

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #2A
Vermont Agency of Transportation
Public & Professional
Comments, Suggestions, & Input

**Vermont Bicycle and
Pedestrian Policy Plan**

Submitted by:
WILBUR SMITH ASSOCIATES

in association with
Toole Design Group

February 21, 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| 2.6. INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| 2.7 USE OF THIS INFORMATION..... | 2 |
| 2.8 FUTURE VISION OF BICYCLING AND WALKING IN VERMONT..... | 2 |
| 2.9 FUTURE FOCUS OF VTRANS..... | 3 |
| 2.10 POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE PERCEPTIONS..... | 4 |
| 2.11 SPECIAL ISSUES, CHALLENGES AND NEW PROGRAMS..... | .6 |
| 2.12 PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND DATA COLLECTION..... | 6 |

Appendices

- 2.B. Interview Questions
- 2.C. Public Work Sessions-Agendas & Notes
- 2.D. Additional Comments
- 2.E. TPI Meetings - Notes

Technical Memo #2A

Public and Professional Comments, Suggestions And Input

Disclaimer: The information below is presented for purposes of reporting on the current thoughts of a (not statistically reliable) cross section of Vermonters relating to the current condition and future vision of bicycling and walking in Vermont to facilitate the discussion of policy issues as they relate to the revision of the Vermont Bicycle and Pedestrian Policy Plan. Inclusion here does not constitute an endorsement by the Vermont Agency of Transportation (VTTrans) of the thoughts or comments, nor does it imply either the actual reliability or the truth of the statements presented below.

2.6 INTRODUCTION

As part of the development of the updated Vermont Bicycle and Pedestrian Policy Plan, the consultants conducted numerous interviews around the State with VTTrans employees, regional commission Transportation Planners, bicycle/pedestrian advocates and others related to bicycle and pedestrian transportation issues. In conjunction with VTTrans and several regional commissions, the study team also conducted four public work sessions around the State, and held two discussions with the Transportation Planning Initiative, a monthly meeting between the regional commission/Chittenden County Metropolitan Planning Organization transportation planners and VTTrans staff. Several individuals also sent comments via email directly to the consultants.

The following pages report on the comments and suggestions received during this process. The study team has grouped and summarized the information to facilitate review by VTTrans Staff and the Study Advisory Committee. The study team has not yet drawn conclusions or recommendations from these comments. The comments focused on what the future of bicycle and walking should be in Vermont and what policies should be in place to implement the vision. While the discussions focused on VTTrans, they were not specifically limited, so the suggestions went beyond areas or issues over which VTTrans has control. Such suggestions, however, do help to understand how VTTrans policies can fit into a larger picture of bicycle and pedestrian transportation and accommodation within Vermont.

After this introduction, this Technical Memorandum 2A next section outlines the purpose of this information and how the Working, Group, Study Advisory Group and consultants will use the information in developing the Bicycle and Pedestrian Policy Plan. The third section summarizes the future vision of bicycling and walking in Vermont as described in a majority of the comments. Subsequent sections provide information on other suggestions and comments on:

- Positive and negative bicycling and walking perceptions;
- New issues, programs or challenges that should be considered;
- Performance measures and data collection;
- The process of developing and administering bicycling and walking projects and programs within VTTrans; and
- Specific existing State policies relating to bicycling and walking.

Appendix 2B contains a copy of the questions asked during the various interviews. **Appendix 2C** contains the agendas for and notes taken during the various work sessions. Each successive work session was conducted slightly different than the previous one. The revisions to the agenda and work sessions were adapted to address perceived deficiencies in the way the previous meeting had progressed.

2.7 USE OF THIS INFORMATION

The comments and suggestions present a varied set of ideas on how a small group of Vermont residents would like to see bicycling and walking programs and facilities in the future. This information is provided to the Study Advisory Group (SAG) so that they can assist VTrans and the consultant:

- Select the most appropriate elements for a realistic future vision,
- Prioritize the various ideas and,
- Focus on the types of policy updates that should be pursued.

The information should be viewed in this light; if it a collection of comments that will help VTrans, the SAG and the Consultants make more informed recommendations and decisions pertaining to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Policy Plan. *Please refer to transmittal information accompanying this Technical Memo for specific instructions on how to use this information.*

2.8 FUTURE VISION OF BICYCLING AND WALKING IN VERMONT

Comments and ideas raised at the public work sessions and from the professionals interviewed included significant similarities as to what the future of bicycling and walking in Vermont should be like. The consistent elements of the different visions included:

- V.1. Bicycling and walking in the future should be more “mainstream” and should constitute a significant portion of the overall number of transportation trips made on a daily basis in Vermont;
- V.2. There should be an excellent network of on-road, *well maintained* bicycling and walking facilities linked to an integrated system of trails (They were consistently called “trails” and not “shared-use paths);
- V.3. Vermont should become the premier state in the country for bicycling and walking and our economy will benefit from it;
- V.4. Bicyclist, pedestrians and motorists should all understand and obey traffic laws and respect each other’s presence on the road;

- V.5. VTrans itself should help achieve this future by consistently considering and accommodating the needs of bicyclist and pedestrian on all of its projects;
- V.6. State policies of all State agencies should be supportive of bicycling and walking and should be coordinated and in harmony with the policies of other State agencies relating to bicycling and walking;
- V.7. There should be an overall, well developed culture of bicycling and walking in Vermont.
- V.8. The economic, environmental, social, and health benefits of walking and bicycling should be recognized and should simplify understanding of why funding the costs of providing bicycling and walking facilities is important; and
- V.9. The State should actively promotes the existence and use of bicycling and walking facilities for transportation, health, economic and environmental reasons (similar to State marketing of Vermont agricultural products or ski resorts).

Other concepts repeated a number of times included:

- V.10. All roadways, (or major roadways, or major bicycle routes) should have good shoulders or other safe and accessible bicycling and walking facilities appropriate to the need for the particular roadway and to the surrounding land use;
- V.11. There should be a statewide map showing bicycle routes and trails and highlighting the rules of the road pertaining to bicycling and walking;
- V.12. There should be good amenities to support the actual needs of bicyclists and pedestrians, such as pedestrian signals, well marked crosswalks, bathrooms, bicycle lockers, showers, and similar supporting items;
- V.13. Bicyclist and walker education should be mandatory in grade and/or middle school;
- V.14. Developed areas should have extensive sidewalk and bicycle systems to facilitate easy circulation without the need to use automobiles, and
- V.15. Bicyclists should be licensed or assessed a user fee and bicycles should be registered.

Appendix 2D includes a complete list of additional vision ideas from the public work session. **Appendix 2E** contains the notes from the TPI meetings.

2.9 FUTURE FOCUS OF VTRANS

Although similar to the “Visions of the Future,” recommendations on where VTrans should focus its energy relating to bicycling and walking issues provide more immediate direction to VTrans relating to bicycling and walking. Numerous individuals raised the following recommendations which relate directly to how VTrans should operate in the future.

- V.16. There should be more of all of the things that the Bicycle and Pedestrian Program (BPP) does now;
- V.17. VTrans should do a much better job of incorporating bicycling and walking concerns into every VTrans project;

- V.18. There should be more outreach, but that VTrans should coordinate this work with the Vermont bicycling and walking advocacy groups, the regions, municipalities, and other agencies;
- V.19. VTrans should focus on building more facilities as its primary focus;
- V.20. VTrans should provide better notification to regions about roadway and other projects being planned so that the regions and municipalities can work *with* VTrans to make sure bicycling and walking needs are met in the project during the early planning stages of the project; and
- V.21. VTrans needs to work on educating engineers, landscape architects and planners in the State, both inside and outside of VTrans, on addressing bicycle and pedestrian issues in their projects or communities.

Appendix 2D contains a listing of other recommendations on VTrans' focus in the future that were mentioned only once or twice during this round of information gathering.

2.10 POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE PERCEPTIONS

Positive Perceptions

Many individuals have strong perceptions of how they think bicycling and walking in Vermont is being accommodated, promoted and managed. Some of the perceptions are accurate, while others are not. The most common perception, held by all of those interviewed and several of the individuals at the public work sessions in a position to know, was the strong positive perception of the work of the BPP Staff. Almost every comment about the BPP also included a strong reference to the importance of the current VTrans employees in the BPP to that success. (Several individuals cited the need to provide clear guidance for the BPP so that its success could continue when the current employees were no longer in that position.)

