approach for issues related to road and highway congestion include 4 criteria listed to the right.</p> <p>3 – The state’s public health approach for issues related to road and highway congestion include 3 criteria listed to the right.</p> <p>2 – The state’s public health approach for issues related to road and highway congestion include 2 criteria listed to the right.</p>	<p>in close proximity to congested roads and highways.</p> <p>A state program that addressed public health issues caused by road and highway congestion could include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Air quality is studied through data analysis [PH.1.2]</li> <li>b. The state reports regularly regarding air quality data and improvements related to state initiatives [PH.1.2]</li> <li>c. Noise quality is addressed through data analysis and reports [PH.1.2]</li> <li>d. Unequal distribution of public health issues tied to congestion are recognized, studied, and addressed in policy. [EQ 4.1, 4.2, PH.1.3].</li> <li>e. Equal distribution of the public health benefits of road and highway congestion reduction strategies is prioritized, addressed in policy, and demonstrated through data analysis. [EQ 1.1, 4.2, PH.1.3].</li> </ul>	<p><b>Tracking Program (EPHT) which studies data that ties in to a national data network set up by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). This program provides communities with a useful tool that tracks Connecticut public health data including air pollution and related public health issues such as asthma, carbon monoxide poisoning, and heart attacks.<sup>xxv</sup></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. The state provides data about public health concerns yet does not appear to provide reports on the data findings, link the public health findings to traffic congestion, or study possible improvements in public health tied to traffic congestion reduction measures. Connecticut's Congestion Relief Study includes no discussion of the relationship of traffic congestion to public health.<sup>xxvi</sup></li> <li>c. The tracking system does not seem to address noise pollution.</li> <li>d. It does not appear that unequal distribution of public health issues related to road and highway congestion are addressed in Connecticut.</li> <li>e. It does not appear that unequal distribution of road and highway congestion mitigation</li> </ul>
--	-------------------------	---	---	---

		<p>1 – The state’s public health approach for issues related to road and highway congestion include 1 criteria listed to the right.</p> <p>0 – The state’s public health approach for issues related to road and highway congestion do not include any of the criteria listed to the right.</p>		<p>strategies are addressed in Connecticut.</p>
<b>C.2</b>	<b>Carpooling/High Occupancy Vehicles</b>			
C.2.1	<p>Do state policies incentivize businesses and individuals to carpool?  <a href="#">[PH.1.1]</a>  <a href="#">[EQ.1.1, EQ.3.1]</a></p>	<p><b><u>Mitigation Score:</u></b></p> <p>6 - The state has policies in place to incentivize businesses and individuals to carpool; the state program includes all six of the strategies listed to the right.</p> <p>5 - The state has policies in place to incentivize businesses and individuals to carpool; the state program includes five of the six strategies listed to the right.</p> <p>4 - The state has policies in place to incentivize businesses and individuals to carpool; the state program includes four of the six strategies listed to the right.</p> <p>3 - The state has policies in place to incentivize businesses and individuals to carpool; the</p>	<p>States incentivize carpooling, or ride-sharing, as a method to increase the number of people traveling on a busy corridor without increasing road or highway congestion. Carpooling lowers individual auto travel expenses related to fuel purchases and vehicle costs, and decreases fossil fuel consumption and harmful vehicular emissions.</p> <p>Many states adopted carpool incentives in the 1970s, such as education programs, ride-sharing rewards or tax credits, HOV lanes, and park-and-ride lots. Many of these policies could be revisited and revised for more relevant application in today's society and culture.</p> <p>Integral to a state carpooling program is an education and information network to publicize and encourage state ride-sharing. Following are strategies that states can employ to incentivize businesses and individuals to carpool:<sup>xxvii</sup></p> <p>a. Tracking the success of all state carpooling policy with data and regular reports on progress and challenges</p>	<p><b><u>Mitigation Score: 3/6</u></b>  <b><u>Equity Score: 0/1</u></b>  <b><u>Public Health Score: 0/1</u></b></p> <p>a. <b>The Connecticut Department of Transportation runs the CT Rides program providing information and ride sharing services to encourage carpooling and public transit. The CT Rides website provides feedback on the success of the program suggesting that the state is tracking the program performance with data.</b></p> <p>b. <a href="#">While Connecticut has nearly 40 miles of High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes in the Hartford area on Interstates 84, 91 and 384, HOV lanes are not in place near any other Connecticut cities.</a><sup>xxviii</sup></p>



