Metro-North Presentation to MAP Forum
Metro-North serves 124 stations in seven counties with 384 route miles and 775 miles of track across a territory of approximately 2,700 square miles.

This territory includes two different power systems which were installed by Metro-North’s predecessors the New York Central and the New Haven respectively.

- DC third rail power serves the Harlem and Lower Hudson Lines.
- AC catenary provides power for the New Haven Line and New Canaan Branch.
- Trains from all other sections of the railroad to Grand Central must be hauled by diesel locomotives with third rail power.
Metro-North was founded in 1983 when the MTA assumed control of Conrail’s commuter operations – but it represents nearly two centuries of railroading in the New York metropolitan area.

- Its eight predecessor railroads reach back to the founding in 1832 of the New York and Harlem Railroad and New York and Erie Railroads.
- The New York and Harlem Railroad and the Hudson River Railroad eventually merged into the New York Central System. These are our Harlem and Hudson Lines, respectively.
- The New York and Erie Railroad and the New Jersey and New York Railroads became the Erie Lackawanna, and are our Port Jervis and Pascack Valley Lines.
- The New York and New Haven, New Canaan, Danbury and Norwalk, and Naugatuck Railroads merged one by one into the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad which extended east to Boston and crossed the Hudson at Poughkeepsie. The New Haven Main Line from Woodlawn to New Haven and the three branches are Metro-North’s portion of this network.
- The Waterbury Branch is the passenger section of the Naugatuck Railroad from Waterbury south to Devon.

Metro-North Railroad
Service Growth since 1983

- Supported by a series of multi-year capital programs to bring the railroad into a state of good repair after decades of disinvestment by its predecessors, Metro-North has been able to maximize its ability to improve service throughout the day and the week through fleet modernization, cyclical track programs, and major investments in Grand Central Terminal and our maintenance shops at Harmon and New Haven.

- These capital programs also included major projects to improve capacity such as the Upper Harlem Electrification, the Wassaic Extension and the Fleetwood-Crestwood Third Track.

- By 2019 total service across the week had increased by almost 50%, driven by increases in off-peak and weekend service to make better use throughout the weekday and over the weekend of equipment, crews, and Metro-North’s improved and expanded infrastructure and fleets.

### Service Increase by Line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>1983</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hudson Line</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlem Line</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven Line</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Jervis</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>170%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pascack Valley</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>164%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Service Increase by time period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>1983</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM Peak</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Peak</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM Reverse Peak</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Peak</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday Total</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend Total</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEKLY TOTAL</td>
<td>3,262</td>
<td>4,816</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall ridership outpaced this substantial growth in service

- While service grew approximately 50%, annual ridership grew over 80%, with significant growth outside the traditional NYC commutation market due to improved off-peak and reverse-peak service
- Frequency builds ridership!
- The mature commutation market grew 34%, but discretionary ridership to and from NYC – occasional commuters and day-trippers – more than doubled
- The reverse-peak market traveling away from NYC grew to around 10% of peak ridership
- Intermediate ridership – Harlem, Hudson, and New Haven Line trips not touching Manhattan – more than tripled
- By 2019 the traditional commutation market – while still growing – represented less than half of total weekday ridership
- The New Haven Line has consistently represented just under half of Metro-North’s total ridership and its growth

Ridership Growth since 1983
On an average weekday in 2019, approximately 94,000 riders boarded AM peak Metro-North trains headed towards New York City. This includes riders headed to intermediate destinations such as Stamford and White Plains as well as riders bound for New York City. Another 54,000 boarded inbound trains during the rest of the day, which includes riders on reverse peak trains who headed outbound from New York City and other origins during the AM peak. This represents almost 150,000 riders who did not drive to work, did not worsen traffic, and did not contribute to global warming.