There were also three other specific successes mentioned numerous times:

- P.1. The Enhancement Program and the projects it funded,
- P.2. The Walk to School Day Program, and
- P.3. The switch to local management of the development of bicycling and walking facilities, administered through the Local Transportation Facilities Program.

The Bike Smart Program and the *Vermont Pedestrian and Bicycle Facility Planning and Design Manual* were also sited as successes, but less frequently.

Several professionals at VTrans and the regional commissions also noted that:

- P.4. There was growing coordination between the regional commissions and the CCMPO and VTrans relating to bicycling and walking issues.

Negative Perceptions

Predictably, negative perceptions, which provided an opportunity to complain, outnumbered the successes cited during the interviews and work sessions. Topping the list, with almost universal mention in every interview and public work session, was the perception that VTTrans fails to consider bicycling and walking concerns and issues into their non-bicycling/walking-specific projects. The perception was expressed in many different forms but the bottom line message was always the same:

- P.5. VTTrans is perceived as failing to routinely incorporate bicycling and walking considerations into its projects.

There were several comments that elaborated by saying that the existence of the BPP actually helped create this problem, because it fostered the mentality that addressing bicycling or walking issues, even if related to a roadway or other VTTrans project, still needed to be addressed by its own BPP project. Others believed that many VTTrans employees, outside of the BPP, think of bicycling and walking facilities as frivolous, luxury items.

The second most noted negative perception (wrongly attributed to VTTrans) was:

- P.6. The lack of State funds addressing bicycling and walking safety issues.

The other negative perception noted more than once was:

- P.7. BPP's abandoned attempt to create a coalition of organizations to support development of a statewide bicycle suitability map.

Numerous reasons were provided for the problem, including:

- The information requested by VTTrans from the various regional commissions was too complicated;
- Inability to get a consensus of project stakeholders as to the information that should be displayed on the map;
- Several of the regional commissions already had similar types of maps, but there was no consistency between them as to what information was presented or how the information was developed, interpreted or presented; and
- VTTrans had limited resources and expertise to produce and distribute the maps and could not get the Departments of Economic Development or Tourism and Marketing to be committed enough to participate in the project.

Appendix 2D contains other negative perceptions mentioned once by an interviewee or individual at a public work session. Two of these perceptions, although mentioned only once, appear to

capture the underlying perception of many of the other comments received and are included here for consideration. They are:

- P.8. The amount of work and the variety of topics, issues and programs to be addressed by the BPP seem to be far more than what the current BPP budget can meaningful support.
- P.9. VTrans' policies relating to bicycling and walking don't appear in the perception of many to carry much weight.

2.11 SPECIAL ISSUES, CHALLENGES & NEW PROGRAMS

There were comments and suggestions that were repeated several times but can not directly be considered as part of a future vision of bicycling and walking in Vermont. Since several different individuals in different parts of the state shared these ideas, they are included here as se they are still important points to be considered as the Vermont Bicycle and Pedestrian Policy Plan study continues. The most important included, in no specific order:

- I.1. The current threshold for gathering crash data does not reliably record bicycle and pedestrian crash and more accurate means of recording this data is needed.
- I.2. Kids need to be trained to use bicycles at school since they are no longer getting this training at home.
- I.3. There should be a small project fund consisting of only State money to help municipalities fund relatively minor projects without jumping through all of the federal hoops (which add cost and make the projects unworkable).
- I.4. VTrans should assist municipalities in managing their bicyclist and pedestrian assets.

2.12 PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND DATA COLLECTION

Individuals were provided a chance to comment on the types of performance measures that should be in place to help monitor progress made based on the expenditure of funds towards improving walking and bicycling facilities and programs in Vermont. The following list presents the suggestions that were mentioned during the meetings and interviews.

- PM.1. Health and economic benefits of walking and bicycling facilities;
- PM.2. The number of children walking or bicycling to school;
- PM.3. The number of children who participate in the BikeSmart or Walk to School programs;
and
- PM.4. The number of VTrans projects that include bicycling and walking facilities.
- PM.5. The number of children's education programs existing around the State;
- PM.6. The number of miles of bicycle lanes, shared use lanes, and shared use paths on State and/or municipal roads;

- PM.7. The number of shared road signs, bicycle stencils on the road and other physical attributes of bicycling and walking;
- PM.8. The number of miles by mode that people travel;
- PM.9. The accurate number of bicycling and walking crashes; and
- PM.10. The amount of money spent on bicycling and walking components of non-BPP projects.

In order to provide the data to help tabulate these performance measures, several individuals provided comments on data collection techniques:

- D.1. The video logs made each year of shared use paths should be analyzed to provide data on the physical characteristics of the paths.
- D.2. The video logs and sufficiency rating data for roadways can provide information on shoulder widths and maintenance, sidewalks and other data relating to bicycling and walking facilities.

APPENDIX 2B
Interview Questions

**Vermont Bicycle & Pedestrian Policy Plan
Interview Questions**

VTrans - Amy Bell & Jon Kaplan

Can you provide a brief description of the various activities that the State Bike/Ped Program currently undertakes or administers?
What additional bike/ped programs would you like to see implemented on a Statewide level?
Are there any bike/ped programs you would like to eliminate or reduce in scope?
How would you describe the current state of VTrans bike/ped policies?
How would you prioritize the various existing bike/ped programs?
Do the current bike/ped performance measures help you do your work?
What types of bike/ped performance measures would you find helpful?
Give budget constraints, what additional bike/ped performance measures do you think are realistic to implement on a Statewide level?
What do you see as the role of regional commissions and the CCMPO in the bike/ped program?
What do you see as the role of municipalities in the bike/ped program?
Do you think that the regional commissions and the CCMPO can do more to promote greater use or implementation of bike/ped facilities?
What do you believe should be the focus of bike/ped funding in the next 5 years? The next 10 years?

VTrans - Al Neveau

How do you see the bike/ped program fitting into the overall priority system of the Local Transportation Facilities focus and the larger VTrans priority system.
Can you provide a brief description of the various activities that the State Bike/Ped Program currently undertakes or administers?
What additional bike/ped programs would you like to see implemented on a Statewide level?
Are there any bike/ped programs you would like to eliminate or reduce in scope?
How would you prioritize the various existing bike/ped programs?
How would you describe the current state of VTrans bike/ped policies?
Do the current bike/ped performance measures help your team do their work?
What types of bike/ped performance measures do you think would be helpful?
Give budget constraints, what additional bike/ped performance measures do you think are realistic to implement on a Statewide level?

VTrans - *Bernie Bryne & Mary Spicer*

Do the current bike/ped performance measures provide meaningful information?
What types of additional bike/ped performance measures do you think would be helpful?
Give budget constraints, what additional bike/ped performance measures do you think are realistic to implement on a Statewide level?
Do you have the staff and or facilities to gather additional bike/ped data to support new performance measures?
Can the regional commissions or the CCMPO assist you in gathering relevant bike/ped data?
Do you have any suggestions on what other means the State can use to gather bike/ped data to support performance measures?

RPC/CCMPO - *Peter Keating, Chuck Wise, & Jim Sullivan*

Can you provide a brief description of the various bike/ped activities that your regional commission currently undertakes or administers?
What additional bike/ped programs would you like to see implemented on a Statewide level?
Are there any local, regional or Statewide bike/ped programs you would like to eliminate or reduce in scope?
How would you describe the current state of VTrans bike/ped policies?
How would you prioritize the various existing bike/ped programs?
Do the current bike/ped performance measures help you do your work?
What types of bike/ped performance measures would you find helpful?
Give budget constraints, what additional bike/ped performance measures do you think are useful and realistic to implement on a Statewide level?
What do you see as the role of regional commissions and the CCMPO in the bike/ped program?
What do you see as the role of municipalities in the bike/ped program?
Do you think that the regional commissions and the CCMPO can do more to promote greater use or implementation of bike/ped facilities?
What do you believe should be the focus of bike/ped funding in the next 5 years? The next 10 years?