		<p>state program includes three of the six strategies listed to the right.</p> <p>2 - The state has policies in place to incentivize businesses and individuals to carpool; the state program includes two of the six strategies listed to the right.</p> <p>1 - The state has policies in place to incentivize businesses and individuals to carpool; the state program includes one of the six strategies listed to the right.</p> <p>0 – The state does not have a carpooling policy in place.</p> <p><b><u>Equity Score:</u></b></p> <p>1 – The state’s carpooling program includes criterion ‘f’ listed to the right.</p> <p>0 -The state’s carpooling program does not include criterion ‘f’ listed to the right.</p>	<p>b. <b>Carpool lanes on most state highways that provide a less congested lane for High Occupancy Vehicles (HOV) [PH.1.1]</b></p> <p>c. <b>Reduced or no tolls for High Occupancy Vehicles (HOV) in high-occupancy toll (HOT) lanes</b></p> <p>d. <b>State incentives for businesses and individuals to carpool, other than carpool lanes or toll reductions, such as awards, discounts, or tax credits</b></p> <p>e. <b>Park-and-ride carpool lots at many highway entrances to encourage carpooling</b></p> <p>f. <b>Equal distribution of all state carpool initiatives, including park-and-ride carpool lots, to all state residents demonstrated by data analysis and regular reports. [EQ 1.1, 3.1].</b></p>	<p>c. Connecticut does not currently have in place any high-occupancy toll (HOT) lanes since there are no tolls on any Connecticut highways or roads.</p> <p>d. <b>Connecticut has a voluntary traffic reduction program for employers with the reward of tax credits, for the purpose of achieving the goals of the Clean Air Act, as a result of Conn. Gen. Stat. §13b-38p.<sup>xxix</sup> Programs that result from law from the 1990s could be reconsidered for more useful application today.</b></p> <p>e. <b>Connecticut has in place an extensive network of park-and-ride carpool lots, developed in the 1970s and 1980s, following a law, Conn. Gen. Stat. §13b-29, requiring these lots.<sup>xxx</sup></b></p> <p>f. <b>While CT Rides seems to address all state residents based on the range of information and services offered, equal distribution of state-ride sharing benefits is not demonstrated by data or reports<sup>xxxi</sup>. In addition, research could be done to document the locations of the park-and-ride lots to evaluate the equity of the distribution of benefits.</b></p>
--	--	---	--	---



<p>C.3.1</p>	<p>Does the state implement sustainable road and highway construction strategies?</p>	<p><b><u>Mitigation Score:</u></b></p> <p>5 - The state implements all 5 sustainable road and highway construction strategies listed to the right.</p> <p>4 - The state implements 4 of the sustainable road and highway construction strategies listed to the right.</p> <p>3 - The state implements 3 of the sustainable road and highway construction strategies listed to the right.</p> <p>2 - The state implements 2 of the sustainable road and highway construction strategies listed to the right.</p> <p>1 - The state implements 1 of the sustainable road and highway construction strategies listed to the right.</p> <p>0 - The state does not implement any of the sustainable road and highway construction strategies listed to the right.</p> <p><b><u>Equity Score:</u></b> N/A</p>	<p>Asphalt is 100% recyclable; composed of 95% aggregates (stone, sand, gravel) and 5% asphalt cement, all of which become fully reusable upon reheating. Milling of existing pavements prior to asphalt overlays generates reusable asphalt materials. A reduction in the use of new asphalt decreases the GHG emissions from asphalt mixing plants and decreases the energy required to collect and transport aggregates.</p> <p>Reclaimed Asphalt Pavement (RAP) can include used roofing, shingles, and rubber tires in addition to recycled asphalt road material. Use of recycled materials decreases the need for virgin materials in the road mix.</p> <p>According to a 2009 report from the National Asphalt Pavement Association, some states recycle 30% of asphalt, total national asphalt recycling in 2009 was 12%, 25% total recycling was proposed as a national goal for GHG reduction.</p> <p>Warm-mix asphalt is a sustainable road construction strategy to make asphalt workable at a warm temperature (212-280 degrees f) instead of the common practice of heating asphalt at a high temperature (320 degrees f) to decrease energy needed, air pollution and GHG emissions. A state can enable warm-mix asphalt by adopting permissive specifications.</p> <p>Perpetual Pavements is a pavement strategy where the road is built in layers, and repair work is limited to the uppermost layer rather than replacing the entire road. Smoother roads with less road maintenance lowers material resource, energy use and costs through decreased repairs, and improves vehicular flow, lowering vehicular hours traveled.<sup>xxxii</sup></p>	<p><b><u>Mitigation Score:</u></b> 1/5  <b><u>Equity Score:</u></b> N/A  <b><u>Public Health Score:</u></b> N/A</p> <p>The specifications for asphalt road and highways construction are highly technical, and require interpretation by persons with a background in asphalt construction. Uncertainty about Connecticut's state road and highway construction standards prevents the assignment of a rating in this category.</p> <p>The Connecticut Department of Transportation is responsible for creating a state Transportation Master Plan every two years. The most current plan available on the CT DoT website is the 2011 plan. Though the state Transportation Master Plan would be an appropriate place to establish sustainable road and highway construction goals, none are addressed in the 2011 plan.<sup>xxxiv</sup></p>
--------------	---	--	---	--

