
APPENDIX E: BENCHMARKING ANALYSIS

Purpose

As part of the Connecticut Statewide Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan Update, a detailed benchmarking analysis was completed for seven states. The purpose of this analysis was to review how Connecticut compared when planning, prioritizing, and funding bicycle and pedestrian programs and improvements. The process examined bicycle and pedestrian plans, policies, maps, funding mechanisms, and design guidelines in four neighboring states and three state-of-the-art states. The four neighboring states included Massachusetts, New York, Vermont, and Rhode Island. The three state-of-the-art states reviewed were New Jersey, Wisconsin, and Oregon. The selected states represent a mix of locations around the U.S, and include large states and small states, as well as a combination of very aggressive and more modest programs.

New York, Massachusetts, Vermont, and Rhode Island were all selected because of their proximity to Connecticut and because each state program has its own unique elements. Massachusetts recently updated its design manual which has since become a model document for “Complete Streets” style development, which promotes bicycling and walking. New York has had an extensive statewide bicycle route network for over a decade, which could serve as a good model for Connecticut. Rhode Island has focused on the development of a statewide system of multi-use paths, while Vermont places their emphasis on local projects which will enhance quality of life.

Of the state-of-the-art states, Oregon has been a leader in bicycle and pedestrian planning for a number of decades. The Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan is over 20 years old and still continues to be cited as a model for other states developing bicycle and pedestrian plans. Wisconsin

has separate plans for bicycles and pedestrians and has developed a strong regional approach to planning. New Jersey recently established a dedicated fund to improve pedestrian safety across the state. This appendix describes each states’ program and responses to the survey questions, which were prepared with assistance from the Steering Committee in April 2008.

Benchmarking States

Massachusetts: The Commonwealth is currently updating its Statewide Bicycle Plan, providing current information for the Connecticut Plan Update. The Massachusetts Bicycle Transportation Program is located in the Executive Office of Transportation, and is presented to the public as both a Bicycle Transportation and a Pedestrian Transportation Program. <http://www.eot.state.ma.us/BikeIndex>

New Jersey: New Jersey has had an ongoing policy of creating bicycle and pedestrian compatible roadways, and a multi-year funding program for improvements. The state is roughly similar in size and demographics to Connecticut, and shares a similar relationship to the New York City Metro region. New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJDOT) promotes safety information and recreational opportunities for bicyclists and is responsible for the planning and design of bicycle facilities on New Jersey highways. NJDOT offers engineering guidelines, a Master Plan for roadways that are compatible with bicyclists and walkers, a bicycle/pedestrian facilities database, planning and design guidelines and a resource center for statewide projects. <http://www.nj.gov/transportation/commuter/bike/resources.shtm>

New York: New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) has developed a statewide bicycle route system, and has had a bicycle/pe-

destrian policy since the mid 1990's. The 1996 State Bicycle/Pedestrian plan was developed through an interagency, public-private task force. The NYSDOT program is managed cooperatively via NYSDOT's regional offices and MPOs. The NYSDOT bicycle/pedestrian website includes maps, design guidelines and links to related agencies, ADA guidelines, state funding programs and non-profit organizations.

<https://www.nysdot.gov/portal/page/portal/divisions/operating/opdm/local-programs-bureau/biking>

Oregon: Oregon has been a leader in bicycle and pedestrian policy and planning for the past three decades. The state first issued a bicycle and pedestrian plan in 1984 and the updated 1995 document has served as model plan for other states. The state's largest city, Portland, has been a testing ground for innovative new treatments which has pushed the city's bicycle mode share to one of the highest in the country. The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) established the Bicycle/Pedestrian Program as a full division, with visible status on the agency's organizational chart. <http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/BIKEPED/>

Rhode Island: The State of Rhode Island has developed a statewide system of bikeways with an emphasis on shared-use paths. The Rhode Island Department of Transportation (RIDOT) provides a central website at 'BikeRI.gov' that provides information, maps, intermodal connections, construction project updates and safety programs. Although Rhode Island is smaller than Connecticut, its program organization and approach represent a model with both similarities and differences for CT from within the New England region. <http://www.dot.ri.gov/bikeri/>

Vermont: Vermont places a significant emphasis on quality of life and tourism in its bicycle/pedestrian program. Their website says "It's hard to imagine a better environment for biking. Vermont's varied terrain and beautiful rural scenery provides opportunities for road touring and mountain biking and accommodates bicyclists

of all abilities." The Local Transportation Facilities Program is responsible for the development of Enhancement projects, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, Park-n-Rides, Scenic Byways, and local projects. The majority of the projects have a high degree of local focus and for the most part, development and construction is managed by local municipalities. <http://www.aot.state.vt.us/Bicycle.htm>

Wisconsin: Wisconsin presents its bicycle and pedestrian programs in parallel, and has developed separate plans for each mode. The Statewide Pedestrian Policy Plan is a 20 year plan that considers pedestrian needs and concerns and provides recommendations to address them; the State Bicycle Plan was created "to help communities and individuals develop bicycle-friendly facilities throughout the state." All 14 metropolitan areas in Wisconsin also have their own bicycle and pedestrian plans. <http://www.dot.wisconsin.gov/modes/bicycles.htm>

Policy / Benchmarking Summary Responses

The following descriptions are a summary of the responses to the survey questions that were submitted to each State Bicycle/Pedestrian Coordinator to assess key policies and benchmarks to provide a context for developing the CT State Bicycle/Pedestrian plan update. The questions are based in part on a prototype for the League of American Bicyclists' new "Bicycle Friendly States" initiative. The responses were collected from a pre-formatted written document along with follow-up conversations to address residual questions.

1. What is your state's current bicycle/pedestrian policy? (Please provide copy)

The overwhelming theme of the policy statements is that bicycling and walking are viable modes of transportation which should be safely accommodated. New Jersey and Vermont have particularly well developed policy statements and Oregon's Revised Statute 366.514 provides de-

tailed language and requirements for the accommodation of bicyclists and pedestrians. Neither Rhode Island nor Wisconsin has a free standing bicycle and pedestrian policy.

2. Do you also have a Complete Streets policy? (Please provide copy)

Oregon's state law "requires that when a roadway is constructed or reconstructed, bikeways and walkways be provided." Massachusetts recently redesigned their Highway Design Manual and it has become a model example for Complete Streets language. Although there are recommendations for bicycle and pedestrian planning in the other policy statements, none of the states have an explicit Complete Streets Policy.

3. Does the agency have a specific sidewalk policy which determines the installation of sidewalks along highways or other rural roadways?

Most of the states have a sidewalk policy as part of their Highway Design Manual which outlines design specifics and exceptions to the policy. Although Wisconsin does not have a formal policy they encourage sidewalk construction for a 10 percent local match providing that the community agrees to maintain the sidewalks. New York State law allows the NYSDOT to install sidewalks over municipal objections where there are overriding pedestrian safety concerns.

4. Does your policy cover only State Department of Transportation (DOT) or are other agencies included? (Transit providers, parks & recreation agency, education, health department, etc. (Check all that apply))

The standard response to question four was that the policies only apply to the DOT. Wisconsin did further stipulate that their policy also applies to projects on the local system where federal funds are used.

5. Is your bicycle/pedestrian policy linked to other statewide policy issues: American with Disabilities Act (ADA), health, safety, energy, environment (check all that apply)

In a few responses, there was mention of ADA or safety connections but for the most part, the DOT policies did not seem to have a strong connection to considerations outside of transportation.