Advocates & Not-for-Profits - *Chapin Spencer (Local Motion), Jim Tasse (Rutland Area Physical Activity Committee), and Kevin Russell (Vermont Trails & Greenways Council)*

Describe what you feel have been VTrans' most successful programs with respect to accommodating and encouraging bicycling and walking. Why do you think those particular programs were successful?
Describe what you feel have been VTrans' failures with respect to accommodating and encouraging bicycling and walking. What do you think are the reasons that these efforts failed?

What Statewide bike/ped policies would you like to see in place?

What do you think the focus of the State bike/ped plan should be?

What role should advocacy groups play in supporting VTrans' work today? Do you see that role changing in the future?

What bike/ped performance measures do you think would be useful to the State?

What is your vision for pedestrian and bicycle transportation in Vermont in 25 years?

What do you believe should be the focus of VTrans' Bike/Ped Program in the next 5 years? The next 10 years?

How do you see your organization assisting in developing programs, information or data to help support the State efforts?

APPENDIX 2C
Public Work Sessions – Agendas & Notes

BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN POLICY PLAN
First Public Meeting/Work Session Series

Norwich, Vermont
November 16, 2005

Vermont Bicycle & Pedestrian Policy Plan
Public Work Session Meetings - Round 1

Agenda

1. Project Introduction.
2. How policies are set.
3. How policies are important.
4. Current Status of VTrans Bicycle and Pedestrian Program.
5. Current VTrans Bicyclists and Pedestrian Policies.
6. Vision and Goals for the future of bicycling and walking in Vermont
7. Discussion of edits, updates, replacements or additions to VTrans Bicycle and Pedestrian Program and Policies.
8. Project Schedule and Next Public Work Session

Work Session Notes

Attendees:

| NAME |
|---------------------|
| |
| Sharon Racusin |
| Jamie Hess |
| Gerhard Postpischil |
| Erica Brinton |
| Will Flender |
| Stuart Richards |
| David Fisk |
| Tom Kenyon |
| Becka Roof |
| Susan Hardy |
| Charlie Sullivan |
| Lucy Gibson |
| John Saydek |
| Alan Isaacson |

| |
|-------------------|
| Jason Rasmussen |
| Tom Linell |
| Gary Fox |
| Robert Chamberlin |
| Wally Elton |
| Kathy Davidow |
| Jill Kearney |
| David Hubbard |
| Jennie Hubbard |
| Matt Osborn |
| Suzanne Wallis |
| Sarah D. Reeves |
| Chuck Wise |
| Bud Hasse |

Jim presented basics of how VTrans policies are made and why they are important. He described the current VTrans policies relating to bicycle and pedestrian travel. He then opened the meeting to comments and discussion.

- N-1. There needs to be rules on how you design roadways for bicyclists. VTrans can't work on bicycle and pedestrian policies in a vacuum. For instance, paving policies for roadways do not always accommodate bicycles and pedestrians, but it is a paving and roadway issue, not necessarily a bicycle and pedestrian issue.
- N-2. The existing policies sound good, but seem to have no teeth and there appears to be a lack of uniformity in the current application of the policies.
- N-3. The quality of the pavement has to meet the needs of all users.
- N-4. There should be bicycle lanes on all roads.
- N-5. The California model of providing education and facilities works well and should be followed here.
- N-6. The State should educate bicyclists as well as drivers on the rules of the road. Education seems to be needed as part of the overall set of policies. The State must educate motorists and bicyclists about how to travel together.
- N-7. VTrans should not try to segregate bicyclist and auto as it seems to be doing now by creating bike paths. Don't narrow the vision of how bicyclists and pedestrian should be able to move around to just bike lanes.

- N-8. All roads must be safe for all users.
- N-9. The two most important things the State can do to make bicycling and walking easier is to lower vehicle speeds to 5 mph in all villages and to eliminate large truck in the State of Vermont.
- N-10. All public transportation should accommodate bicyclists.
- N-11. Land development regulations and Act 250 must consider bicyclists and pedestrians as part of the review of impacts to transportation systems.
- N-12. VTrans access permits should also consider bicyclist and pedestrian access to the road in addition to vehicular access.
- N-13. Drivers need to know how to safely maneuver around bicycles. There should be a section in “Rules of The Road” providing this information and other information about sharing the road with bicyclists and pedestrians.
- N-14. Safe bicycle education should start early in schools.
- N-15. When planning bicyclists and pedestrian facilities, require that they contain links to bus stops and transit, where applicable.
- N-16. Education of drivers and bicyclists is very important; predictable behavior from both groups is important in insuring safety.
- N-17. Policies should be considered as part of the five Es: Encouragement; Education; Engineering; Enforcement; Evaluation.
- N-18. There should be a presumption of guilt on driver when a vehicle strikes or hits a bicyclist or pedestrian.
- N-19. Create a pedestrian zone in all village areas – no crosswalks would be needed; pedestrians could cross the street where ever they wanted.
- N-20. Don’t create a blanket policy, but allow villages and towns to create more pedestrian friendly policies in their villages.
- N-21. There should be different policies for meeting the needs of bicyclists and pedestrians in villages than there are on rural roads.
- N-22. Traffic calming elements are important considerations.

- N-23. Allow lower than 25 mph speed limits in village areas.
- N-24. Provide greater flexibility for villages to accommodate pedestrian and bicyclists in the centers by allowing the use of pedestrian zones, lower speed limits, and center islands, but have certain standards of what would be allowed. The State needs to have some standard so that there won't be totally different situations from village to village.
- N-25. Enforcement of current regulations is important. Speed carts should be used.
- N-26. The State should clarify its signage.
- N-27. The State must have consistent rules for bicyclists and vehicles.
- N-28. There needs to be better integration between highway planning and bicyclist and pedestrian considerations.
- N-29. Motorists and the State need to realize that bikes are not toys but legitimate vehicles and that they should be allowed to share the travel lanes and not be limited to riding on the shoulders.
- N-30. Guardrails need to be installed so that they do not limit the use of the road by bicyclists. Most new ones appear to be placed directly next to the edge of the paving, which narrows the amount of pavement that can be used by bicyclists. The type of guardrail used should also be friendly to bicyclists.
- N-31. Pavement levels should be maintained in a safe condition around drainage grates. Storm drains must be bike friendly.
- N-32. There should be a policy to follow policies. Perhaps there should be an ombudsman to insure the policies are followed.
- N-33. Make the travel lane wide enough to accommodate both vehicles and the types of bicyclists that will be using it (commuters, grade school children, fitness riders).
- N-34. Make shoulders wide enough to be used by bicyclists on busier roads.
- N-35. Education appears to be a more realistic fix for rural road conditions than adding shoulders.

- N-36. Continue to maintain road ways so that they remain bicycle friendly into the future. This includes repaving, cleaning, and pavement repair.
- N-37. All VTrans engineers should consult the Ped Bike Design Manual to make sure they consider bicyclists and pedestrian needs in their designs.
- N-38. VTrans should consider having all plans reviewed for suitability for bicyclists and pedestrians and certified.
- N-39. VTrans needs to maintain its facilities to standard that allow continued use by bicyclists and pedestrians.
- N-40. Where do bicycles belong? Shoulder should be used as much as possible to increase bicycle travel on roadways.
- N-41. Add shoulder when possible where repaving is underway.
- N-42. There should be 5 feet for shoulder and bike ped use.
- N-43. Every road should have a shoulder.
- N-44. Roadway widths should be consistent along the length of the road with no sudden changes in width that suddenly force bicyclists into the travel lane.
- N-45. DMV should have bicycle safety as part of drivers test
- N-46. Reform Sate standards to be more bicyclists friendly.
- N-47. Must balance width of shoulder with the extent that it will encourage speeding. The greater the traffic volume, the more the need for shoulders.
- N-48. The types of facilities provided and policies created should consider the needs of the users.
- N-49. VTrans should have a policy that encourages people to walk and bicycle.
- N-50. Where there is a narrowing of road there should be share the road signs. There should be a policy that ensures that the signs are used and used consistently.
- N-51. There should be education to make sure bicycles are accepted on public roads by motorists, although motorists', and sometimes bicyclist's, attitudes create educational challenges.

N-52. Vermont should live up to its image as a great place to cycle.

N-53. In 25 years, there should be as many bikes on the road as there are vehicles.

BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN POLICY PLAN
First Public Meeting/Work Session Series

South Hero, Vermont
November 30, 2005

Vermont Bicycle & Pedestrian Policy Plan
Public Work Session Meetings - Round 1

Agenda Meeting #2

1. Project Introduction. **(10minutes)**
 - *What this meeting is about (JIM)*
 - *How this meeting will be conducted (JIM)*
 - *What the project is attempting to accomplish. SCOTT*
 - *How it is being managed. SCOTT*
 - *What the project is and is not. SCOTT / JIM*
2. Overview of Current VTrans Bicyclists and Pedestrian Policies. (Jim & Amy) **(10 minutes)**
Handout with policies divided into Education, Enforcement, Engineering, Evaluation and Encouragement.
3. Vision and Goals for the future of bicycling and walking in Vermont. **(20 minutes)**
 - *How would/should Vermont's transportation system differ in 10 years; 25 years?*
 - *What types of systems, facilities, and programs should exist for bicycling and walking?*
 - *Use easel to record comments.*
4. Discussion of needed VTrans policy changes that will impact bicycling and walking **(80 minutes)**
 - *Using the five E as a means of organizing the discussion*
 - *How do the policies need to change to meet the goals?*
 - *Identify under who's jurisdiction identified policy will be addressed*
 - *Use easel to record comments.*
5. Project Schedule and Next Public Work Sessions. **(5 minutes)**
6. Other discussion items from the audience.

Note: If there are more than 15 people, the audience will be split into two groups for Agenda items 3 and 4. The groups will talk for about 80 minutes on both topics, with 20 minutes for group discussion.

Work Session Notes

Attendees:

| Name |
|------------------------------|
| |
| Jim Donovan |
| Amy Bell |
| Scott Bascom |
| Chapin Spencer |
| Peter Hawks |
| Roy Neuer |
| Steve Pierce |
| MaryLou Recor |
| Jon Kaplan |
| Becka Roolf |
| Dave Park |
| Lou Bruce |
| Bill Cimonetti |
| Jim Dudley |
| Chuck Vile |
| Moe Cloutier (Silver Spokes) |
| Peter Zamore |
| Roland and Carol Tremble |
| Warren Steadman |
| Michael Guernsey |
| David Borthwick Leslie |
| Jim Limanek |
| Dave Hobbs |
| Michael Hechmer |
| Jim Mogan |
| Lani Seifert |
| |

After a description of the intent of the project, the relationship of this project to other VTrans projects, the purpose of this particular meeting and an overview of existing Vermont bicycling

and walking policies, the audience was divided into two groups. Each group was asked to develop their vision for the future of bicycling and walking in Vermont over the next five years.

Group 1 developed the following ideas on their future for bicycle and walking:

- S-1. Vermont is the most bicycling and walking friendly state in the country.
- S-2. There are shoulders on all paved roads, and design specifications that provide information on how wide the shoulders will be for new or reconstructed roads. In general, shoulders are wider as travel lanes widen. Roadways are widened as needed to accommodate shoulders.
- S-3. There are State maps available showing on and off-road complimentary facilities.
- S-4. The State is moving towards a community-based system of bicycling and walking facilities to connect important origins and destinations.
- S-5. Motorists respect bicyclist and bicyclist respect motorists.
- S-6. Vermont tourist spending is increased by bicycling travelers.
- S-7. Pedestrian and bicyclist facilities are maintained and usable, including shoulders, signage, toilets, showers, lockers, racks, etc.
- S-8. There is an overall State bicycling and walking plan, made up of regional plans, that guides development of bicycling and walking facilities.
- S-9. There is a State-supported and promoted bike trail system for both on and off road facilities.
- S-10. There is a State system for off-road bicyclists for mountain bikes.
- S-11. Every developed area has sidewalks.
- S-12. Crosswalks are respected.
- S-13. There is a culture of bicycling and walking as a first choice over driving (and there is a support system of make this happen).
- S-14. Group #1 went on to look closely at the existing policies relating to bicycling and walking and made numerous comments. The first set of

comments relates to the policy contained in State Law shown in italics. The second set are general comments on policies.

- S-15. *The agency of natural resources shall coordinate the development of trails and the agency of transportation shall coordinate the development of bicycle and pedestrian paths.* One organization should address the needs of all trips; Marketing of bicycling and walking facilities should be added in addition to “development.” VTrans and ANR should work together
- S-16. *Town highway funds may be used for the establishment and maintenance of bicycle routes.* Be more general. Mandate some portion of State funds be used for maintenance.
- S-17. *VTrans may establish and maintain bicycle routes separately or in conjunction with the construction, reconstruction or maintenance of existing or new highways.* Reference bicycle and pedestrian facilities in general. (In general, add pedestrians where ever there is a reference to bicyclist in current laws and policies.)
- S-18. *VTrans shall assist and cooperate with regional planning commissions, municipal governments, other state agencies and citizens’ groups in the development and construction of local and regional bicycle projects and in the application for any funds available for these projects.* Add “promote and support” in addition to “development and construction” to help create a statewide system.
- S-19. *No landowner shall be liable for any property damage or personal injury sustained by any person who is using, for any purpose permitted by state law or by a municipal ordinance, bicycle routes constructed on the landowner’s property pursuant to this chapter, unless the landowner charges a fee for the use of the property.* Being held not liable is not enough. Landowners need protection from law suits and financial loss due to frivolous law suits.
- S-20. *The state shall provide paved shoulders on major state highways with the intent to develop an integrated bicycle route system.* Use “appropriate” not “major”. Focuses on “integrated bicycle route system”; add State standards.
- S-21. *Any construction, or reconstruction, including upgrading and resurfacing projects on major state highways shall include paved shoulders unless the agency deems certain sections to be cost prohibitive.* Remove “major” and use “appropriate.”
- S-22. Evaluation policies need to be geared towards the different types of areas being evaluated; rural/urban/suburban areas should have different evaluation criteria.
- S-23. All Class 4 roads should become bicyclist friendly.

- S-24. Consider providing “adequate bicycling and walking facilities” rather than requiring shoulders all the time.
- S-25. VTrans should coordinate the promotion of bicycling and walking throughout the State and within individual communities.
- S-26. VTrans should assess the overall value to bicycling and walking facilities that include health and tourism benefits.
- S-27. Bicycling and walking facilities should actually meet the needs of the users, such as providing bike lockers vs. bike racks in places where all day storage is needed; or eliminate poor pavement patching on shoulders which can spill bicyclists..
- S-28. Some agency needs to take on job of creating a State bicycling system.
- S-29. There should be special protection laws for bicyclists and pedestrians - a “Move over and slow down” law
- S-30. There should be better education of motorists and cyclists.

Group #2 made the following comments on the future of bicycling and walking in Vermont.

- S-31. Get bikes off highways.
- S-32. Don’t get bikes off highways.
- S-33. There are bike lanes on all major commuter corridors.
- S-34. Link transportation investments with economic considerations e.g. public/private partnership air quality or congestion mitigation.
- S-35. All schools and businesses are catering to bicycling and walking needs.
- S-36. Larger cities have extensive bicycling and walking networks.
- S-37. There is courtesy towards bicyclists and pedestrian including a “bike culture.”
- S-38. There are sidewalks that link businesses with homes and community facilities.
- S-39. All paved roads have shoulders.