			<p>The amount of fossil fuels burned in transportation of aggregates for use in road mix can be minimized through local sourcing. Standards for aggregate material used in road construction could be adjusted to make acceptable local materials.<sup>xxxiii</sup></p> <p>Based on the findings above, a sustainable state asphalt recycling program might include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. State mandate for road and highway construction strategies that recycle and reuse a minimum of 25% of Reclaimed Asphalt Pavement (RAP)</li> <li>b. State approval and advocacy of alternative Reclaimed Asphalt Pavement (RAP) materials, such as recycled roofing, shingles, and rubber tires, for road and highway construction</li> <li>c. State mandate for warm-mix asphalt instead of hot-mix asphalt</li> <li>d. State mandate of Perpetual Pavements road construction strategy for all roads and highways</li> <li>e. State road mix specifications that encourage use of local aggregate materials in order to decrease material transport distance</li> <li>f. CT allows, not mandates RAP. CT has piloted RAP with recycle and reuse amounts of 15-40%.             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Endnote: Scott Zinke and James Mahoney, The Use of Recycled Asphalt Products in Asphalt Pavements, June 2015, <a href="https://www.cti.uconn.edu/Document.asp?DocID=8673">https://www.cti.uconn.edu/Document.asp?DocID=8673</a></li> </ol> </li> <li>g. Allowed             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Donald A Larsen, PE, Alexander Bernier PE, James Mahoney, Connecticut Annual Pavement Report,</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>April 2020, <a href="https://portal.ct.gov/-/media/DOT/documents/dpavement/Connecticut-DOT-Annual-Pavement-Report_2019.pdf">https://portal.ct.gov/-/media/DOT/documents/dpavement/Connecticut-DOT-Annual-Pavement-Report_2019.pdf</a></p> <p>h. CT allows, not mandates warm-mix asphalt. CT has piloted warm-mix asphalt.</p> <p>a. Scott Zinke, James Mahoney, and Kelly Morison, Connecticut Warm Mix Asphalt (WMA) Pilot Projects 2010 and 2011, June 2014, <a href="https://www.cti.uconn.edu/Document.asp?DocID=8678">https://www.cti.uconn.edu/Document.asp?DocID=8678</a></p> <p>i. CT has piloted Perpetual Pavement roads.</p> <p>a. Endnote: Iliya Yut, Iliya, Derek Nener-Plante, and Adam Zofka, Case Study on Perpetual Flexible Pavement in Connecticut, 2010, <a href="http://geotechpedia.com/Publication/Show/2530/CASE-STUDY-ON-PERPETUAL-FLEXIBLE-PAVEMENT-IN-CONNECTICUT">http://geotechpedia.com/Publication/Show/2530/CASE-STUDY-ON-PERPETUAL-FLEXIBLE-PAVEMENT-IN-CONNECTICUT</a></p>	
<b>C.4</b>	<b>Non-Motorized Transport</b>			
C.4.1	<p>Does the state have non-motorized transport (NMT) policy, with a designated oversight body, to incentivize walking and biking for greenhouse gas (GHG) mitigation and public health? [PH.1.2., PH.4.1, PH.5.1] [EQ.1.1, EQ.3.1]</p>	<p><b><u>Mitigation Score:</u></b></p> <p>5 – The state has NMT policy, with a designated oversight body, includes all 5 of the NMT program components listed to the right.</p> <p>4 - The state has NMT policy, with a designated oversight body, that includes 4 of the NMT program components listed to the right.</p>	<p>Non-motorized transport (NMT) policy is government strategy to increase walking and biking, and to provide infrastructure and safety for walkers and bicycle riders. Goals of NMT include greenhouse gas (GHG) mitigation and improvement of public health. Integral to NMT is a plan for non-motorized transport policy and a designated oversight body. Successful NMT planning includes.<sup>.xxxvxxvi</sup></p> <p>a. <a href="#">Promotion and public involvement in NMT programs [PH.4.1, PH.5.1]</a></p> <p>b. Regular reports on successes or challenges of NMT programs</p>	<p><b><u>Mitigation Score: 3/5</u></b>  <b><u>Equity Score: 0/1</u></b>  <b><u>Public Health Score: 2/2</u></b></p> <p>a. <a href="#">In 2009, Connecticut passed a non-motorized transport (NMT) policy with An Act Improving Bicycle and Pedestrian Access P.A. 09-154.<sup>xxxvii</sup> This Act establishes the Connecticut Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board composed of state Senators</a></p>