6. Does your policy adoption process require legislative action or approval outside of DOT?

Most states responded that external approval was not required for policy adoption internal to DOT. Interestingly, RIDOT initiated a general law as part of their policy adoption in 1997 in cooperation with the Narragansett Bay Wheelmen, the local cycling club.

7. What administrative or organizational processes are in place to support the policy? i.e.: State Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Council or Task Force

Many of the states indicated that there was an active Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Council that was in place to support the policy. Although Rhode Island does not have an advisory council, the RIDOT Bicycle Coordinator does meet regularly with advocacy groups such as the Greenways Alliance of Rhode Island and the Providence Bicycle Coalition.

8. How do you communicate your policy to key stakeholders and the public?

Online resources, media relations and outreach to advocacy groups were the most common answers to Question Eight. Vermont DOT has offered technical sessions to consultants and local municipalities.

9. How did your policy get initiated and adopted? Who were the key leaders in the process?

“Commissioner adoption” was a common answer although there was mention of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Council and the Bicycle-Pedestrian Coordinator in the cases of New York State and

Vermont. In Oregon, the law which jump-started their bicycle and pedestrian planning process was introduced by a state legislator.

10. Has the state developed its own bicycle and pedestrian guidelines in addition to the national guidelines? Is there an internal education process to inform the design, operations and engineering staff about routine bicycle and pedestrian accommodations? Is there a standard review process that all projects must undergo to identify opportunities for bicycle and pedestrian amenities?

Nearly all of the states interviewed have developed their own bicycle and pedestrian design guidelines. RIDOT has no additional guidelines and refers to the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) *Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities*. Both Vermont and New Jersey affirmatively answered the internal training question and most states indicated that there is a review process in place to insure that bicycle and pedestrian amenities are included.

11. How many of your staff are committed full or part time to bicycle/pedestrian efforts?

Massachusetts: One full time employee

New Jersey: Five full time employees

New York: One full time Bicycle/Pedestrian Coordinator, One full time Pedestrian Specialist, and each region has a part-time bicycle/pedestrian coordinator

Oregon: Three full time employees

Rhode Island: one full time VT employee, one full time Bicycle/Pedestrian Program Manager, one full time SR2S Coordinator, one full time Transportation Enhancements Program Manager (approx. 50% bicycle/pedestrian)

Wisconsin: Two full time employees

12. Do you have a stand alone bicycle/pedestrian plan or is it integrated into an overall state transportation plan?

The document is a stand alone plan in any of the states that do have a bicycle/pedestrian plan. Massachusetts and Wisconsin noted that they have both a bicycle and a pedestrian plan.

13. Does the plan include specific performance measures and/or a project lists to help measure progress toward implementation of the plan? Does the plan include regional and local level tasks? (Please provide copy)

Yes, every state except one with a plan indicated that performance measures and regional tasks are included as part of the overall mission. Oregon indicated that they did not have a plan that covers these measures but included the caveat that most bicycle and pedestrian projects are built in conjunction with routine highway projects.

14. Is your plan updated on a regular basis?

Most plans are not updated on a regular basis. New Jersey stated that it would like to update it every five years although it seems like 10 years is roughly the average time between plan updates. Vermont also stated that it strives for a five-year update cycle.

15. How are the state's Safe Routes to School and Recreational Trails Programs linked with the bicycle and pedestrian programs?

In New Jersey and Vermont the SRTS is integrated with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Program. In New York and Oregon the two programs are not formally linked although technical assistance is shared between the two. The Recreational Trails Program was not directly linked to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Program in any of the responding states.

16. Does the state have any dedicated funding sources, in addition to federal programs for bicycle, or bicycle and pedestrian projects? If yes, how much funding is available?

New Jersey and Oregon are the only two states interviewed that have dedicated funding sources. New Jersey has approximately \$57.5 million dedicated solely to pedestrian safety. Oregon has a minimum one percent that the state, cities, and counties must spend on bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

17. What percentage of the following federal funding programs is typically spent on bicycling projects?

- a. Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)
- b. Surface Transportation, not including Transportation Enhancements
- c. Transportation Enhancements
- d. Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)

The percentages varied widely in this question and a number of respondents indicated that they did not know what the breakdown was. For those that did respond, the Transportation Enhancements program was the highest funding category.

Rhode Island appeared to have the most balanced distribution between the categories and also included "High Priority Projects" and "Public Lands Highway" programs as other funding sources.

18. Is there a statewide bicycle map or other resource that is available to the public? If so, does the map include suitability ratings, or information on conditions that impact bicycling like traffic volume and shoulder widths? (Please provide a copy)

New Jersey is the only state that indicated that it does not have a state bicycle map. Wisconsin has produced a series of regional maps which cover the state and New York has a number of state bicycle route maps which are available in print and on-line. Oregon and Rhode Island have state maps, both of which are available on-line. Massachusetts and Vermont do not have a state map but have regional bicycle and trail maps.

Connecticut Policy / Benchmarking Survey Response and Comparison:

The following section is a comparison of Connecticut's responses to the survey questions contrasted with those of the benchmarking states. Connecticut's responses are included in italics while the comparison and recommendation information is in bold.

1. What is your state's current bicycle/pedestrian policy? (Please provide copy)

The following is the Vision which is stated in the Department's present Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan (1999):

To enhance the bicycling and walking environment throughout Connecticut by providing for the safe, convenient and enjoyable use of these modes of transportation in an effort to meet the public's demand for improved mobility and a better quality of life. Any Connecticut resident will be able to walk, bicycle, or use other type of non-motorized transportation mode safely and conveniently from his or her home to any destination in the State. From any town, residents will be able to follow multiuse trails that are connected to other towns in the region, to other regions, and to neighboring States. Employment centers, shopping areas, bus and train centers, recreation and cultural attractions, and schools will accommodate the walking and bicycling needs of employees, customers, residents, both within the development and to nearby destinations.

The existing Connecticut policy adequately addresses safety and mobility issues to a wide range of destinations and the role they play in quality of life assessments. The focus on multi-use trails should be expanded to include on-road facilities and the target users shouldn't be limited solely to Connecticut residents.

2. Do you also have a Complete Streets policy? (Please provide copy)

No.

To encourage the effective implementation of the policies and goals outlined in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Update, CT DOT should consider outlining an internal Complete Streets Policy which dictates that, "all projects are designed and operated to enable safe access for all users. Pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists and bus riders of all ages and abilities are able to safely move along and across a complete street." The policy would add greater weight to the existing bicycle and pedestrian efforts and could be further supported by updates to the Highway Design Manual, similar to those included in Massachusetts's Updated Highway Design Manual.

3. Does the agency have a specific sidewalk policy which determines the installation of sidewalks along highways or other rural roadways?

Yes: Connecticut Department of Transportation Policy Statement

Policy No: Highways 19

Subject: Policy on Sidewalks

A. State Roads

1. Sidewalk Already Exists

If a roadway is to be reconstructed with State or State and Federal funds and the project will disturb an existing sidewalk, the reconstruction of the sidewalk, in kind, will be included in the reconstruction project.

2. Bridges

When the State is constructing or reconstructing a bridge in an area where side-

walks exist or are likely to exist, sidewalks will be included in the bridge project.