To put this in perspective, Metro-North’s approximate share in 2019 of the transportation market to the Manhattan Central Business District (CBD) was as follows:

- 86% of all commuters = six out of seven trips
- 72% of all discretionary weekday travel = three out of four trips
- 67% of all weekend travel = two out of three trips

*Without Metro-North, automobile and other travel to the CBD would have overwhelmed the regional transportation network and brought I-95 to a standstill.*

Metro-North Railroad
The Impact of COVID

- The onset of COVID in March 2020 turned off the power to this long period of growth, with ridership plummeting to 5% of normal in April 2020.
- Annual ridership for 2020 matched ridership when Grand Central Terminal was opened over a century ago.
- Metro-North had to react quickly to a completely new set of requirements:
  - Service was cut drastically – first to weekend service, then hourly service – in order to minimize financial losses, but hourly service had to be maintained to serve essential workers, avoiding the further cuts taken by some other agencies.
  - An aggressive car-cleaning and disinfection program was initiated.
  - At the same time, we tried wherever possible to make sure that trains had enough seating to provide space between customers with a target of 60% loading.
  - Metro-North quickly developed a system which would use the weight of the train to calculate how full it was, and then transmit that information to our TrainTime app to show customers which cars were emptiest.

[Graph showing ridership trends from 1913 to 2020, with annotations for ridership at the opening of Grand Central and ridership at the founding of Metro-North.]
Ridership hovered around 20% for the first year of the pandemic, with the traditional rush hour peak-of-the-peak crowding largely wiped away.

- Essential workers were the core of this steady base of our ridership.
- Markets such as the Waterbury Branch which had a larger share of this market did not see the substantial declines in ridership experienced elsewhere on the railroad.

Ridership recovery from COVID did not really begin in earnest until vaccines became readily available in the spring of 2021 and companies began to require at least partial return to their offices.

Although steady growth has been repeatedly hobbled by new variants, when each variant fades, ridership appears to come back stronger.
At the end of March, Metro-North introduced an “89% schedule”

This schedule provides almost all the service of the 2019 timetable
- Only a handful of peak trains from 2019 remain to be reinstated

Ridership has risen to over 50% of pre-pandemic levels in the past several months as Omicron faded, and has risen in recent weeks to approximately 55%

- There may be other factors besides service pushing our ridership higher, in tandem with or as a result of corporate return-to-work policies
  - Higher gas prices typically drive higher ridership as motorists do the math
  - Coinciding with the decline of the Omicron variant, traffic at the MTA Bridges now appears to be equaling or exceeding pre-COVID volumes

We have reinstated peak fares on non-commutation tickets as normal commuting patterns have begun to reassert themselves, but now also offer a discounted 20-trip ticket aimed specifically at hybrid workers

- Despite much discussion in the press early in the pandemic of the “end of traditional commuting”, we are seeing traditional patterns re-emerging
  - The 7:30 to 9:00 peak-of-the-peak and Tuesday-Thursday peak-of-the-week curves have reappeared, with hybrid workers who use the 20-trip tickets clearly working at home on Fridays
Metro-North and CTDOT are always reviewing the schedule for potential improvements.

Ridership recovery over the longer term is harder to gauge, and we will be eager to see just how close we get to pre-pandemic levels in the coming years.

We will need to continue to make sure our service and infrastructure plans maintain the flexibility we have achieved thus far in the pandemic.

Further down the line, the MTA has contracted the final design and construction of the Penn Station Access project.

This project furthers Metro-North’s work to make the most of the regional infrastructure by constructing four new stations in the East Bronx on the Hell Gate Line to Penn Station.

These new stations will allow Metro-North to significantly improve access from this historically underserved portion of the city to Manhattan and the significant job markets along the New Haven Line in Westchester and Fairfield Counties.

The project is expected to begin service in 2027.

As it happens, the Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments also has some ideas ...