- S-40. There is a commitment to maintain sidewalks and lanes clear of debris and snow.
- S-41. There is a system of off-highway bicycling and walking facilities, with a State policy off developing and maintaining the system analogous to the State's commitment to the state highway system e.g. CVT, LCB maintained by state as a "statewide network"
- S-42. There are bicycle symbols posted along most roads and there are bike lane/share the road/signs.
- S-43. Motorists are courtesy toward bicyclists and pedestrians; there is bicyclist and pedestrian education.
- S-44. There is education to get State and local jurisdictions to coordinate better - to create seamless network of bicycling and walking facilities regardless of jurisdiction.
- S-45. There are State incentives for businesses to promote/encourage bicycling and walking.
- S-46. There is an even mode split between bicycling/walking and motor vehicles.
- S-47. There is Tourism promotion of bicycle routes and better information than there is now.
- S-48. Vermont looks at other countries' bicycling and walking polices/practices for application in Vermont and incorporate the best practices in Vermont.
- S-49. Bicycling and walking needs are given equal priority on all infrastructure projects.
- S-50. There is mandatory, annual bicycling and walking project funding.
- S-51. There are user fees for bicycling
- S-52. There is a "seamless network" between bicycling, walking and transit facilities.
- S-53. There is Statewide recognition of dirt / road biking as a resource.
- S-54. Mountain biking is a significant economic resource and is better utilized in Vermont

- S-55. There are more amenities to support year round bicycling and walking e.g. bathrooms, donut shops.
- S-56. Vermont supports a “healthy lifestyle.”
- S-57. Everyone is “happy and healthy” and physical activity is a part of everyone’s life
- S-58. Expanded roadway shoulders promote more on-road bicycling
- S-59. There is good education that makes pedestrians and bicyclists more aware of the need to be visible.
- S-60. Vermont has developed innovative engineering solutions for crossing divided or high speed roads.
- S-61. There is VTrans commitment to benchmark progress on bicycling and walking.
- S-62. There is travel time comparison by mode

Group 2 opted to review the policies in more detail at home and send in comments.

BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN POLICY PLAN
First Public Meeting/Work Session Series

Wallingford, Vermont
December 7, 2005

Vermont Bicycle & Pedestrian Policy Plan
Public Work Session Meetings - Round 1

Agenda Meeting #3

1. Project Introduction. (Power Point – **10 minutes MAX**)
 - *What this meeting is about (JIM)*
 - *How this meeting will be conducted (JIM)*
 - *What the project is attempting to accomplish. (General Mention of other Modal Plans – no specific reference to highway plan)(JIM)*
 - *How it is being managed. (JIM)*
 - *What the project is and is not. (JIM)*

2. Overview of Current VTrans Bicyclists and Pedestrian Plan. (Power Point -**10 minutes**)
 - *Review contents(JIM)*
 - *Review accomplishments (JIM)*
 - *Review on-going work (JIM)*

3. Overview of Existing Policies (Power Point – **JIM -5 minutes**)
Handout with policies divided into Education, Enforcement, Engineering, Evaluation and Encouragement.

4. Vision and Goals for the Future of Bicycling and Walking in Vermont. (Small Group Work - **20 minutes max**)
 - *How would/should Vermont's transportation system differ in 10 years; 25 years?*
 - *What types of systems, facilities, and programs should exist for bicycling and walking?*
 - *Use easel or stickies to record comments.*

5. Discussion of Needed VTrans Policy Changes That Will Impact Bicycling and Walking (Small Group Work - **20 minutes max**)
 - *Use the five E as a means of organizing the discussion*
 - *What policies need to exist to promote your vision?*
 - *Identify under who's jurisdiction identified policy will be addressed*
 - *Use easel or stickies to record comments.*

6. Group Discussion of Small Group Work (*JIM* – **10 minutes**)
7. Project Schedule and Next Public Work Sessions. (*JIM* - **5 minutes**)
8. Other discussion items from the audience.

Work Session Notes

Attendees:

| |
|-------------------|
| Name |
| |
| Jim Sullivan |
| Amy Bell |
| MaryLou Bolt |
| Erneset DeMatties |
| Becka Roof |
| Charles Angel |
| Susan Schreibman |
| Mark Blucher |
| Lynn Achee |
| Tony Digacomo |
| Alison Church |
| Betsy Wickman |
| Don Wickman |
| Scott Bascom |
| Charles Angel |

After a description of the intent of the project, the relationship of this project to other VTrans projects, the purpose of this particular meeting and an overview of existing Vermont bicycling and walking policies, the audience members were asked to develop their vision for the future of bicycling and walking in Vermont over the next five years.

Their vision included:

- W-1. More well-used, interconnected rail trails;

- W-2. Good pavement conditions and wide, well-maintained shoulders on State highways;
- W-3. Single file riding - bicyclists and motorists obey state laws (note: State Law allows two bicyclist to ride abreast);
- W-4. Designated roads that are “safe” for riding;
- W-5. Bicycles registration;
- W-6. Bicyclists receive training before riding on roads;
- W-7. Bikes insured and operators licensed;
- W-8. Vermonters aware of the value of bicycling and walking;
- W-9. Motorists that treat pedestrians with respect;
- W-10. Roadway shoulders that are well-maintained;
- W-11. Enforcement of litter laws to ensure clean shoulders;
- W-12. ALL existing trails are well-maintained and maintained by the users who are coordinated by State D&H & LV Rail Trails;
- W-13. Good signage;
- W-14. Good interstate coordination (D&H Rail Trail)
- W-15. Trail maintenance done by those that need to do community service or restitution;
- W-16. All state roads provide safe walking conditions;
- W-17. Safe walking or bicycling wherever you want to go, including private development and parking lots;
- W-18. Safely crossing roadways;
- W-19. Mandatory on-road bicycle education for all Vermont middle school students;

- W-20. Meeting accessibility needs of all Vermonters;
- W-21. Adequate recreation walking loops in developed areas;
- W-22. Promotion of Vermont as a bicycling and walking destination state;
- W-23. More transportation funds spent on alternative transportation;
- W-24. Transportation/travel demand management routinely incorporating bicycling and walking provisions;
- W-25. Culture of VTrans understands and incorporates needs of bicyclists and pedestrians;
- W-26. Focused bicycling and walking expertise retained in VTrans;
- W-27. Each community retains a bicycling and walking coordinator;
- W-28. Bicyclist and pedestrians have a strong statewide organization (VAST, model) w/ local or regional clubs; and
- W-29. VTrans understands the value of walking on State highways as vital to our health.

BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN POLICY PLAN
First Public Meeting/Work Session Series

Montpelier, Vermont
December 20, 2005

Work Session Notes

Attendees:

| Name |
|-------------------|
| |
| Ben Matchstick |
| Rose Paul |
| Linda Henzel |
| Betty Rose |
| Becka Roof |
| Mary Welz |
| Carolyn Grodinsky |
| John Lynch |
| Gerry D'Amico |
| Mark Houle |
| Judy Bond |

There were more attendees who opted not to sign-in.

After a description of the intent of the project, the relationship of this project to other VTrans projects, the purpose of this particular meeting and an overview of existing Vermont bicycling and walking policies, the audience members were asked to develop their vision for the future of bicycling and walking in Vermont over the next five years.

Their vision included:

- M-1. An integrated system of bicycling and walking facilities;
- M-2. A strong VTrans vision statement with "commitment" to a multi-modal transportation system;
- M-3. State incentives to encourage trail development projects;
- M-4. Streamline permitting for bicycling and walking projects;

- M-5. There is a bridge and culvert program type process for bicycling and walking projects, creating a State funded system to eliminate compliance with federal requirement;
- M-6. Appropriate shoulders for bicycling and walking are added when doing paving project.
- M-7. There is better education of drivers and motorists on how to co-exist, so that motorists expect cyclists and give them the appropriate right-of-way and respect and bicyclist act responsibly towards motorists.
- M-8. The State promotes Vermont as a bike friendly state;
- M-9. There is a system of well-signed bike routes—similar to motor vehicle signage.
- M-10. Bicycling and walking are promoted as means of transportation, not just as recreation.
- M-11. There is a more extensive system of regional paths to accommodate running.
- M-12. VTrans provides greater distance between paved roadway shoulders and guardrails.
- M-13. There are great multi-modal connection providing bicycle and pedestrian access to buses.
- M-14. The State uses abandoned railroad tracks as paths.
- M-15. Vermont is the first state in the U.S. to have a cycling simulation machine that is used to train both bicyclists and motorists.
- M-16. Vermont requires all motorists to pass a bicycling test in the cycling simulator before getting their drivers license.
- M-17. Vermont focuses on making downtowns more walkable.
- M-18. Vermont shuts down more streets to motor vehicles in urban areas.
- M-19. The State supports a work force of migrating, bicycle-riding, organic farm workers as an educational example of the interdependence of sustainability and alternative transportation.
- M-20. There is a culture of bicycling in Vermont.