		<p>3 - The state has NMT policy, with a designated oversight body, that includes 3 of the NMT program components listed to the right.</p> <p>2 - The state has NMT policy, with a designated oversight body, that includes 2 of the NMT program components listed to the right.</p> <p>1 - The state has NMT policy, with a designated oversight body, that includes 1 of the NMT program components listed to the right.</p> <p>0 - The state does not have NMT policy with a designated oversight body.</p> <p><b><u>Equity Score:</u></b></p> <p>1 – The state’s NMT policy includes criterion ‘e’ listed to the right.</p> <p>0 – The state’s NMT policy does not include criterion ‘e’ listed to the right.</p> <p><b><u>Public Health Score:</u></b></p> <p>2 – The state’s NMT policy includes criteria ‘a’ and ‘c’ listed to the right.</p>	<p>c. Data collection and analysis on scope and impacts of program, and progress toward policy goals [PH.1.2]</p> <p>d. Financing for NMT programs</p> <p>e. Equal access to NMT benefits and funding by all state communities demonstrated through data analysis and included in reports. [EQ 1.1, 3.1].</p>	<p><b>and Representatives to promote NMT initiatives and evaluate state progress with an annual report.</b></p> <p>b. <b>This advisory board generates annual reports on state NMT policy that includes a list of state funding provided for NMT initiatives.<sup>xxxviii</sup> The Board has a website that promotes the work of the Board on state NMT initiatives.<sup>xxxix</sup></b></p> <p>c. <b>As part of a 2019 Active Transportation Plan, the CT Department of Transportation is working on an updating the 2009 Statewide Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan and the 2009 Statewide Bicycle Map - seemingly a data analysis of scope and impacts of program, and progress toward goals.<sup>xl</sup></b></p> <p>d. There does not appear to be an established funding source for NMT initiatives.</p> <p>e. <b>The NMT advisory reports do not appear to address equity issues.</b></p>
--	--	---	---	---

		<p>1 – The state’s NMT policy includes either criteria ‘a’ or ‘c’ listed to the right</p> <p>0 – The state’s NMT policy does not include criteria ‘a’ or ‘c’</p>		
<p>C.4.2</p>	<p>Is there a Complete Streets policy in place?  <a href="#">[PH.1.2, PH.5.1]</a>  <a href="#">[EQ.1.1, EQ.3.1]</a></p>	<p><b><u>Mitigation Score:</u></b></p> <p>5 - The state has a Complete Streets policy in place that includes all 5 of the Complete Streets program components listed to the right.</p> <p>4 - The state has a Complete Streets policy in place that includes 4 of the Complete Streets program components listed to the right.</p> <p>3 - The state has a Complete Streets policy in place that includes 3 of the Complete Streets program components listed to the right.</p> <p>2 - The state has a Complete Streets policy in place that includes 2 of the Complete Streets program components listed to the right.</p> <p>1 - The state has a Complete Streets policy in place that includes 1 of the Complete Streets program components listed to the right.</p>	<p>Complete Streets policies encourage non-motorized transport by making streets safer and more accessible for walkers and bicycle riders. Complete Streets policies also seek to provide easier non-motorized access to public transit. These measures reduce fossil fuel consumption and promote public health. States can establish new street design standards for local or state-wide implementation that provide accessibility for all community users. A successful Complete Streets policy often includes:<sup>xlixlii</sup></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State mandate for municipalities to develop Complete Streets designs as part of community plans, incorporating community engagement [PH.5.1]</li> <li>A state-wide oversight body that reports regularly on program successes and challenges</li> <li>Data collection and analysis on scope and impacts of program, and progress toward state goals [PH.1.2]</li> <li>Financing for Complete Streets programs</li> <li>Equal distribution to all state community members of Complete Streets benefits demonstrated by data and reports. [EQ 1.1, 3.1].</li> </ol>	<p style="text-align: right;"><b><u>Mitigation Score: 2/5</u></b>  <b><u>Equity Score: 0/1</u></b>  <b><u>Public Health Score: 1/2</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>The Connecticut Department of Transportation oversees the state Complete Streets Program and, in 2014, adopted a Complete Streets policy to make all roads more accessible and safer for all users.</b><sup>xliii</sup></li> <li><b>In this policy, data collection on Complete Streets results is listed as a responsibility of the CT DoT.</b></li> <li>A survey of the CT DoT Complete Streets website did not yield any discussion of Complete Streets data or progress reports related to program successes and challenges.<sup>xliiv</sup></li> <li>Conn. Gen. Stat. §153f(a)(d), mandates that, as of 10/1/2010, a minimum of 1% of state or federal transportation funds must be used by a department or municipality for Complete Streets work, but the department or municipality has the ability to opt out without</li> </ol>