Metro-North Railroad
DataHaven 25th Anniversary Event (Photo: Harold Shapiro)

Mark Abraham, Executive Director
Email: info@ctdatahaven.org
Tel: 203-500-7059
Website: ctdatahaven.org
About DataHaven

- Non-profit with a 25-year history of public service to Connecticut
- Mission is to empower people to create thriving communities by collecting and ensuring access to data on well-being, equity, and quality of life
- Free technical assistance to 200 agencies per year on use of federal, state, and local data
- DataHaven is a formal affiliate of the National Neighborhood Indicators Partnership of the Urban Institute (Washington, DC)
Context of the COVID-19 Pandemic

Human Development Index (The Economist, 2010)
Context of the COVID-19 Pandemic

FIGURE 14: LIFE EXPECTANCY, GREATER NEW HAVEN BY CENSUS TRACT, 2015

In last 35 years, a significant drop in middle-income neighborhoods
A new analysis from DataHaven shows that from 1980 to 2013, the percentage of Connecticut residents living in neighborhoods of concentrated wealth or poverty...

TRENDC.T.ORG
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Context of the COVID-19 Pandemic

An Expanding Longevity Gap

Wealthier Americans tend to live longer than poorer Americans. Despite advances in medicine and education, the difference in life span between the richest and the poorest has more than doubled since the 1970s.

- **MEN**
  - Life expectancy at age 50
  - Richest 10%: 70
  - Middle 50%: 60
  - Poorest 10%: 50

- **WOMEN**
  - Life expectancy at age 50
  - Richest 10%: 80
  - Middle 50%: 70
  - Poorest 10%: 60

Sources: Brookings Institution; U. of Michigan Health and Retirement Study

By The New York Times

https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.2014746118
All-cause mortality spiked in 2020, moreso in the state's largest cities
Age adjusted, all-cause mortality rates (per million), 2015-2021

Opportunity Atlas: Estimated 32% of boys who grew up in low-income families in parts of North Hartford are currently incarcerated; vs. <1% in West Hartford

CTDOC Community Supervision Population: Race/Ethnicity

Source: CTOPM CJPPD Research Unit
Tree Canopy Coverage in 2016:

- 37% in A-Grade areas
- 11% in D-Grade areas
Context of the COVID-19 Pandemic

**FIG 10**

Black and Latino households—especially those headed by women—are more often cost-burdened

SHARE OF COST-BURDENED HOUSEHOLDS BY RACE/ETHNICITY AND GENDER OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD, CONNECTICUT, 2018

**OWNER-OCUPIED**

- WHITE: 23% (M), 30% (F)
- BLACK: 37% (M), 40% (F)
- LATINO: 35% (M), 39% (F)

**RENTER-OCUPIED**

- WHITE: 39% (M), 50% (F)
- BLACK: 50% (M), 62% (F)
- LATINO: 52% (M), 63% (F)
DataHaven Community Wellbeing Index

- Investors include nearly every hospital, community foundation, city, and large public health district in CT, plus other agencies
- Project involves 300 Advisory Council and Research Advisory Committee members, and 25 co-authors of the report
- Data sources include:
  - Federal, state, local public data sources, and raw data provided by special request
  - For community health assessments, data from CT Hospital Association (records from all CT residents served by hospitals)
  - DataHaven Community Wellbeing Survey

https://www.ctdatahaven.org/reports/
• Completed 45,000 live, in-depth interviews with randomly-selected adults in every Connecticut zip code (2012, 2015, 2018, 2020, 2021), including over 10,000 in the five largest cities

• About 9,000 interviews were conducted from June to December 2021

• Interviews conducted by contacting randomly-selected landline and cell phone numbers, with additional testing and benchmarking using other methods (in-person, postcard mail, electronic)

• Interviews are weighted using 2020 Census data to create reliable estimates that are representative of populations in each area

https://www.ctdatahaven.org/reports/
Example of Survey Questions: Experiences of Discrimination

At any time in your life, have you ever been unfairly fired, unfairly denied a promotion or raise, or not hired for a job for unfair reasons? [If yes, how many times did this happen and for what reasons?]