3. Sidewalks Do Not Currently Exist

a. Federal Funds are Involved

When the State is reconstructing or constructing a State road in an area where the local community can demonstrate, in accordance with generally accepted AASHTO standards, that a sidewalk is warranted; and the community will enter into an agreement with the State to provide funding for the full nonfederal share of the cost associated with designing and constructing a sidewalk, including associated right-of-way and utility costs; and the municipality will enter into an agreement with the State in perpetuity, clearly stating that the municipality is fully responsible for all liability, maintenance, and snow and ice removal; then sidewalks within the limits of the construction project will be included in the project. Under this provision of the policy, no exclusive sidewalk projects will be considered, except under the STP-U program as provided under the STP-Urban Pavement Rehabilitation/Sidewalk Guidelines.

b. 100 Percent State Funds

Under the same conditions as Section 3a, sidewalks may be included in State road projects. The only change being that the community would be responsible for 100 percent of the cost of the sidewalk design and construction, including associated rights-of-way and utility portions of the project.

B. Local Roads

When an improvement is being made to a local roadway with federal aid funds, sidewalk improvements may be included within the limits of the project if they satisfy generally accepted AASHTO standards and warrants, and the local communities will enter into an agreement to provide the financial resources for the full nonfederal share of the design and construction, including associated rights-of-way and utility costs of such sidewalks. Where no federal funds are involved, the State will not participate in the construction of any sidewalk.

Connecticut's sidewalk policy is fairly comprehensive with respect to the bounds of what the DOT will and will not provide and what conditions need to be met. This policy could be connected to the Complete Streets Policy to further encourage the development of the sidewalk network and the state should consider providing state funds to accommodate that development. AASHTO clearly states, "Sidewalks are integral parts of city streets... because pedestrians are the lifeblood of our urban areas..."

4. Does your policy cover only State DOT or are other agencies included? (Transit providers, parks & recreation agency, education, health department, etc. List all that apply)

The policy relates only to CTDOT. However, for the past several years, the Department's Office of Public Transportation has been working with CT Transit to place bicycle racks on transit buses in most of the major transit districts in the state.

Connecticut's policy, like those of the reviewed benchmarking states, is somewhat limited with its outreach and connection to other organizations and agencies. Although the benchmarking states did not offer a good model for such a connection, this could provide an opportunity for Connecticut to be a leader in linking transportation choices with health outcomes. The Depart-

ConnDOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Update								
	State							
Benchmarking Question	CT	MA	NJ	NY	OR	RI	VT	WI
Question #1 Current Bicycle & Pedestrian Policy	Please see comprehensive response from the surveys							
Question #2 Complete Streets Policy	No	Yes - Highway Design Manual	No	No	Yes	No	No	See Response
Question #3 Sidewalk Policy	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Question #4 Interagency Cooperation	No	No	No	No	Yes	No Answer	No	No
Question #5 Linked to Other Statewide Policy Issues	ADA & Others	No	No	No	No	No Answer	No	ADA & Safety
Question #6 Policy Adoption Requires Legislative Action	No	No	No	No	Depends	Yes	No	No
Question #7 Processes to Support Policy	Advisory Committee	Advisory Committee	Advisory Committee	Advisory Committee	Advisory Committee	Advocacy Outreach	Bike/Ped Coordinator	State Bike Council
Question #8 Communication with Public Stakeholders	Website	Advisory Committee	Public Notice	Website	Multiple Means	Media Releases & Website	Technical Sessions & Website	Yes
Question #9 Policy Adoption	Office of Intermodal Planning	DOT Commissioner	DOT Commissioner	1994, Modified 1996	See Response	Legislative Action	Secretary of Trans.	Not Applicable
Question #10 State Bike/Ped Guidelines	No	Highway Design Manual	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Question #11 Staff Numbers	2, including SR2S Coord.	1	5	2	3	1	2, including SR2S Coord.	2
Question #12 Stand Alone Bike/Ped Plan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not Applicable	Yes	Yes, Bike Plan & Ped. Plan
Question #13 Performance Measures	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Not Applicable	Yes	Yes
Question #14 Plan Update Schedule	Yes	Last updated 1998	No	No	Currently Being Updated	Not Applicable	5 Years	Yes
Question #15 Connection with SR2S & Rec. Trails Program	Collaboration	No Answer	Yes SR2S	Not formally	Technical Assistance	Technical Review	Yes SR2S	No Answer
Question #16 Dedicated Funding Source	DEP Rec. Trail Program	No	\$57.5 Million Ped. Safety	No	Minimum Spending %	No	No	No
Question #17 Funding Percentages	TE: 90%	No Answer	No Answer	TE: 90%	TE: 70-80%	TE: 10%	TE: 50%	TE: 75%
Question #18 Statewide Bicycle Map	Yes	No	No	3 Routes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes

ment of Health should be invited to help develop healthy activity levels which can be correlated to transportation choices. Walking and bicycling would be a key indicator to the healthy transportation statistics and this could be enacted as one of the leading goals of the updated Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.

5. Is your bicycle/pedestrian policy linked to other statewide policy issues? (ADA, health, safety, energy, environment, etc. List all that apply)

Yes. All new sidewalk construction is ADA compliant. The CTDOT Bicycle and Pedestrian coordinator collaborates with representatives of other state agencies, including the Department of Public Health, Department of Environmental Protection, and Office of Public Safety to protect the health, well-being and safety of all users of the state's transportation system.

In response to this question, Connecticut may be ahead of the curve with respect to the other benchmarking states. ADA compliance should be a given at this point but if the Bicycle & Pedestrian Coordinator is actively collaborating with Public Health, Environmental Protection and Public Safety, Connecticut may be well on its way to achieving the goals recommended in the prior question. These existing partnerships should continue to be developed as Connecticut works to become a leader in healthy transportation assessment.

6. Does your policy adoption process require legislative action or approval outside of DOT?

Isn't the policy for all DOTs that accept federal funds (i.e. all DOTs) summarized by the FHWA Guidance of April 4, 2007? This states, in part, that "SAFETEA-LU confirms and continues the principle that the safe accommodation of nonmotorized users shall be considered during the planning, development, and construction of all Federal-aid transportation projects and programs. To varying extents, bicyclists and pedestrians will be

present on all highways and transportation facilities where they are permitted and it is clearly the intent of SAFETEA-LU that all new and improved transportation facilities be planned, designed, and constructed with this fact in mind."

Beyond this, I believe (I'm neither a lawyer nor a legislator) that the agency Commissioner decides whether to accept all agency draft transportation plans and their stated policies, without legislative approval or additional approval from outside the agency.

For most states, policy adoption is usually done internally without too much input or pressure from the state legislature. If CTDOT is committed to implementing the changes recommended in the updated Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan then it should be able to handle any new policies internally. If that effort falls short, there may be a role for the legislature to play to encourage more bicycle and pedestrian friendly policies within the state.

7. What administrative or organizational processes are in place to support the policy? i.e.: State Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Council or Task Force

The state Highway Design Manual includes a checklist of bicycle accommodation warrants as well as the current design guidelines from the AASHTO Green Book (Manual for the Design of Bicycle Facilities, 1999). In 2005, the CTDOT established a Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee representing the interests of stakeholders throughout the state, which meets periodically as needed.

Most of the states indicated that there was a bicycle and pedestrian advisory committee in place. Connecticut established their committee in 2005 but indicated that it meets only periodically. It is recommended that the committee have a regularly scheduled meeting whether it is monthly, quarterly or semi-annual. Without a regularly scheduled meeting it is too easy for the committee to fall prey to apathy and disuse. This

is exactly what happened to New York's advisory committee and it has taken nearly ten years to get it up and running again.