		<p>0 - The state does not have a Complete Streets program in place.</p> <p><b><u>Equity Score:</u></b></p> <p>1 – The state’s Complete Streets program includes criterion ‘e’ listed to the right.</p> <p>0 – The state’s Complete Streets program does not include criterion ‘e’ listed to the right.</p> <p><b><u>Public Health Score:</u></b></p> <p>2 – The state’s Complete Streets program includes criteria ‘a’ and ‘c’ listed to the right.</p> <p>1 – The state’s Complete Streets program includes either criteria ‘a’ or ‘c’ listed to the right</p> <p>0 – The state’s Complete Streets program does not include criteria ‘a’ or ‘c’</p>		<p>much difficulty, making the mandate more of an option.<sup>xlv</sup></p> <p>e. There was no discussion on the CT DoT Complete Streets website related to equal distribution of program benefits throughout the state.</p>
C.4.3	<p>Is there a state Greenways program in place? [PH.5.1] [EQ.1.1, EQ.3.1]</p>	<p><b><u>Mitigation Score:</u></b></p> <p>5 - The state has a Greenways program in place that includes all 5 of the Greenways program components listed to the right.</p> <p>4 - The state has a Greenways program in place that includes 4 of the Greenways program components listed to the right.</p>	<p>Greenways programs designate public park lands as part of a broader Greenways system that usually includes trails for walking or biking, promoting public health and non-motorized vehicular transit. Greenways often have a historic quality with trails following streams, rivers, canals, or former railroad lines. Linkages between Greenways within a state or between states generate a vast system of connected recreational trails for public use. Greenways programs evolve through collaboration between local individuals or groups and state or local</p>	<p><b><u>Mitigation Score: 3/5</u></b> <b><u>Equity Score: 0/1</u></b> <b><u>Public Health Score: 1/1</u></b></p> <p>a. In 1995, Conn. Gen. Stat. §23-100 through 23-103 established a council within the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (CT DEEP), the DEEP Greenways Council, to</p>

		<p>3 - The state has a Greenways program in place that includes 3 of the Greenways program components listed to the right.</p> <p>2 - The state has a Greenways program in place that includes 2 of the Greenways program components listed to the right.</p> <p>1 - The state has a Greenways program in place that includes 1 of the Greenways program components listed to the right.</p> <p>0 - The state does not have a Greenways program in place.</p> <p><b><u>Equity Score:</u></b></p> <p>1 – The state’s Greenways program includes criterion ‘e’ listed to the right.</p> <p>0 – The state’s Greenways program does not include criterion ‘e’ listed to the right.</p> <p><b>Public Health Score:</b></p> <p>1 – The state’s Greenways program includes criterion ‘b’ listed to the right.</p> <p>0 – The state’s Greenways program does not include criterion ‘b’ listed to the right.</p>	<p>governments. Following are ways that state governments can promote Greenways:<sup>xlvi</sup><sup>xlvi</sup></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Provide state leadership and set model Greenways standards and goals for local use</li> <li>b. Promote Greenways development strategies and coordinate development effort among various parties involved, including parties in other states, to build a larger, interconnected Greenways system [PH.5.1]</li> <li>c. Data collection, analysis, and regular reports on scope and impacts of program, and progress toward state goals</li> <li>d. Provide funding</li> <li>e. Equal distribution to all state community members of Greenways benefits demonstrated by data and reports. [EQ 1.1, 3.1].</li> </ol>	<p><b>encourage the establishment of Greenways to protect land resources and encourage non-motorized transportation, through advice and funding.</b><sup>xlvi</sup></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. <b>The DEEP Greenways Council keeps records about state Greenways and holds an annual conference to promote collective work on Greenways among various groups.</b></li> <li>c. It does not seem that the DEEP Greenways Council reports regularly on the progress of the policy toward any state goals.<sup>xlix</sup></li> <li>d. <b>The DEEP Greenways Council provides funding to local organizations to support establishment of Greenways.</b></li> <li>e. <b>The process of designating Greenways begins with local group activity, a system that could favor communities with more volunteers and community activism, and favor non-urban communities with more open space.<sup>l</sup> The network of CT Greenways, according to a map of Greenways on the CT DEEP website, appears to be distributed throughout the state, though not evenly distributed.<sup>li</sup></b></li> </ol>
--	--	---	---	--