Percent of adults who say it has happened to them within the past 3 years:

- 20% of young adults, 6% of seniors
- 15% of men, 17% of women
- 11% of White, 23% of Black, 20% of Latino adults
- Most common reasons given for why it happened: Race or Ancestry, Gender, Age
Young adults, Black and Latino adults, and low-income adults report more experiences of discrimination
Share of adults who reported experiencing being treated unfairly in the past 3 years, by scenario, 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accessing health care</th>
<th>At work or looking for work</th>
<th>Interacting with police</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connecticut</strong></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ages 18-34</strong></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 35-49</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 50-64</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 65+</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black</strong></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Latino</strong></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$30K</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30K-$100K</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100K+</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wealthy towns</strong></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suburban towns</strong></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rural towns</strong></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Periphery towns</strong></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Core towns</strong></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example of Survey Questions: Quality of Built Environment

Percent of adults who agree there are safe places to walk (map at left) and ride a bicycle (map at right)

Source: Analysis of 2015-2021 DataHaven Community Wellbeing Survey data (Draft maps, not for use)
Example of Survey Questions: Quality of Built Environment

**FIGURE 25: RESIDENTS’ RATINGS OF COMMUNITY COHESION MEASURES, SHARE OF ADULTS, 2015-2021**

- Trust neighbors: 59%
- Satisfied with area: 70%
- Youth have positive role models: 77%
- Good place to raise kids: 70%
- Safe to walk at night: 71%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good parks</th>
<th>Connecticut</th>
<th>Greater Hartford</th>
<th>Hartford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ages 18-34</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 35-49</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 50-64</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 65+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DataHaven Greater Hartford Equity Profile (2022, not yet published)
Example of Survey Questions: Institutional Trust

Local health officials and healthcare workers are generally well-trusted

Share of Greater Hartford adults reporting great or fair amount of trust in institutions, with Hartford and Connecticut for reference, 2021

## Pandemic Impacts: Financial Security

**How has your financial situation changed in the past 12 months?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Better off financially</th>
<th>About the same</th>
<th>Worse off financially</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $30K</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $100K</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pandemic Impacts: Financial Security

More adults in urban areas experienced pandemic-related hardships
Share of adults who experienced select hardships since February 2020

- **Lost job**
  - Connecticut: 23%
  - Rural towns: 21%
  - Suburban towns: 20%
  - Urban Core towns: 28%
  - Urban Periphery towns: 24%
  - Wealthy towns: 23%

- **Used food bank**
  - Connecticut: 13%
  - Rural towns: 12%
  - Suburban towns: 6%
  - Urban Core towns: 24%
  - Urban Periphery towns: 14%
  - Wealthy towns: 4%

- **Worse off financially**
  - Connecticut: 19%
  - Rural towns: 17%
  - Suburban towns: 17%
  - Urban Core towns: 26%
  - Urban Periphery towns: 19%
  - Wealthy towns: 18%
Pandemic Impacts: Financial Security

Black, Latino, and Low-Income Adults Face More Hurdles To Meet Basic Needs
Share of Connecticut adults, Aug. 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Financial Insecurity</th>
<th>Food Insecurity</th>
<th>Housing Insecurity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy/Suburban</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Periphery</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Core</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income &lt;$30K</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income $30K-$100K</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income $100K+</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DataHaven
Pandemic Impacts: Financial Security

Percent of Connecticut men and women, by race/ethnicity, who say it is likely they will have to leave their home in the next 2 months because they are behind on rent or mortgage.

Source: 2021 DataHaven Community Wellbeing Survey (n=9,139 statewide, June to December 2021)
Pandemic Impacts: ARPA 1-year expansion of Child Tax Credit

**Food Insecure: CTC-Eligible, Age<65 Households with Children vs. No Children, 2015-2021**

- Expected trend without tax credit based on trends in the non-treatment group and during prior years

**eFigure 1. Assessment of Outcome Pre-trends for Difference-in-Differences**

Weighted using household survey weights divided by number of waves.