8. How do you communicate your policy to key stakeholders and the public?

A digital copy of the present Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan is posted on the Department's website.

Although a digital copy of the existing Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan is available on the website, it is not easy to locate. It also seems that there are no available printed copies of the plan available internally or to the public. The updated Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan should be more available to the cycling public and copies should be distributed to the cycling groups and regional planning agencies around the state. An active advisory committee can also help to communicate policies and updated information to interested stakeholders.

9. How did your policy get initiated and adopted? Who were the key leaders in the process?

The Plan was prepared by the CTDOT Office of Intermodal Planning in 1999. I believe the principals have retired from state service.

In the majority of the states reviewed, policy initiation was accomplished through adoption by the Commissioner. In some cases there was support from the bicycle and pedestrian advisory committee. In Connecticut's case, the Office of Intermodal Planning was actively involved but the historical connection to the people involved in that process has been lost.

10. Has the state developed its own bicycle and pedestrian guidelines in addition to the national guidelines? Is there an internal education process to inform the design, operations and engineering staff about routine bicycle and pedestrian accommodations? Is there a standard

review process that all projects must undergo to identify opportunities for bicycle and pedestrian amenities?

The states facility design guidelines essentially recapitulate the AASHTO Green Book design guidelines. There is no formal educational process. However, last summer, the Department funded a Bicycle Facility Design workshop which was developed and presented by the University of Connecticut. Department staff engaged in design and engineering may attend other relevant classes, courses or workshops. The Department's Highway Design manual includes a checklist of bicycle accommodation warrants which must be completed by the design engineer and retained as part of the project file.

Nearly all of the states interviewed have developed their own bicycle and pedestrian design guidelines. It appears that there is an opportunity for CTDOT to develop a more comprehensive and forward-thinking manual which could include design and engineering tools to better establish Complete Streets style development. Massachusetts recently updated their manual to include better accommodation of pedestrians and bicyclists and that could be used as model.

11. How many of your staff are committed full or part time to bicycle/pedestrian efforts?

There is a Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator and a Safe Routes to School Program Coordinator.

Every state interviewed indicated that they had at least one full time person committed to bicycle and pedestrian efforts. Some of the states also had individual staff for bicycling and walking respectively. In Connecticut, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator is not a full time position and that should be upgraded if the state is going to fully pursue the goals highlighted in the updated Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.

12. Do you have a stand alone bicycle/ pedestrian plan or is it integrated into an overall state transportation plan?

It is specific to bicycle and pedestrian, as referenced in Item One, above.

The document is a stand alone plan in any of the states that do have a bicycle and pedestrian plan. Two of the states indicated that they have both a bicycle and a pedestrian plan. Connecticut is taking the right step in updating the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan and it should be regularly updated every five or ten years.

13. Does the plan include specific performance measures and/or a project lists to help measure progress toward implementation of the plan? Does the plan include regional and local level tasks? (Please provide copy)

No, one of the biggest deficits we have identified with regard to the current plan is a lack of specific performance measures. We hope to correct this in the new plan. The regional information in the plan consisted of regional plans which were provided by the state's regional planning agencies and then reprinted verbatim within the state plan.

Every benchmarking state except one indicated that performance measures and regional tasks are included as part of the overall mission. The existing Connecticut Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan is noticeably lacking in specific performance measures and they should definitely be included in the updated plan.

14. Is your plan updated on a regular basis?

Yes, that is the intention. The present update process began several years ago but was delayed by a lack of available funding.

Historically speaking, most of the plans of the benchmarking states have not been updated on

a regular basis. The respondents did, however, indicate that it would be beneficial to have a regular update cycle of five or ten years. CTDOT should plan to regularly update and review the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, with specific attention paid to whether or not the performance measures and goals are being met.

15. How are the state's Safe Routes to School and Recreational Trails Programs linked with the bicycle and pedestrian programs?

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator attends the monthly meetings of the state's Greenway Council, which is chaired by the Department of Environmental Protection's Recreational Trails Program Manager. The Department's Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator and the Safe Routes to School Coordinator seek to avail themselves of opportunities to collaborate together in the reinforcement of the goals and policies of both programs.

Most of the benchmarking states indicated that there is a connection between the Bicycle and Pedestrian Program and the Safe Routes to School Program. In some states the Safe Routes to School Program is housed within the Bicycle and Pedestrian Program whereas in other states, the connection is more informal but present nonetheless. The Recreational Trails Program was not directly linked to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Program in any of the benchmarking states. The Connecticut Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator should continue to maintain a high level of communication with the Safe Routes to School Coordinator since the two positions have similar goals in common. It would also be worthwhile to include the staff and goals of the Recreational Trails Program into the long range planning efforts of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Program.

16. Does the state have any dedicated funding sources, in addition to federal programs for bicycle, or bicycle and

pedestrian projects? If yes, how much funding is available?

There is the DEP Recreational Trail Program funding and there are annual Greenways Committee Grant awards.

Oregon and New Jersey were the stand-out benchmarking states with regard to dedicated funding sources. Oregon has been directing one to two percent of transportation funds to bicycle and pedestrian projects for the past few decades. New Jersey has dedicated approximately \$57.5 million dollars to pedestrian safety to combat the growing pedestrian fatality rate in the state. CTDOT could follow the lead of both states by providing dedicated funding sources to both engineering and education programs.

17. What percentage of the following federal funding programs is typically spent on bicycling projects?

- a. Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)**
- b. Surface Transportation, not including Transportation Enhancements**
- c. Transportation Enhancements**
- d. Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)**

a) CMAQ funding is not used by the Department for bicycling projects (0%)

b) STP urban funds may not be used for bicycling projects, but may be used for the local match for sidewalks.

c) I believe about 90% of the Transportation Enhancement funding goes to bicycle projects (mainly multi-use trails).

d) I don't know what HSIP is.

Connecticut, like most of the states reviewed, is receiving the vast majority of their bicycle and pedestrian funds from the Transportation Enhancements Program. It would be worthwhile for the Bicycle and Pedestrian Program to tap into CMAQ funds, especially in the more populated urban areas that are struggling to meet air quality standards. The funds can be used to promote education and encouragement projects that would shift short-distance motor vehicle trips to bicycle and walking trips. The HSIP money could be used to address safety issues in areas where there are high bicycle and pedestrian collision rates.

18. Is there a statewide bicycle map or other resource that is available to the public? If so, does the map include suitability ratings, or information on conditions that impact bicycling like traffic volume and shoulder widths? (Please provide a copy)

Yes, there is a statewide bicycle map available both in print and on-line. The present map indicates recommended bicycle routes by colored highlighting. A suitability rating system is being considered for the new map which is being developed.

Connecticut's statewide bicycle map is currently being reviewed as part of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan update. The state could incorporate some of the elements from the benchmarking states maps to better enhance the existing map and make it more user-friendly. New York's maps include specific routes and topography information for each of the routes. It might also be worthwhile to develop more regional maps in conjunction with the regional planning commissions to show a higher level of detail.

19. Is there anything else that you would like to add?

There are numerous obstacles to the development of a complete bicycle network in Connecticut. Many of Connecticut's existing roadways are

narrow, with poor sight lines, and cannot be significantly improved without purchasing additional width (right-of-way), which is expensive. The vast majority of the state's commuters drive to work, and maintaining roads for use of these motorists remains a priority for the Department. One recent accommodation which has been accomplished by the Department is the placement of bicycle racks on transit buses in most of the major transit districts in the state.