<p>C.4.4</p>	<p>Does the state implement a Parking Pricing program?</p>	<p><b><u>Mitigation Score:</u></b></p> <p>5 - The state has a Parking Pricing policy in place that encourages and models Parking Pricing strategies; includes all 5 program components listed to the right.</p> <p>4 - The state has a Parking Pricing policy in place that encourages and models Parking Pricing strategies; includes 4 program components listed to the right.</p> <p>3 - The state has a Parking Pricing policy in place that encourages and models Parking Pricing strategies; includes 3 program components listed to the right.</p> <p>2 - The state has a Parking Pricing policy in place that encourages and models Parking Pricing strategies; includes 2 program components listed to the right.</p> <p>1 - The state has a Parking Pricing policy in place that encourages and models Parking Pricing strategies; includes 1 program components listed to the right.</p> <p>0 - The state does not have any Parking Pricing policy in place.</p>	<p>State Parking Pricing policy can require or encourage municipalities, businesses and residential developments to charge for parking in order to discourage personal motorized vehicle use, relieve congestion on roads, encourage public transit, encourage non-motorized transit, and encourage residential shift to walkable or public transit-oriented communities.<sup>lii</sup></p> <p>Parking Pricing provides a funding source for transportation financing, and is a simple, inexpensive strategy to reduce vehicular travel. One type of Parking Pricing is Origin-Destination Parking Policy (ODPP) which charges parking rates based on trip origin and destination in order to make drivers accountable for distance traveled. In this program, residents in parking area have free parking near home and pay increasing rates that increase with the distance of the trip from their residence.</p> <p>State Parking Pricing programs could include the following strategies:<sup>liii</sup></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Parking Pricing mandated by state for municipalities</li> <li>b. Parking should be priced to encourage users to switch from personal vehicular travel to public transit, as demonstrated by data analysis</li> <li>c. Parking prices should be zoned for higher parking rates in urban areas and areas where public transit access is a viable option as alternative travel options</li> <li>d. Origin-Destination Parking Policy (ODPP) with rates based on trip origin and destination</li> <li>e. <b>Impacts of Parking Pricing on various Connecticut communities are studied and</b></li> </ol>	<p><b><u>Mitigation Score: 0/5</u></b>  <b><u>Equity Score: N/A</u></b>  <b><u>Public Health Score: N/A</u></b></p> <p>Connecticut does not seem to have a state-wide Parking Pricing program. While increased parking rates are being implemented in urban locations such as Hartford, current Parking Pricing efforts appear to be managed on a local level.<sup>liv</sup></p>
--------------	--	---	---	--

		<p><b>Equity Score:</b></p> <p>1 – The state’s Parking Pricing policy includes criterion ‘e’ listed to the right.</p> <p>0 – The state’s Parking Pricing policy does not include criterion ‘e’ listed to the right.</p>	<p>strategies are put into place to minimize unfair impacts. [EQ 1.1, 2.1].</p>	
<b>Section C Mitigation Total</b>				<p>13/47 ~27.66%</p>
<b>Section C Equity Total</b>				<p>5/11 ~45.455%</p>
<b>Section C Health Total</b>				<p>5/11 ~45.455%</p>

<sup>i</sup> P. J. Pérez-Martínez et al., “Evaluation of the Influence of Toll Systems on Energy Consumption and CO2 Emissions: A Case Study of a Spanish Highway,” *Journal of King Saud University - Science*, Special Issue on “Advances in Transportation Science,” 23, no. 3 (July 1, 2011): 301–10, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jksus.2010.12.006>.

<sup>ii</sup> Brian D. Taylor and Rebecca Kalaskas, “Addressing Equity in Political Debates over Road Pricing: Lessons from Recent Projects,” *Transportation Research Record* 2187, no. 1 (January 1, 2010): 44–52, <https://doi.org/10.3141/2187-07>.

<sup>iii</sup> Joseph I. Daniel and Khalid Bekka, “The Environmental Impact of Highway Congestion Pricing,” *Journal of Urban Economics* 47, no. 2 (March 1, 2000): 180–215, <https://doi.org/10.1006/juec.1999.2135>.

<sup>iv</sup> Elizabeth Deakin, “Toll Roads: A New Direction for U.S. Highways?,” *UC Berkeley: University of California Transportation Center*, 1989, <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4qv8q1ht>.

<sup>v</sup> “CTDOT Releases Report on All-Electronic Tolling,” CT.gov - Connecticut’s Official State Website, accessed November 18, 2019, <http://portal.ct.gov/DOT/News-from-the-Connecticut-Department-of-Transportation/2018/CTDOT-Releases-Report-on-All-Electronic-Tolling>.

<sup>vi</sup> “CT Congestion Study,” Connecticut Department of Transportation, accessed November 19, 2019, [https://www.dotdata.ct.gov/ct\\_congestion\\_site/index.html](https://www.dotdata.ct.gov/ct_congestion_site/index.html).

<sup>vii</sup> Burris Mark W., “Application of Variable Tolls on Congested Toll Road,” *Journal of Transportation Engineering* 129, no. 4 (July 1, 2003): 354–61, [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)0733-947X\(2003\)129:4\(354\)](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)0733-947X(2003)129:4(354)).