- M-21. The existing State GIS roadway system data is expanded to collect information to be used in determining suitability of specific roadway sections for bicycling in Vermont (on-road); the State uses the information to create a GIS compatible decision tool for future improvements.
- M-22. Cycling and walking on all State roads is allowed, including the interstate system and limited access roadways.
- M-23. Bicycling and walking rules taught in Vermont schools.
- M-24. The State educates adults about proper interactions with cyclists through public service announcements and other outlets.
- M-25. Create bicycling routes that parallel significant, heavily traveled roads to separate bicyclists and trucks and other vehicles.
- M-26. Touring cyclists are better educated about proper riding on Vermont roads.
- M-27. VTrans helps to secure railroad right-of-way for corridors that have reverted to adjacent landowners.
- M-28. There are strictly enforced speed limits and passing zone.
- M-29. The State makes it easier to provide continuous roadway shoulders and provides signing and stencils where shoulder can't be continuous.
- M-30. Passing lanes on low speed (25 mph) roadways are converted to bike lanes.
- M-31. Every school in Vermont has safe bicycling and walking to school options.
- M-32. VTrans works communities to inventory current bicycling and walking conditions and opportunities and setting priorities.
- M-33. There is adequate signing for cyclists at pinch points on road.
- M-34. Vermont educates motorists at border entries of Vermont about laws specific to bicyclists and pedestrians through signs and other means.
- M-35. There is a standard policy that all crosswalks have adequate visibility from the roadway.
- M-36. The State encourage pedestrians to dress brightly.

- M-37. The State understand that better education in grammar schools and above key to safe bicycling.
- M-38. There is a bicycling and walking facility funding program that is funded only through State money.
- M-39. Every map/information system that Vermont publishes or partners in publishing includes section on Vermont vehicular, bicycling and walking laws.
- M-40. Vermont networking with other rural states to get more flexibility in use of federal funds.

The group made the following recommendations about bicycling and walking policies.

- M-41. All modes of transportation are treated with equal importance (instead of the focus on road and motor vehicles needs.)
- M-42. Transportation modes are developed appropriate to the environment through which they pass.
- M-43. Bicycling and walking are viable modes of transportation.
- M-44. Alternative transportation is encouraged for transportation, health, environment and economic benefits.
- M-45. The State focuses on big picture thinking when considering the benefits of bicycling and walking, e.g. air quality.
- M-46. Bicycling and walking facilities and programs are integrated into the health care system.
- M-47. The State mandates bike education for transportation designers, politicians, and troopers.
- M-48. There is a mandatory on-bike component of Vermont drivers test.
- M-49. There are a set of enforceable laws for bicycling.
- M-50. Bicyclists are licensed to ride on-road.

- M-51. The State uses fees collected from registration for bicyclists and pedestrians to pay for infrastructure and enforcement and to foster ownership; the Fees are proportional to impact.
- M-52. Vermonters demand enforcement of bicycling and pedestrian laws.
- M-53. Licensing of bicyclists is used to encourage not discourage bicycling by providing access to the State network.
- M-54. Transportation facilities are designed to eliminate the need to violate existing laws to be safe.
- M-55. Vermont regulates personal safety device use, such as bicycle helmets, bright clothing, etc.
- M-56. It is permitted to use sidewalks as path, but the use by all users is examined.
- M-57. State activity works to resolve conflicts between motorists, pedestrians and bicyclists.
- M-58. Vermont embraces the Share the Road policy.
- M-59. There is State supported funding programs to promote bicycling and the use of safety devices.
- M-60. The State provides incentives for non-motorized, public transit, or car/van pool travel of citizens.
- M-61. There are State supported alternative commuter tax incentives.
- M-62. State and public buildings support alternative transportation with appropriate year round facilities.

APPENDIX 2D
Additional Comments

The following comments were made at least once during an interview or public work session.

Vision

- V.22. It is possible to safely walk or bike where you want to go.
- V.23. The accessibility needs of all Vermonters are met.
- V.24. Travel demand management routinely includes bicycling and walking provisions.
- V.25. There is adequate funding for alternative transportation.
- V.26. Bikes are off the highway.
- V.27. Bikes are kept on the highway.
- V.28. All schools and businesses cater to bicycling and walking needs.
- V.29. There is an even mode split between bicycling/walking and motor vehicles.
- V.30. There is a mandatory bicycling/walking design and construction project funding.
- V.31. There is statewide recognition of dirt (mountain) biking as a resource.
- V.32. Mountain biking is recognized as a significant economic resource that is used well by Vermont.
- V.33. VTTrans is committed to benchmark progress on bicycling and walking.
- V.34. Vermont compares travel times by mode.
- V.35. There are more sidewalks.
- V.36. There are well developed bicycling and walking standards and specifications.
- V.37. There is a State mountain bike system.
- V.38. Every developed area has sidewalks.
- V.39. Transportation benefits of bicycling and walking should be linked with economic considerations important to both public and private concerns and should inspire public/private partnerships for mutual economic benefit.

- V.40. There should be a strong commitment by communities to maintain sidewalks and bicycling facilities clear of debris and snow.
- V.41. VTTrans should assist municipalities with maintenance funds for bicycling and walking facilities.
- V.42. Good signage should be in place statewide to encourage greater use of bicycling and walking facilities.
- V.43. VTTrans should provide monetary incentives to use alternative transportation, including bicycling and walking.
- V.44. Each community should have a bicycling and walking coordinator.
- V.45. There should be a strong bicycling and walking advocacy group or groups that work well with VTTrans.
- V.46. There should be an overall statewide bicycling and walking “plan” that is based on and coordinates the various regional plans.
- V.47. There should be a statewide bicycle route system.
- V.48. There should be excellent inter-municipal, inter-state, and VTTrans-regional commission coordination of bicycling and walking systems and programs.
- V.49. There should be a continued, even focus on bicycling and walking needs and issues.

Negative Perceptions

- P.10. VTTrans’ is thought to have a hold on funding new bicycle and pedestrian design projects. (*VTTrans has not ordered the hold.*)
- P.11. VTTrans is thought to have had minimal efforts to educate local officials about the values of bicycling and walking.
- P.12. Several individuals think that VTTrans opposes the use of federal funds to finance sidewalks, believing instead that they should be considered local issues and addressed by local funds.
- P.13. Some believe that the percentage of over all VTTrans funding of bicycling and walking projects and programs is significantly below the percentage of travel to work trips in

Vermont via bicycling and walking as reported in the National Trip to Work Survey.
(*No specific data has been provided to support this statement.*)

- P.14. It appears to some that Vermont is falling behind other New England states in the number of bicycling and walking facilities it has or is developing, especially relating to trails. (*No specific data has been provided to support this statement.*)

Issues, Challenges and New Programs

- I.5 The Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan is specific enough to be able to be used as a tool when working with municipalities; it highlights what is important to the public and has some punch that makes it usable.
- I.6 Roundabouts do not accommodate bicyclists and pedestrian well.
- I.7 The BPP becomes an excuse for ignoring bicycling and walking issues on other VTrans projects.
- I.8 The regions need more funding to help distribute the bicycling and walking information they have developed.
- I.9 The regions need more information on the benefits of bicycling and walking to share with their municipalities to help promote bicycling and walking at the local level.
- I.10 Finding the time and budget to meet the public's expectations regarding bicycling and walking programs and facilities in Vermont will be a challenge in the future.
- I.11 There should be a quarterly VTrans publication promoting the benefits of multi-modal, alternative transportation.

Performance Measures

- PM.11. Measure the walkability in villages.
- PM.12. Measure how people travel.

New Policies

- Pol.1. White lines along the sides of the road have value and are maintained so that they are always visible.

- Pol.2. The centerline is not striped on rural roads as a means of calming traffic.
- Pol.3. VTTrans makes a strong effort to manage demand and control congestion of motor vehicles.
- Pol.4. VTTrans educates local officials on bicycle and pedestrian policies and the advantages of bicycling and walking.
- Pol.5. Safety is the number one focus of VTTrans.
- Pol.6. Safety funds should be split between the different modes based on the percentage of crashes associated with that mode of travel.
- Pol.7. The Pavement Management and Operations Programs must include provisions for bicycling and walking on major bicycling and walking routes.
- Pol.8. Maintenance of existing facilities for all modes of travel should be of the utmost importance.
- Pol.9. Existing bicycle and pedestrian laws need to be enforced.
- Pol.10. Bicyclists should be educated and pass a bicycling license test before being allowed to ride on public roads.
- Pol.11. VTTrans considers all modes of travel in every one of its actions.
- Pol.12. VTTrans review of access permits to State roads must consider adequate means of access for all modes of travel accommodated on the adjacent roadway.
- Pol.13. Detection loops and other physical features of roadways and intersections accommodate bicyclist and pedestrians as well as motor vehicles.
- Pol.14. Speed limit policies should consider the presence of pedestrians and bicyclists and land use with or without a speed study for any speed.
- Pol.15. Villages should be able to set their own standards for accommodating bicyclists and pedestrians on State roads.
- Pol.16. There is consistency between the State's Bicycle and Pedestrian Policy Plan and the regional plans and actions.