Conclusions:

Connecticut is not too far behind the other states when it comes to bicycle and pedestrian planning. However, each state benchmarked in this analysis is doing something slightly better that Connecticut can learn about and perhaps model after. An adoption of a Complete Streets policy and the inclusion of such measures in the Highway Design Manual would be a significant first step to more comprehensive bicycle and pedestrian planning. CTDOT could include more specific performance measures in the updated Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan with a minimum dedicated funding source to insure that the performance measures are met.

In addition, there are opportunities for improved interagency cooperation. Transportation performance measures could be linked to health and safety and environmental measures and increased bicycling and walking can help to achieve both of those goals. The Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan could be updated on a regular basis to insure that performance measures are being met and updated. This current round of updates presents CTDOT with the opportunity to take a significant step forward to become a leader in bicycle and pedestrian accommodation.

**State Bicycle / Pedestrian Coordinator
Contacts**

Source: <http://design.transportation.org/>

CONNECTICUT

www.ct.gov/dot

David Balzer
Bicycle & Pedestrian Coordinator
Department of Transportation
2800 Berlin Turnpike
P.O. Box 317546
Newington CT 06131-7546
860-594-2141; Fax 860-594-3028
E-mail: david.balzer@po.state.ct.us

MASSACHUSETTS

<http://www.eot.state.ma.us/BikeIndex>

Josh Lehman
Bicycle-Pedestrian Program Manager
Executive Office of Transportation and Public
Works
10 Park Plaza, Room 3170
Boston MA 02116
617-973-7329; Fax 617-973-8032
josh.lehman@eot.state.ma.us

NEW JERSEY

[http://www.state.nj.us/njcommuter/
html/bikewalk.htm](http://www.state.nj.us/njcommuter/html/bikewalk.htm)

Sheree Davis
Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Coordinator
NJ Department of Transportation
1035 Parkway Ave
Trenton NJ 08625
609-530-6551; Fax 609-530-3723
E-mail: sheree.davis@dot.state.nj.us

NEW YORK

[www.dot.state.ny.us/pubtrans/bphome.
html](http://www.dot.state.ny.us/pubtrans/bphome.html)

Eric L. Ophardt, P.E.
Bicycle & Pedestrian Program Manager
New York State Dept of Transportation
50 Wolf Road, POD 5-4
Albany NY 12232
518-457-8307; Fax 518-457-8358
E-mail: eophardt@dot.state.ny.us

OREGON

www.odot.state.or.us/techserv/bikewalk/

Sheila Lyons
Bicycle & Pedestrian Program Manager
Oregon Department of Transportation
355 Capitol St NE, Room 222
Salem OR 97301-3871
503-986-3555; Fax 503-986-3749
E-mail: sheila.a.lyons@odot.state.or.us

**RHODE ISLAND and Providence Planta-
tions**

<http://www.dot.ri.gov/bikeri/>

Steven C Church
Bicycle Coordinator, Intermodal Planning Div
RI DOT Planning
Two Capitol Hill Rm 372
State Office Building
Providence RI 02903-1190
401-222-4203 x 4042
E-mail: schurch@dot.ri.gov

VERMONT

www.aot.state.vt.us/

Jon Kaplan, PE
Bicycle & Pedestrian Program Manager
Local Transportation Facilities
Vermont Agency of Transportation
1 National Life Drive
Montpelier, VT 05633-5001
802-828-0059; Fax 802-828-5712
E-mail: jon.kaplan@state.vt.us

WISCONSIN

<http://www.dot.state.wi.us/>

Tom Huber
Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
4802 Sheboygan Ave. Room 901
P.O. Box 7913
Madison, WI 53707-7910
608-267-7757; Fax 608-267-0294
E-mail: thomas.huber@dot.state.wi.us

Survey Responses by State

Massachusetts:

1. What is your state's current bicycle/pedestrian policy? (Please provide copy)

The 1998 Plan's vision statement reads: "The vision of the Statewide Bicycle Transportation Plan is recognition of bicycling as a viable means of transportation and reasonable accommodation of the needs of bicyclists in policies, programs, and projects. Greater recognition and the accommodation of the needs of bicyclists will lead to a more balanced transportation system with greater modal choice and improvements in bicycle safety. Such actions will enhance the environment and quality of life in the Commonwealth, and improve personal mobility.

2. Do you also have a Complete Streets policy? (Please provide copy)

Yes. The Massachusetts Highway Design Guidelines was recently updated to better integrate modes and gives cities and towns more control over design decisions.

(http://www.vhb.com/mhdGuide/mhd_Guide-Book.asp)

"Multimodal Consideration — to ensure that the safety and mobility of all users of the transportation system (pedestrians, bicyclists and drivers) are considered equally through all phases of a project so that even the most vulnerable (e.g. children and the elderly) can feel and be safe within the public right of way. This includes a commitment to full compliance with state and federal accessibility standards for people with disabilities."

3. Does the agency have a specific sidewalk policy which determines the installation of sidewalks along highways or other rural roadways?

From the Massachusetts Pedestrian Plan: On locally-owned roads, it is the responsibility of the municipality to ensure sufficient right-of-way and that easements exist to accommodate all uses, including accessible sidewalks. On state highways in developed areas, MassHighway will make every effort to accommodate all uses, including accessible sidewalks, where municipalities agree to be responsible for maintenance. MassHighway will not take right-of-way specifically to provide sidewalks without community support.

4. Does your policy cover only State DOT or are other agencies included? (Transit providers, parks & recreation agency, education, health department, etc. List all that apply)

Only Massachusetts Highway Department.

5. Is your bicycle/pedestrian policy linked to other statewide policy issues? (ADA, health, safety, energy, environment, etc. List all that apply)

Not really.

6. Does your policy adoption process require legislative action or approval outside of DOT?

No

7. What administrative or organizational processes are in place to support the policy? i.e.: State Bicycle/pedestrian Advisory Council or Task Force

Bicycle/pedestrian Advisory Council

8. How do you communicate your policy to key stakeholders and the public?

Bicycle/pedestrian Advisory Council, cooperation with MassBike, media releases

9. How did your policy get initiated and adopted? Who were the key leaders in the process?

10. Has the state developed its own bicycle and pedestrian guidelines in addition to the national guidelines? Is there an internal education process to inform the design, operations and engineering staff about routine bicycle and pedestrian accommodations? Is there a standard review process that all projects must undergo to identify opportunities for bicycle and pedestrian amenities?

11. How many of your staff are committed full or part time to bicycle/pedestrian efforts?

One per the BFS application

12. Do you have a stand alone bicycle/pedestrian plan or is it integrated into an overall state transportation plan?

Stand alone bicycle and pedestrian plans.

13. Does the plan include specific performance measures and/or a project lists to help measure progress toward implementation of the plan? Does the plan include regional and local level tasks? (Please provide copy)

14. Is your plan updated on a regular basis?

The last plan was completed in 1998.

15. How are the state's Safe Routes to School and Recreational Trails Programs linked with the bicycle and pedestrian programs?

16. Does the state have any dedicated funding sources, in addition to federal programs for bicycle, or bicycle and pedestrian projects? If yes, how much funding is available?

17. What percentage of the following federal funding programs is typically spent on bicycling projects?

- a. Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)
- b. Surface Transportation, not including Transportation Enhancements
- c. Transportation Enhancements
- d. Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)

18. Is there a statewide bicycle map or other resource that is available to the public? If so, does the map include suitability ratings, or information on conditions that impact bicycling like traffic volume and shoulder widths? (Please provide a copy)

While there is not a comprehensive state bicycle map, MassHighway has worked closely with the Massachusetts Office of Travel and Tourism to develop maps and brochures geared to bicycle travel.