Source: Authors' analysis of Household Pulse Survey data from the Census Bureau, July to August 2021 (final wave of Phase 3.2).

Graphic from Shafer et al., 2022
https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamanetworkopen/fullarticle/2788110

Graphic from analysis of DataHaven Community Wellbeing Survey (unpublished)
Pandemic Impacts: Mental Health and Substance Use Disorder

Adults who feel more anxious and depressed are less likely to say they're in very good health

Share of Greater Hartford adults, with Hartford and Connecticut for reference, 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Anxious</th>
<th>Feels depressed</th>
<th>Very good self-rated health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Hartford</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 18-34</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 35-49</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 50-64</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 65+</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$30K</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30K+</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DataHaven
## Pandemic Impacts: Vaccine Equity

Share of adults who are vaccinated, and reported plans of unvaccinated Connecticut adults, Aug. 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Fully/partially vaccinated</th>
<th>Get as soon as possible</th>
<th>Wait to see its effects</th>
<th>Get only if required</th>
<th>Definitely will not get</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No family member incarcerated</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family members incarcerated</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great deal of trust in fed. govt.</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No trust at all in fed. govt.</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great deal of trust in local healthcare</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No trust at all in local healthcare</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always/usually get social support</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely/never get social support</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financially comfortable</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding it very difficult to get by</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perceptions of suitable employment have improved but remain lower in urban areas

Share of adults who agree that there are suitable employment options in their area, 2015–2021

- Greenwich: 72% to 75%
- Stamford: 58% to 68%
- Connecticut: 42% to 63%
- New London: 35% to 60%
- New Haven: 28% to 46%
- Bridgeport: 22% to 40%
- Hartford: 22% to 40%
- Waterbury: 20% to 35%

DataHaven
Reports use new approaches to analyze data from:

- 2020 Census
- American Community Survey (2020 is most current)
- State and federal agencies
- 2015-2021 DataHaven Community Wellbeing Survey (45,000 live, in-depth interviews of randomly selected adults)
- More 2020/2021 data and new indicators to be added for version 2.0 (send suggestions)

https://www.ctdatahaven.org/reports/connecticut-town-equity-reports
Audiences:

- Residents
- Town-level committees on inclusion, anti-racism, declaring racism a public health crisis, equity and sustainability
- Town-level elected officials and candidates
- Non-profit organizations, and other programs that serve residents in defined geographic areas
- K-12 schools and higher education (ctdatahaven.org/classroom)
- State legislators (DataHaven has also produced legislative district profiles), state or regional advocacy groups

EMILY TANG-LEE
Empowering community through data

I grew up in Brooklyn in a scrappy refugee family, one that didn’t have much money but that valued education. My experience is one that can be reflected in the Stamford community, as families across the city.

My mom worked as an admin at a large hospital, and my dad was a taxi driver. We were a family eligible for free lunch. My parents tried to keep worries about money to themselves, but even in elementary school I knew that to ask for a school trip was to ask my parents to pay for something we might not be able to afford. Mom and dad’s engagement with teachers was through report cards and parent-teacher conferences. No one told them to join a parent-teacher organization, and besides, they didn’t have time or energy to spare.

My parents’ English was good enough but not their first language and as I got older, I often found myself at the computer, inputting data on my parents’ behalf.

Through my parents’ encouragement and my own hard work, I forged a path to higher education, going through New York City specialized public schools, then to the Top 5 Mural arts college at a large university and finally to Johns Hopkins for my master’s degree.

Emily Tang-Lee

My parents are wonderful parents who set me and my brother up for success, despite their income. But it took an immense amount of effort to get us where we are today, and I wonder what would have happened to us if we didn’t have the good fortune of having my parents, who were at least armed with information they could use to guide us on our education journey. What happens to the other children, who are equally bright?