APPENDIX E
TPI Meetings - Notes

**BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN POLICY PLAN
TPI Meeting #1**

**Montpelier, Vermont
October 20, 2005**

Meeting Notes

PRESENT:

Scott Bascom (VTrans)
Kim Johnson (WSA)
Bethany Whitaker (WSA)
Greg Reilly (VTrans)
Chris Jolly (FHWA)
Amy Bell (VTrans)
Steve Gladczuk (CVRPC)
Bill Rose (NWRPC)
Alison Church (Bennington)
Eleni Churchill (VTrans)
Matt Mann (Windham County RPC)
Jason Rasmussen (South Windsor County RPC)
Kimberly Murray (Transportation Coordinator)
Rick Kehne (Addison County RPC)
Daryl Benoit (CCMPO)
Susan Schreibman (Rutland RPC)

Greg Reilly introduced Scott Bascom. Scott explained that he, along with Amy Bell and Jon Kaplan, is managing the bike/ped policy plan. He explained that this new revision of the plan is in its early stages, i.e. info gathering, etc. He also said that Jim Donovan is the project manager, but in his absence, Bethany was here.

He mentioned the letter from Jim to the RPCs explaining what is needed from them – policy issues, performance measures and goals and how they can use them to direct the agency’s work. This kind of thing is not done in any other part of the country at the state level so this is new territory and being created as we go, he said.

Bethany said that we are doing a national scan in terms of bike ped policy planning and producing a tech memo about that. A first draft is currently being reviewed by VTrans and will be sent out to the advisory committee next week.

The second element is existing conditions and what's going on around the state. Jim sent out letters in September listing things he needed help with, including physical assessments of bike/ped facilities. He will get in touch with you soon to follow-up as much of that information is necessary for the second tech memo.

As part of the existing conditions phase, we are doing stakeholder interviews. We will use this meeting today to hear from you, i.e. how you use the bike ped policy plan, what are your priorities and what can we do to make it a more tangible document.

She explained that there are 3 questions that they need answers to from the RPCs:

HOW DOES BIKE PED POLICY PLAN INFLUENCE WHAT YOU DO IN RELATIONSHIP TO THE SEVEN THINGS?

- TPI.1. **Mr. Kehne** – it helps validate. You have people that are interested in this and then a lot of other people ask why are we wasting money on bike ped? So, anything that you can do within the bike ped transportation plan to really validate and justify the program in terms of transportation is very helpful. Because when it comes down to policy, it all should be “transportation” and the bike ped is a significant piece of the transportation effort.
- TPI.2. Also, it would help if the plan could illustrate how bike ped benefits the transportation system as a whole.
- TPI.3. **Daryl Benoit** – he hasn't used the plan per se – they have a bike ped subcommittee which is formed of interested residents – they really encourage from the preliminary stages of any repaving project RPC and public involvement in terms of shoulder widths. Need some language in the policy plan that encourages a more assertive way to get other people involved with widening shoulders.
- TPI.4. **Kehne** – he doesn't use the plan now because it isn't specific enough to be able to use as a tool when working with municipalities as it is now. Need to be able to give it some punch to be able to use it, e.g. what is it important to the public at large.
- TPI.5. **Amy Bell** – Amy asked if she and Jon didn't exist, would the RPCs use the plan more?
- TPI.6. **Kehne** – we rely on you guys. He said they provide them with specific information and are very useful.
- TPI.7. **Daryl Benoit** – we rely on their experience. People can relate to Amy and ask questions and the policy plan is black and white.

TPI.8. **Amy Bell** – as long as there was someone in the agency, when she was in the RPC, she didn't use it much as a tool, but when there wasn't a person available, it became a tool.

TPI.9. **Alison Church** - used it for language to support grant applications

TPI.10.**Jason Rasmussen** – his concern is to make sure that there is consistency between the policy plan and the regional bike plans.

TPI.11.**Kehne** – the plan is a vehicle around which communication and planning centers. It is a statewide vision and tied to national initiative – the big picture. The ability to use it is how well-defined it is.

TPI.12.**Bethany** - The existing Bike Ped Policy plan lays out seven areas where the regions and localities are working on bicycle and pedestrian activities. Of the seven things, which are most important, which do you put the highest priority on?

TPI.13.**Kehne** – suggested that they list the seven things and go over them one by one.

Seven things:

Infrastructure

Project Planning

Safety

Education and Outreach

Research

Design

Coordination

TPI.14.**Steve Gladzuc** - CVRPC tries to match the State's criteria to their project. Safety is also the big thing as well as shoulder width.

TPI.15.**Daryl Benoit** – it goes along with infrastructure as well. And education. The CCMPO developed their bike suitability map to educate the public.

TPI.16.**Kehne** – they rely on conversations with Amy especially because he is new to the RPC.

TPI.17.**Amy Bell** – the design manual answers the questions. The project specific issues still come up however.

TPI.18.**Kehne** - coordination is an area that is important as well – focus more on coordination to have an idea of ultimate goal

- TPI.19.**Amy Bell** - the number one thing is working with all the bike ped interest groups in the state. They are working with those groups to insure coordination among them and keep them going and focused.
- TPI.20.**Susan Schreibman** - some of it is innate but maybe people need more assistance with the coordination piece, but as planners that's what we do on a daily basis, so the coordination planning piece isn't as important as the other pieces.
- TPI.21.**Alison Church** – it's hard to prioritize the list of seven. For her there is always need to know more information but how it relates to safety is important. Safety is No. 1. Design is not as important because they already have the design manual to refer to.
- TPI.22.**Kehne** – coordination rings a bell with him too. To him it is important in a policy plan because you're looking at infrastructure (transportation) as a whole and we should be delineating what are our goals and how they relate to coordination statewide, region wide – that makes it important to him. The public is going to look at this with a very limited window of focus, so should say “where are we going with this and why?”
- TPI.23.**Bill Rose** – he echos previous comments saying that all seven are important. The design manual isn't as important or crucial as the others.
- TPI.24.**Amy Bell** – research – some of the research VTrans does is TRB-related, but we do specific research projects as well. They are working right now installing in-pavement crosswalk lights at Quechee Gorge. Another project is a study on shared use path barrier types – different types of fencing, vegetation, etc. They have 5 ongoing research projects. Another is the green bike lanes in South Burlington. Truncated domes in Montpelier is another one – how they endure the weather conditions.
- TPI.25.**Kehne** – in a policy plan itself, is research more specific than other areas and should that be a subcategory itself?
- TPI.26.**Elani Churchill** – in the policy plan, you create a general policy but if you endorse the policy of actually using those monies, you have to have the policy statement.
- TPI.27.**Kimberly Murray** – all are important. RPCs don't do design work.
- TPI.28.**Amy Bell** - said she was surprised no one has mentioned or discussed project planning; the most significant thing most of the people in the room do is project planning.
- TPI.29.**Kehne** - RPCs take project planning for granted because that's what they do.

TPI.30.**Jason Rasmussen** – what they are working on is dictated by their regional plan and once they are doing that planning work, they draw on the other seven things, so it is hard to prioritize them – all are interrelated.

TPI.31.**Alison Church** – would it be possible to have a link to the existing research on the web? For example, she would like to know what is happening with the truncated domes and how it relates to her project. If there is a way that RPCs know where to go....

TPI.32.**Amy Bell** – go to the LTF website and the reports are there. All reports and write-ups are there and the analysis on how different projects are performed.

HOW CAN PLAN BE BETTER? WHAT NEW THINGS DO YOU WANT IN THE PLAN TO MAKE IT MORE USEFUL?