19. Is there anything else that you would like to add?

New Jersey:

1. What is your state's current bicycle/pedestrian policy? (Please provide copy)

I. PURPOSE

To outline Department Policy in regard to addressing bicycle and pedestrian travel in the planning, design, construction and operation of transportation facilities funded or processed by NJDOT, and the development and implementation of transportation programs.

II. DEFINITIONS

N.A.

III. POLICY

Bicycling and walking are viable and important travel modes and offer untapped potential for meeting transportation needs and providing recreational and health benefits. Provisions for bicycling and walking are important and necessary elements of comprehensive solutions to transportation problems and needs. Opportunities should be actively sought to address transportation needs and deficiencies through the provision of bicycle and pedestrian accommodations. These modes can also supplement transit use and replace motor vehicle trips by serving short trips.

It is the Department's policy to provide non-motorized travel options by routinely integrating bicycling and walking into transportation systems and promoting bicycling and walking as a preferred choice for short trips.

Bicycle and pedestrian issues will be routinely addressed as part of the activities of all units of the Department. Basic research and data gathering efforts should include data collection and analysis for the non-motorized modes. Beginning at the earliest stage of needs analyses and problem definition, and continuing through the entire project development process, bicycle and pedestrian travel needs shall be incorporated in the planning, scoping, design, construction and management of all transportation projects and programs funded or processed by the NJDOT.

Transportation facilities are to be designed and constructed, and maintained to accommodate use by bicycle and pedestrian traffic. Additionally, independent projects will be initiated to address bicycle and pedestrian access and safety needs or opportunities and correct deficiencies in the transportation system which inhibits the use of these modes. Where needs or opportunities are identified, roadway improvements, bikeways, walkways or other facilities intended to encourage or support travel by bicycle or walking should be designed and constructed.

2. Do you also have a Complete Streets policy? (Please provide copy)

No

3. Does the agency have a specific sidewalk policy which determines the installation of sidewalks along highways or other rural roadways?

We do not have a policy, but for now follow AASHTO guidelines for installation of sidewalks. We are completing a chapter in our Roadway Design Manual that is specific to pedestrian accommodations.

4. Does your policy cover only State DOT or are other agencies included? (Transit providers, parks & recreation agency, education, health department, etc. List all that apply)

Only NJDOT

5. Is your bicycle/pedestrian policy linked to other statewide policy issues? (ADA, health, safety, energy, environment, etc. List all that apply)

Not really.

6. Does your policy adoption process require legislative action or approval outside of DOT?

No

7. What administrative or organizational processes are in place to support the policy? i.e.: State Bicycle/pedestrian Advisory Council or Task Force

Besides the policy the department issues an Administrative Directive to enforce the policy. We do also have a Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Council who support the overall Bicycle/pedestrian program.

8. How do you communicate your policy to key stakeholders and the public?

The best way I can explain it is that the public/stakeholders get to see bicycle/pedestrian projects get completed, or that the bicycle/pedestrian piece to a capital project stays IN the project.

9. How did your policy get initiated and adopted? Who were the key leaders in the process?

Commissioner adoption.

10. Has the state developed its own bicycle and pedestrian guidelines in addition to the national guidelines? Is there an internal education process to inform the design, operations and engineering staff about routine bicycle and pedestrian accommodations? Is there a standard review process that all projects must undergo to identify opportunities for bicycle and pedestrian amenities?

We completed our own guidelines back in 1995. However, we are currently integrated bicycle, pedestrian and traffic calming into our Roadway Design Manual. We are constantly training our planning and design staff on these issues.

To answer the last question, yes--bicycle & pedestrian staff are part of the scoping process--the department policy is clear that all projects must be screened for possible bicycle & pedestrian accommodations.

11. How many of your staff are committed full or part time to bicycle/pedestrian efforts?

We have a staff of five who are dedicated full time to the issues.

12. Do you have a stand alone bicycle/pedestrian plan or is it integrated into an overall state transportation plan?

We have a stand alone plan.

13. Does the plan include specific performance measures and/or a project lists to help measure progress toward implementation of the plan? Does the plan include regional and local level tasks? (Please provide copy)

Yes

14. Is your plan updated on a regular basis?

Not really.....we would like to update it every five years.

15. How are the state's Safe Routes to School and Recreational Trails Programs linked with the bicycle and pedestrian programs?

The Safe Routes to School Program is part of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Program. The RTP is located within the Department of Environmental Protection, but the funds for the program come through the NJDOT capital program.

16. Does the state have any dedicated funding sources, in addition to federal programs for bicycle, or bicycle and pedestrian projects? If yes, how much funding is available?

Yes, approx 57.5 million of state dollars is dedicated solely to pedestrian safety.

17. What percentage of the following federal funding programs is typically spent on bicycling projects?

- a. Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)
- b. Surface Transportation, not including Transportation Enhancements
- c. Transportation Enhancements

d. Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)

I am not really sure of the answer to these questions.

18. Is there a statewide bicycle map or other resource that is available to the public? If so, does the map include suitability ratings, or information on conditions that impact bicycling like traffic volume and shoulder widths? (Please provide a copy)

No, we do not have a state map.

19. Is there anything else that you would like to add?

New York State:

1. What is your state's current bicycle/pedestrian policy? (Please provide copy)

A copy of the Department's Bicycle and Pedestrian Policy may be obtained from the web site listed below.

<https://www.nysdot.gov/portal/page/portal/divisions/operating/opdm/local-programs-bureau/biking>

2. Do you also have a Complete Streets policy? (Please provide copy)

No.

3. Does the agency have a specific sidewalk policy which determines the installation of sidewalks along highways or other rural roadways?

Engineering Instruction (EI) 97-002 permits the NYSDOT to install sidewalk over municipal objection where there is determined to be overriding pedestrian safety condition.

EI 04-011 requires project designers to use a Pedestrian Checklist to conduct an assessment

of the land use surrounding each NYSDOT sponsored project (where applicable) for the presence of pedestrian activity. A YES indicated that a sidewalk should be constructed unless exceptional circumstances (cost, scarcity of use, or prohibited by law).

4. Does your policy cover only State DOT or are other agencies included? (Transit providers, parks & recreation agency, education, health department, etc. List all that apply)

NYSDOT only.

5. Is your bicycle/pedestrian policy linked to other statewide policy issues? (ADA, health, safety, energy, environment, etc. List all that apply)

No

6. Does your policy adoption process require legislative action or approval outside of DOT?

No. Approval is only required by the Department's Commissioner.

7. What administrative or organizational processes are in place to support the policy? i.e.: State Bicycle/pedestrian Advisory Council or Task Force

The NYSDOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Policy is supported by the Department and the NYS Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Council.

8. How do you communicate your policy to key stakeholders and the public?

The policy is available to the general public by viewing the 1997 New York State Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. The Plan may be viewed or downloaded on line on the NYS DOT Department's website www.nysdot.gov.

9. How did your policy get initiated and adopted? Who were the key leaders in the process?

The Department Bicycle and Pedestrian Policy was initially developed in 1994 and later modified in 1996 to coincide with the release of the New York State Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan 1997. The key leaders in the process were Jeff Olson, NYSDOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator (1993 – 1998) and the New York State Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Council (1993 – 1997).