This is where a quality education, nonprofit organizations and local government can come in. I feel so lucky to call Stamford my home. There is a vibrant community of designers, philanthropists, and political activists here, all working toward a brighter future for our neighbors. But even as I’m buoyed by optimism, the data shows a lack of equity and opportunity. If we are to be responsible to our neighbors, we ought to address these issues. A recent report by DataHaven, a Connecticut-based nonprofit that empower citizens to create thriving communities through data, points to a few indicators of well-being that should sound the alarm bells for us all.

- 23 percent of all households are cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 30 percent or more of their total income on housing costs.
- After keeping a roof over your head and food on the table, this leaves little, or nothing at all, for low-income families to invest in their futures.
- There is a gulf in median household income between groups. While median household income for white households is $124,000, for Black families in Stamford it’s less than half that — $40,000. Similarly, the median household income of a Latino household is $45,000. Racial disparities in employment, pay and education are the through line.
- In a high-cost area such as our own, we must find ways to grow the earning potential of our neighbors through “tried and true” solutions such as workforce development, wage growth, and high-quality public education, while keeping our hearts and minds open to innovative solutions offered through public-private partnerships, nonprofit organizations, and community lead-
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Send us your questions / comments / criticism / feedback
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🐦 @ctdata

🌐 ctdatahaven.org
Route 8 & Waterbury Rail Line Alternative Modes Assessment Study
MAP Forum Spring Meeting – June 3, 2022
Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments
Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments

- Located in West-Central CT
- 19 Cities and Towns
- Centered around Waterbury
- Bristol to the North
- Shelton to the South
- 450,400 Residents (2020 Census)
Transportation System

- Diverse and mature highway & transportation system
- I-84 and Route 8 anchor the highway network
- US Route 6 connects northern communities & Bristol
- Route 34 connects southern communities to New Haven
- Waterbury Rail Line – branch of the New Haven Rail Line
- Six operators provide local bus service – fragmented
Waterbury Rail Line

- Connects Waterbury to the New Haven Main Line
- 6 stops
- Most riders transfer at Bridgeport for service to Stamford & New York metro area
Project Background

Project Study Team:
- AECOM & CDM Smith

Multi-task planning study/project
- Assess feasibility of alternative transportation options
- TOD opportunities: Naugatuck, Beacon Falls, Seymour, Ansonia and Derby
- Invest in rail line to be catalyst for economic revitalization
- Route 8 Expressway – Waterbury to Bridgeport
- Bridgeport Avenue (Shelton) Corporate Office District
Current Travel Patterns

• Over 2 Million daily trips – overwhelmingly auto & drive alone
• Route 8 ADT = 77,600
• Daily back-ups occur on Route 8 – main bottleneck at the Derby-Shelton town line
• Daily ridership on WRL = 1,100
• About 12,500 commuters travel to the Bridgeport Avenue corridor – limited transit option
Project Goals & Objectives

- Reduce congestion on Route 8
  - Avoid expensive highway expansion costs
- Upgrade & modernize Waterbury Rail Line:
  - Capitalize on recent infrastructure improvements
  - Expand service
  - Replace & modernize equipment
  - Enhance station areas
- Incentivize Transit Oriented Development
  - Revitalize old, urban centers
  - Support developments with ½ mile of a station
- Explore feasibility of a Bus Rapid Transit system
  - Expanded express bus service
  - Median running busway
Conducted on-board survey on all trains

- **Limited service – can’t make connections**
- Equipment unreliable, in poor condition and not clean – riders want CTDOT to be more responsive to complaints
- Poor communication when service delayed or disrupted
- Poor on time performance – average for 2018 was 81.2%
- On-board safety and security concerns
- Excessive delay when buses substituted for service
- Lack of station amenities
CTDOT WRL Capital Projects

- Invested $115 million in infrastructure upgrades
- Completed installation of Signal System & PTC
- Passing sidings:
  - Derby siding track completed: August 2019
  - Beacon Falls siding track expected to be completed: April 2020
  - Other sidings to be worked on during outages scheduled in 2020 and 2021
  - Passing sidings can’t be put into service until signal system operational
- Signal & PTC systems operational – multiple trains can be permitted to operate on WBL
- Looking at leasing rail equipment from other states
- Plans to add 7 additional trips each day: Summer 2022
Proposed WRL Action Plan