TPI.33.**Kehne** – anything that the plan can do to help them with prioritizing and selecting projects based on different criteria and help them then get funding and support to move those things forward would be good. Anything that can be done with the plan to integrate it with other transportation plans and activities also would be good.

TPI.34.**Daryl Benoit** – road widths - in terms of when a repaving project starts up, to look at widening shoulders - that's not always the case. So to have the RPC involved to bring that issue to the table as well helps out and funding for any project would be ideal. Over the last 4 or 5 years, he said, there have been a lot of paving projects where shoulder width doesn't get looked at. So when an RPC knows when a project is happening, it's almost too late.

TPI.35.**Bethany** – So you would like this policy plan to help advocate that?

TPI.36.**Daryl Benoit** – yes, but this is just a guidance document.

TPI.37.**Kehne** – But it is a document that is used by both RPCs and VTrans. So it is a good chance to address how we do that before paving projects get going.

TPI.38.**Kimberly Murray** - bike ped needs to integrate with all they do, not just an afterthought. Also on bridges. To have it more stated in the policy plan would be good.

TPI.39.**Daryl Benoit** - that's where project design comes in. When determining how much funding is allocated to a project, include bike ped stuff at first instead of looking at it at the end when there's no more money. If you put it into a budget initially, it would be good.

TPI.40.**Alison Church** – a lot of town roads don’ t have the white shoulder anymore because of the cost falling on the town. In terms of policy, express that the white shoulder lines have value – they provide a visual cue and make things safer and explain how it would fall under safety, etc.

TPI.41.**Steve Gladczuk** - Steve said that one of his problems with the state policy is that in submitting projects to be funded for construction, they have been developing a regional path and they consciously chose not to submit for funding because they felt they were going to ask for half of all the funding available, so they submitted a much smaller scale sidewalk project. So there needs to be a way to get the long-distance projects built in the system.

TPI.42.**Rutland**– the policy plan needs to address maintenance of facilities.

TPI.43.**Kehne** - agrees with Steve – how do we keep large projects alive instead of ignoring them? Get them in a system where they can progress so it’s worth the effort to develop long-range – some kind of mechanisms whereby that could be possible.

TPI.44.**Greg Reilly**- how are businesses tied into development of this plan? For instance, with the Stowe path, there is an impact on local business. What is the communication between private and public going forward?

TPI.45.**Scott Bascom** – it is part of the Steering Advisory Committee - they have invited commerce and community members to be part of this committee – they haven’t gotten anyone to sign yet to be included but it is still early in the process.

TPI.46.**Amy Bell** - the SAC hasn’t met yet – not until November. She anticipates that through the public outreach process, they will get participation from the bike ped coalition.

TPI.47.**Bethany** - reported on upcoming public meeting schedule:

Norwich – November 16
South Hero – no date yet
Montpelier – nothing yet

There will be another round of public meetings when a draft plan is available, which will be in the spring. They will be looking for RPCs to host those as well.

Scott Bascom will be sending out notices when they are established.

Jim Donovan will be getting in touch with you all in a couple of weeks about the physical assessments.

BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN POLICY PLAN
TPI Meeting #2

Montpelier, Vermont
November 17, 2005

Meeting Notes

Attendees:

| Name | Affiliation |
|------------------|--------------------|
| Jason Rasmussen | SWCRPC |
| Rick Kehne | ACRPC |
| Chuck Wise | TRORC |
| Matt Mann | WRC |
| Jon Kaplan | VTrans |
| Susan Schreibman | RRPC |
| Eleni Churchill | VTrans |
| Polly McMurtry | VTrnas |
| Kimberly Murray | VTrans |
| Greg Riley | VTrans |
| Scott Bascom | AOT |
| Steve Gladczuk | CVRPC |
| Doug Morton | NVDA |
| Jim Donovan | WSA |
| Gina Campole | AOT |
| Alison Church | BCRC |
| Daryl Benoit | CCMPO |
| Bill Rose | NWCRPC |
| | |

What bicycling and walking facilities and programs should be coordinated and developed at the regional level?

TPI.48. Regions should focus on implementation. State will need to rely on regions to do training.

TPI.49. Maintain tech expertise in VTrans.

TPI.50. Regions should produce bike ped plans.

- TPI.51. Regions should help towns develop specific bicycle/pedestrian projects.
- TPI.52. Have earlier notification of roadway projects in the region, so that they can review inclusion of bicycle/pedestrian facilities.
- TPI.53. Help municipalities prepare development guidelines for BP facility implementation in zoning and other development regulations
- TPI.54. Use involvement in Act 250 to talk to developers about BP facilities in their plans
- TPI.55. Have more focus on alternative forms of transportation rather than continuing an auto only focus
- TPI.56. Regions can provide bike/ped recommendations on town plans/ordinances.
- TPI.57. Regions can foster better integration coordination between land use issues and transportation issues.
- TPI.58. Coordinate BPP work with regions on bicycling and walking workshops
- TPI.59. Have BPP provide internal VTrans education with regional commission staff, public works directors and TAC members
- TPI.60. Request something relating to bicycling and walking every year in the TIP.
- TPI.61. Prepare best practices information for bicycling and walking issues that can be project specific; they can be organized in a lessons learned format focusing on how has the project helped, anecdotal information, and before and after examples.

What can VTRans do to help the regions promote bicycle pedestrian programs and facilities?

- TPI.62. Define Vermont specific Bicycle Level of Service (BLOS).
- TPI.63. Provide more funding for bicycling and walking facilities.
- TPI.64. Incorporate regional plan information and recommendations into State plans for roadway improvements.
- TPI.65. Make sure there is a good link between bicycling and walking needs and State highway projects.
- TPI.66. Assist regions with clarifications about maintenance and liability issues.

- TPI.67. Help regions promote bicycling and walking and explain benefits of bicycling and walking modes of travel by highlighting linkages between bicycling and walking and public health, tourism, and economic growth.
- TPI.68. Create a marketing program about the gains made elsewhere in economic growth through improved bicycling and walking facilities.
- TPI.69. Bicycling and walking are minority modes of travel and must act like one; they need to have a marketing program to promote it; generate a yearly work program in BPP for this.
- TPI.70. Help explain why providing funds to bicycling and walking facilities is important even when roads are in bad shape.
- TPI.71. Provide a clear information about where bicycling and walking funding originates.
- TPI.72. Help identify opportunities for partnerships to improve conditions for BP between local entities, such as private, municipalities/regions and not-for-profit organizations; provide funding incentives to bring in partners.
- TPI.73. Partner with community development programs to advance bicycling and walking.
- TPI.74. Provide funding for maintenance of roadways.
- TPI.75. Look at other funding options for municipalities to fund maintenance and/or development.
- TPI.76. Educate DTA about importance of maintaining roadway facilities for B/P.
- TPI.77. The inventory of State Federal Highway System shoulder data can provide basics of a shoulder network.
- TPI.78. More funding for bicycling and walking programs (new and existing maintenance).
- TPI.79. Provide more crosswalks.
- TPI.80. Incorporate BP interest into State projects and regulations.
- TPI.81. More BP input into transportation policies.

- TPI.82. Consider all modes of travel when making decisions concerning transportation facilities.
- TPI.83. Eliminate auto/truck as dominant mode of travel.
- TPI.84. Educating municipalities on current funding and policies as they relate to bicycling and walking (class 2-3 funding can go to BP work).
- TPI.85. Think about a dedicated fund for BP facilities construction or maintenance.
- TPI.86. Strengthen link between regions and State projects.
- TPI.87. Let municipalities know what is on State long-term plans to help in local planning.

General Comment from the TPI.

- TPI.88. Issues that could be included in policy plan can address a range of concerns from very local to Statewide; from crossing the street to riding across the state.
- TPI.89. Make sure we focus on all types of bicycling and walking projects.
- TPI.90. Help prioritize bicycling and walking funding.
- TPI.91. The policies must address different policies for different situations.
- TPI.92. Make sure the BP user is considered in all transportation projects.
- TPI.93. Policies should emphasize Bicycle and Pedestrian Program issues and activities (post Jon and Amy planning).
- TPI.94. May be different levels of performance measures.
- TPI.95. Maintenance practices are critical to successful integration of BP concerns into roadway design.