10. Has the state developed its own bicycle and pedestrian guidelines in addition to the national guidelines? Is there an internal education process to inform the design, operations and engineering staff about routine bicycle and pedestrian accommodations? Is there a standard review process that all projects must undergo to identify opportunities for bicycle and pedestrian amenities?

NYSDOT has developed separate bicycle and pedestrian design guidance for its professional engineering and planning staffs. This information is located in the Department's Highway Design Manual, Chapter 17, Bicycle Facility Design, and Chapter 18, Pedestrian Facility Design.

The Department of Transportation has developed Engineering Instruction (EI) 04-11 which provides a Pedestrian Checklist which must be completed by the project designer and regional bicycle and pedestrian coordinator.

11. How many of your staff are committed full or part time to bicycle/pedestrian efforts?

NYSDOT has dedicated: one full time Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator, one full time Pedestrian Specialist, and each NYSDOT region has been allotted one bicycle and pedestrian coordinator on a part time (10%) basis.

12. Do you have a stand alone bicycle/ pedestrian plan or is it integrated into an overall state transportation plan?

The 1997 New York State Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan was a stand-alone document. The 2006 NYSDOT Transportation Plan integrated bicycling and walking as a component of a broader state-wide transportation ideal.

13. Does the plan include specific performance measures and/or a project lists to help measure progress toward implementation of the plan? Does the plan include regional and local level tasks? (Please provide copy)

Yes. A copy of the 1997 New York State Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan may be downloaded at:

<https://www.nysdot.gov/portal/page/portal/divisions/operating/opdm/local-programs-bureau/biking>

14. Is your plan updated on a regular basis?

No. There were discussions to update the 1997 NYS Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan with the Department's 2006 Transportation Master Plan update, but no new Plan was authorized.

15. How are the state's Safe Routes to School and Recreational Trails Programs linked with the bicycle and pedestrian programs?

The State Bicycle and Pedestrian Section has no official role in the development of program guidance or the selection of candidate projects under the Safe Route to School and Recreational Trails Programs. However, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Program is routinely invited to comment on any program guidance and selection criteria updates for both programs.

16. Does the state have any dedicated funding sources, in addition to federal

programs for bicycle, or bicycle and pedestrian projects? If yes, how much funding is available?

No.

17. What percentage of the following federal funding programs is typically spent on bicycling projects?

a. Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)
N/A

b. Surface Transportation, not including Transportation Enhancements N/A

c. Transportation Enhancements 90%

d. Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)
N/A

18. Is there a statewide bicycle map or other resource that is available to the public? If so, does the map include suitability ratings, or information on conditions that impact bicycling like traffic volume and shoulder widths? (Please provide a copy)

Yes, The Department has maps for its three major bicycle routes, 5, 9 & 17. The Department has also produced the Hudson Valley Bikeway and Trailway Map, and the Long Island Bicycle Map is due to be published in summer 2008.

19. Is there anything else that you would like to add?

The first is that the Department is completing the signing of new State Bicycle Routes 11, 14, 19, 20 and 25. The last section of these routes is expected to be signed by end of this summer. These new bicycle routes will:

- Increase by almost 1,000 miles the total number of signed long distance bicycle routes across New York State.

- And, will provide a link with existing bicycle routes in New Jersey, Pennsylvania and the Province of Quebec.

Secondly, the Department is developing a 511 system statewide. It which will be a free, one-stop, all-encompassing phone and web service offering information on transportation services and conditions throughout the State. It is scheduled to be implemented by the end of 2008. It is going operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Besides information for motorists, this web site will also offer information on cycling in the State. Information will include:

- All on-road and off-road bicycle facilities. The user will be able to view the state bicycle routes and can then "Zoom In" to view local shared use pathways and trails.
- It will also include information on trail head locations, links to bus and rail schedules and real-time highway information construction and road closures.

Oregon:

1. What is your state's current bicycle/ pedestrian policy? (Please provide copy)

Oregon has a number of policies and laws governing the provision of bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) 366.514
<http://www.leg.state.or.us/ors/366.html>

(State law) requires Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), cities and counties to include "bikeways and walkways" on all road construction and reconstruction projects, with three exceptions:

1. If adding these provisions would make the road unsafe;
2. If there is no need or probable use; or

3. If the costs would be excessively disproportionate to need or probable use.

The law also requires ODOT, cities and counties to spend reasonable amounts of their share of the state highway fund (state gas tax and vehicle registration fees) in providing pedestrian and bicyclist facilities, as needed.

A “reasonable amount” is open to translation, so the statute specifies that ODOT, cities and counties must spend no less than one percent of their share of the state highway fund on such facilities. ODOT has to spend the one percent minimum each year, but cities and counties can carry that over a ten-year period (a small jurisdiction may not do a road project every year, and one percent may represent too small a sum to do anything with).

So the basics are: provide a system for pedestrians and bicyclists, create roads that accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians, and spend a reasonable amount of the highway fund to do so.

Some other points:

1. Since a 1980 constitutional amendment, highway funds can only be spent within a highway, road or street right-of-way, meaning that paths in parks or on abandoned railroad tracks cannot be built using state highway funds. This sorely limits the money available for off street infrastructure – often the type most supported by the citizenry.
2. The primary objective is to ensure that the correct facilities get included on road construction and reconstruction projects - sidewalks on virtually all urban roads and streets, and bike lanes and/or simple paved shoulders on most high level roads or streets, urban or rural.
3. Most streets with low-moderate traffic function fine for bicyclists as “shared roadways,” with no special provisions.

4. Most paved shoulders are provided for the benefit of motorists, and are **not** “bicycle facilities.” ODOT therefore does not count the cost of shoulders toward the 1% minimum. Paved shoulders in urban areas can be striped as bike lanes, at almost no additional cost.
5. About 90 percent of the highway funds ODOT expends on pedestrian and bicycle facilities go towards sidewalks.

Also, the [Oregon Transportation Plan](#)

<http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/docs/or-transplanupdate/2007/OTPvol1.pdf>

Policy 1A requires a “balanced” approach to transportation, “A balanced transportation system is one that provides transportation options...reduce reliance on the single occupant automobile...”

Policy 2B Urban Accessibility: “It is the policy of the State of Oregon to define minimum levels of service and assure balanced, multimodal accessibility to existing and new development within urban areas to achieve the state goal of compact, highly livable urban areas.”

The [Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan](#) is an adopted modal plan of the Oregon Transportation Plan. It outlines the policy and technical requirements to accommodate bicycling and walking.

Finally the [Oregon Administrative Rule 12](#) governs the planning of transportation facilities in Oregon and requires that cities, counties and the state plan for bicycling and walking. (http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/rules/OARS_600/OAR_660/660_012.html)

2. Do you also have a Complete Streets policy? (Please provide copy)

Sort of: ORS 366.514 requires that when a roadway is constructed or reconstructed bikeways and walkways be provided.

Also, the [Highway Design Manual](#)

http://egov.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/ENGSER-VICES/hwy_manuals.shtml

Outlines the design specifics, based on roadway classification. Departures from the requirements of the HDM require a signed design exception. On urban, non-expressway, roadways, sidewalks and bike lanes are required, per the HDM.

3. Does the agency have a specific sidewalk policy which determines the installation of sidewalks along highways or other rural roadways?

Yes – the HDM, see above response.

4. Does your policy cover only State DOT or are other agencies included? (Transit providers, parks & recreation agency, education, health department, etc. List all that apply)

ORS 366.514 applies to any agency spending state highway funds – effectively DOT's across the state. The Transportation Planning Rule 12 also applies to all agencies. The Highway Design Manual, Oregon Transportation Plan and Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan apply to ODOT only.