<sup>viii</sup> Taylor and Kalaskas, “Addressing Equity in Political Debates over Road Pricing.”

<sup>ix</sup> Liisa Ecola, Rand Environment, Energy, and Economic Development (Program), and Rand Transportation, Space, and Technology (Program), eds., *Integrating U.S. Climate, Energy, and Transportation Policies: Proceedings of Three Workshops*, Conference Proceedings (Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 2009).

<sup>x</sup> Daniel and Bekka, “The Environmental Impact of Highway Congestion Pricing.”

<sup>xi</sup> “CT Congestion Study.”

<sup>xii</sup> S. Vaidyanathan and Eric Mackres, “Improving Travel Efficiency at the Local Level: An ACEEE Policy Toolkit,” 2012.

<sup>xiii</sup> “Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) Transportation Funding,” Connecticut General Assembly, accessed November 19, 2019, <https://www.cga.ct.gov/2012/rpt/2012-R-0029.htm>.

- xiv David S. Kim et al., “Technology Evaluation of Oregon’s Vehicle-Miles-Traveled Revenue Collection System: Lessons Learned,” *Transportation Research Record* 2079, no. 1 (January 1, 2008): 37–44, <https://doi.org/10.3141/2079-06>.
- xv “Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) Transportation Funding.”
- xvi Governor Ned Lamont Executive order 21-3 (December 16, 2021).
- xvii Vaidyanathan and Mackres, “Improving Travel Efficiency at the Local Level.”
- xviii Cecily T. Talbert and Nadia L. Costa, “Current Issues in Inclusionary Zoning,” *The Urban Lawyer* 36, no. 3 (2004): 557–69.
- xix Matt A. V. Chaban, “In Wealthy Pocket of Connecticut, an Innovative Approach to Affordable Housing,” *The New York Times*, April 25, 2016, sec. New York, <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/26/nyregion/in-wealthy-pocket-of-connecticut-an-innovative-approach-to-affordable-housing.html>.
- xx “Chapter 126a - Affordable Housing Land Use Appeals,” Connecticut General Assembly, accessed November 19, 2019, [https://www.cga.ct.gov/current/pub/chap\\_126a.htm](https://www.cga.ct.gov/current/pub/chap_126a.htm).
- xxi “Chapter 126a - Affordable Housing Land Use Appeals.”
- xxii “Chapter 124 - Zoning,” Connecticut General Assembly, accessed November 18, 2019, [https://www.cga.ct.gov/current/pub/chap\\_124.htm#sec\\_8-2i](https://www.cga.ct.gov/current/pub/chap_124.htm#sec_8-2i).
- xxiii “Affordable Housing,” Connecticut General Assembly, accessed November 18, 2019, <https://www.cga.ct.gov/PS98/rpt%5Colr%5Chtm/98-R-0170.htm>.
- xxiv Caroline Shaw et al., “Health Co-Benefits of Climate Change Mitigation Policies in the Transport Sector,” *Nature Climate Change* 4, no. 6 (June 2014): 427–33, <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate2247>.
- xxv “CT Environmental Public Health Tracking Portal,” Connecticut Public Health Data Explorer, accessed November 19, 2019, <https://stateofhealth.ct.gov/>.
- xxvi “CT Congestion Study.”
- xxvii David Ungemah et al., “Examining Incentives and Preferential Treatment of Carpools on Managed Lane Facilities,” *Journal of Public Transportation* 10, no. 4 (December 1, 2007), <https://doi.org/10.5038/2375-0901.10.4.8>.
- xxviii Tim Dwyer, “Keep HOV to Cut Monogamous Driving,” *The Day*, February 20, 2011, <https://www.theday.com/article/20110220/op01/302209895>.
- xxix “Chapter 242 - Department of Transportation,” Connecticut General Assembly, 242, accessed November 19, 2019, [https://www.cga.ct.gov/current/pub/chap\\_242.htm#sec\\_13b-29](https://www.cga.ct.gov/current/pub/chap_242.htm#sec_13b-29).
- xxx “Chapter 242 - Department of Transportation.”
- xxxi “CTrides - Free Commuter Services from the Connecticut DOT,” CTrides, accessed November 19, 2019, <https://ctrides.com/>.
- xxxii “Sustainability Report,” National Asphalt Pavement Association, accessed December 6, 2019, [https://www.asphaltpavement.org/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=493&Itemid=1058](https://www.asphaltpavement.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=493&Itemid=1058).
- xxxiii “Sustainable Asphalt Pavements: A Practical Guide,” National Asphalt Pavement Association, accessed November 16, 2019, <https://www.asphaltpavement.org/PracticalGuide>.
- xxxiv “ConnDOT Master Transportation Plan,” CT.gov - Connecticut’s Official State Website, accessed December 6, 2019, [http://portal.ct.gov/DOT/PP\\_Bureau/Documents/ConnDOT-Master-Transportaion-Plan](http://portal.ct.gov/DOT/PP_Bureau/Documents/ConnDOT-Master-Transportaion-Plan).
- xxxv Jamie Hosking, Elaine Fletcher, and World Health Organization, eds., *Health in the Green Economy: Health Co-Benefits of Climate Change Mitigation: Transport Sector*, Health in the Green Economy (Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization, 2011).
- xxxvi United Nations Environment Programme, U. N. Environment, and Gail Jennings, “Share the Road Global Outlook on Walking and Cycling, October 2016,” February 23, 2017, <https://wedocs.unep.org/handle/20.500.11822/17030>.
- xxxvii “An Act Improving Bicycle and Pedestrian Access,” Connecticut General Assembly, accessed November 14, 2019, <https://www.cga.ct.gov/2009/ACT/PA/2009PA-00154-R00SB-00735-PA.htm>.
- xxxviii “Reports,” Connecticut Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Board, accessed November 14, 2019, <http://www.ctbikepedboard.org/reports.html>.
- xxxix “Connecticut Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Board,” Connecticut Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Board, accessed November 14, 2019, <http://www.ctbikepedboard.org/>.
- xl “Connecticut Active Transportation Plan,” Connecticut Active Transportation Plan, accessed November 14, 2019, <http://www.ctbikepedplan.org/index.html>.