2020-2022
- WRL Working Group recommended increase in service at January 13, 2020 event
- State adding 7 trips – Summer 2022

2025-2030
- Acquire new, modern rail equipment for WRL – coaches & dual-powered locomotives
- Expand service: 30-min. headways (peak); 60-min. headways (off-peak)
- Develop and construct new rail maintenance & storage yard for WRL

2025 - 2035
- Construct new rail stations with full amenities

Long Term Vision
- Develop & construct a transfer station
- Operate shuttle services; connect with NHML service
Short-term Actions – 2022-2024

Commit to acquiring new rail coaches and dual-powered locomotives dedicated to the Waterbury Branch Line: placed in service by 2025

- At least 4 sets to replace existing equipment
- At least 4 sets to expand service
Mid-Term Actions – 2025

• Expand service to provide 30-minute headways during peak periods & 60-minute headways during off-peak periods:

• Develop new rail maintenance shop, storage yard and fueling at Waterbury:
Mid-to-Long Term Actions – 2025-2030

New and rehabilitated stations:

- New building at Ansonia
- Consolidate Beacon Falls & Seymour stations; relocate at planned TOD site
- Relocate Naugatuck
- Rehabilitate Derby/Shelton station (RAISE project – 2021 Award)
- Include Full Station Amenities:
  - High level platforms
  - Platform canopies
  - Landscaping and parking
  - Real-time information systems
  - Ticketing kiosks
  - Full accessibility
  - Connections to downtown areas
Long-Term Vision – Beyond 2030

Design and construct new permanent transfer station

- Install interconnected platforms between WRL & NHML
- Connection to Track 4
- Operate “shuttle” type service on WRL to meet NHML trains
- Avoids adding trains to NHML
- Connect to New Haven
- Maintain / retain through service
Why Invest in Alternative Modes?

• Avoid highway expansion costs
• Less congestion: reduces out of pocket expenses, less time spent in traffic
• Spurs economic development
• Incentivizes TOD – mixed-use, higher density
• Helps revitalizes town centers
• Increases property & land values
• More reliable freight & goods movement
• Improves health & safety
Assessed Potential for TOD

Naugatuck Valley cities & towns are prime TOD candidates:

- Compact downtowns
- Historic/interesting architecture
- Infrastructure in place
- Rail service in place – stations in Downtowns
- Opportunity sites near train stations
- Affordable land & housing

What is needed?

- Reliable, convenient & frequent train service
- Good access to job centers – Stamford, Norwalk, New York City
- Public-private investments – need to incentivize TOD
Opportunities for TOD

- Conducted a series of workshops/Charrettes in each of the host communities
- Explained what TOD is
- Conducted TOD Visual preference survey
  - Building density & scale
  - Site layout
  - Architectural character
- Identified type & intensity of the TOD that each community preferred
- Developed “Model Block” concept
- Identified opportunity sites near train stations
Assessed Potential for BRT

- BRT would provide better travel options to corporate campuses along Bridgeport Avenue – limited public transit services
- Complement current bus and commuter rail services
- Direct, fast connection between Derby-Shelton station & Bridgeport Transportation Center
- Transit hub along Bridgeport Avenue with feeder service
- Future stops at other corporate & office parks in the corridor
Assessed Five Possible BRT Systems

Alternatives assessed:
- Median Running on Route 8
- Shoulder Running on Route 8 – Outside Shoulder
- Enhanced GBT Route 22X – Along Bridgeport Ave to Derby
- New Express Bus Route along Route 8 – Bridgeport to Waterbury
- Full BRT on Bridgeport Avenue

Need to fully assess feasibility & cost
For more information:
Project website: www.Rt8corridorstudy.com
NVCOG website: www.NVCOGCT.gov