- 
- <sup>xli</sup> “What Are Complete Streets?,” ChangeLab Solutions, accessed December 6, 2019, <https://www.changelabsolutions.org/product/what-are-complete-streets>.
- <sup>xlii</sup> Vaidyanathan and Mackres, “Improving Travel Efficiency at the Local Level.”
- <sup>xliii</sup> “Complete Streets,” CT.gov - Connecticut’s Official State Website, accessed November 14, 2019, [http://portal.ct.gov/DOT/PP\\_Policy/Documents/CompleteStreets](http://portal.ct.gov/DOT/PP_Policy/Documents/CompleteStreets).
- <sup>xliv</sup> “Complete Streets.”
- <sup>xlv</sup> “Chapter 238 - Highway Construction and Maintenance,” Connecticut General Assembly, 238, accessed November 14, 2019, [https://www.cga.ct.gov/current/pub/chap\\_238.htm#sec\\_13a-153](https://www.cga.ct.gov/current/pub/chap_238.htm#sec_13a-153).
- <sup>xlvi</sup> Robert L. Ryan, Julius Gyula Fábos, and Jessica Jo Allan, “Understanding Opportunities and Challenges for Collaborative Greenway Planning in New England,” *Landscape and Urban Planning*, Greenway Planning around the World, 76, no. 1 (April 30, 2006): 172–91, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2004.09.031>.
- <sup>xlvii</sup> Anne P. Hoover and Margaret A. Shannon, “Building Greenway Policies within a Participatory Democracy Framework,” *Landscape and Urban Planning*, Greenways, 33, no. 1 (October 1, 1995): 433–59, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0169-2046\(94\)02033-C](https://doi.org/10.1016/0169-2046(94)02033-C).
- <sup>xlviii</sup> “Chapter 454 - Greenways and Bikeways,” Connecticut General Assembly, 454, accessed November 16, 2019, [https://www.cga.ct.gov/current/pub/chap\\_454.htm](https://www.cga.ct.gov/current/pub/chap_454.htm).
- <sup>xlix</sup> “Greenways,” Connecticut Department of Energy & Environmental Protection, accessed November 16, 2019, [https://www.ct.gov/deep/cwp/view.asp?a=2707&q=323858&deepNav\\_GID=1704](https://www.ct.gov/deep/cwp/view.asp?a=2707&q=323858&deepNav_GID=1704).
- <sup>l</sup> “Greenways.”
- <sup>li</sup> “Official Connecticut Greenways,” Connecticut Department of Energy & Environmental Protection, accessed December 6, 2019, <https://www.ct.gov/deep/cwp/view.asp?a=2707&q=323852>.
- <sup>lii</sup> Vaidyanathan and Mackres, “Improving Travel Efficiency at the Local Level.”
- <sup>liii</sup> Luca D’Acierno, Mariano Gallo, and Bruno Montella, “Optimisation Models for the Urban Parking Pricing Problem,” *Transport Policy* 13, no. 1 (January 1, 2006): 34–48, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2005.08.001>.
- <sup>liv</sup> “Hartford Parking Authority Announces Rate Increase Within Newly Established Downtown Central Zone,” Hartford Parking Authority, accessed November 19, 2019, <https://hartfordparking.com/hartford-parking-authority-announces-rate-increase-within-newly-established-downtown-central-zone/>.