5. Is your bicycle/pedestrian policy linked to other statewide policy issues? (ADA, health, safety, energy, environment, etc. List all that apply)

It's related and complimentary to the Transportation Planning Rule 12, but not directly linked. ORS 366.514 came 1st and thus stands alone; subsequent policies have built upon it. I know that the State, thru the Governor's office and other state agencies, has adopted policies to promote and support bicycling and walking, but I am not personally familiar with them.

6. Does your policy adoption process require legislative action or approval outside of DOT?

Depends – internal policies, like the Highway Design Manual, do not require outside action or approval. Changes to the TPR 12 would and of course any changes to an ORS require legislative action.

7. What administrative or organizational processes are in place to support the policy? i.e.: State Bicycle/pedestrian Advisory Council or Task Force

ORS 366.112 Established the Oregon Bicycle Committee, later expanded to the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee. This Governor appointed, 8-member, volunteer committee advises the Oregon Transportation Commission on matters pertaining to bicycling and walking.

8. How do you communicate your policy to key stakeholders and the public?

Any way we can: publications, meetings, web sites, media, press releases, public events, committees, advocacy groups, outside agency outreach, educational classes, etc. We publish a number of bicycle maps, the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan and the Oregon Bicyclist's Manual.

9. How did your policy get initiated and adopted? Who were the key leaders in the process?

Bob Stathos – Republican legislator from Jacksonville Oregon sponsored and passed 366.514.

Of course, Oregon's land use laws and progressive transportation policies were proposed, supported, and sustained by numerous Oregonians for more than 40 years, since the Oregon Trail really. I could not name them all. The Bicycle Transportation Alliance has begun to serve an increasingly important role in the statewide transportation policy arena, though it got a relatively late start in

the early '90's. The first bicycle transportation facility bond measure was passed in Benton County in 1980 and provided \$2 million dollars for bicycle paths. The City of Eugene adopted pro bike/walk policies in the early 1970's.

10. Has the state developed its own bicycle and pedestrian guidelines in addition to the national guidelines? Is there an internal education process to inform the design, operations and engineering staff about routine bicycle and pedestrian accommodations? Is there a standard review process that all projects must undergo to identify opportunities for bicycle and pedestrian amenities?

See previous discussion on the Highway Design Manual, etc. All ODOT project construction plans are reviewed by the Pedestrian and Bicycle Program staff. We are also tapped to sit on any number of agency policy and leadership committees and groups, to represent bicycling and walking interests.

11. How many of your staff are committed full or part time to bicycle/pedestrian efforts?

Three full time on bicycle/pedestrian alone, though there must be hundreds or thousands (including maintenance crews) that have a partial role in supporting bicycling and walking.

12. Do you have a stand alone bicycle/pedestrian plan or is it integrated into an overall state transportation plan?

Yes – see question one.

13. Does the plan include specific performance measures and/or a project lists to help measure progress toward implementation of the plan? Does the plan include regional and local level tasks? (Please provide copy)

No – we have good planning and design policies and standards, so most facilities are built in conjunction with routine highway projects. We do not have a strategic plan for provision of bicycling and walking facilities, which I think we need. We are currently inventorying bicycle facilities and sidewalks in urban areas on state highways. One of the outcomes of this inventory will be (I hope) a more strategic approach to providing for bicycling and walking.

14. Is your plan updated on a regular basis?

The Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian plan is currently being update, for the first time since 1995.

15. How are the state's Safe Routes to School and Recreational Trails Programs linked with the bicycle and pedestrian programs?

The Pedestrian/Bicycle Program has provided technical assistance the SRTS program. We are otherwise unrelated.

16. Does the state have any dedicated funding sources, in addition to federal programs for bicycle, or bicycle and pedestrian projects? If yes, how much funding is available?

See discussion about ORS 366.514, we currently spend about \$6 million per year from the state highway fund and an equal amount from federal transportation funds on biking and walking facilities. You can find detailed expenditure reporting in our annual report: http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/BIKEPED/docs/2006_Program_Report.pdf

(2006 is the latest report; the 2007 report is still pending.)

17. What percentage of the following federal funding programs is typically spent on bicycling projects?

I don't know the answer to this question and I'm afraid that I don't have time to research at the moment.

- a. Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)
- b. Surface Transportation, not including Transportation Enhancements
- c. Transportation Enhancements 70 – 80%
- d. Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)

18. Is there a statewide bicycle map or other resource that is available to the public? If so, does the map include suitability ratings, or information on conditions that impact bicycling like traffic volume and shoulder widths? (Please provide a copy)

Yes, and it's being updated to GIS format in the next two years.

<http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/BIKEPED/maps.shtml>

19. Is there anything else that you would like to add?

In Oregon the bicycle is a legal vehicle, with all the rights and responsibilities assigned to any other vehicle, with exceptions based on operating characteristics. This legal status has enormous positive consequences: it is very difficult to ban bicycles from any stretch of roadway, bicyclists have legal standing to use the public right of way, and bicyclists have legal standing to use the travel lanes. Professionals up and down the transportation ladder – design, construction, enforcement, policy, regulatory etc., must act if not in the direct interest of bicyclists, at least with the knowledge that the bicycle is a legal vehicle and as such is best accounted for in their respective

work. It also gives advocates very solid ground on which to stand. Here's the law:

814.400 Application of vehicle laws to bicycles. (1) Every person riding a bicycle upon a public way is subject to the provisions applicable to and has the same rights and duties as the driver of any other vehicle concerning operating on highways, vehicle equipment and abandoned vehicles, except:

(a) Those provisions which by their very nature can have no application.

(b) When otherwise specifically provided under the vehicle code.

(2) Subject to the provisions of subsection (1) of this section:

(a) A bicycle is a vehicle for purposes of the vehicle code; and

(b) When the term "vehicle" is used the term shall be deemed to be applicable to bicycles.

(3) The provisions of the vehicle code relating to the operation of bicycles do not relieve a bicyclist or motorist from the duty to exercise due care. [1983 c.338 §697; 1985 c.16 §335].

Finally – Oregon's policies are not complete. The funding stream, while generous by national standards, falls far short of the levels required to provide a complete bikeway network. Bicycle transportation is tolerated in many areas of the state, but not quite embraced. Transportation and land use polices acknowledge bicycling (and walking), but often allow things that are counter to a true fostering of a progressive transportation network. All that said – things in Oregon are quite good for bicyclists. And none of this would be real if it weren't for the many dedicated bicyclists who have attended meetings, hearings, joined boards and commissions and run for office. It is bicyclists advocating for bicycling that has created the favorable conditions we have in Oregon.

Rhode Island:

1. What is your state's current bicycle/pedestrian policy? (Please provide copy)

RIDOT does not have a formal written bicycle/pedestrian policy/document; we just do it, using a pro-active planning process www.planning.ri.gov/transportation and sound engineering judgment. www.dot.ri.gov/engineering

2. Do you also have a Complete Streets policy? (Please provide copy)

No.

3. Does the agency have a specific sidewalk policy which determines the installation of sidewalks along highways or other rural roadways?

No, sidewalk's on RIDOT owned/maintained roadways are installed as part of roadway re-construction (3R) and under ADA sidewalk improvement projects subject to available funding and priority in STIP: <http://www.planning.ri.gov/transportation/amendedreport.pdf>

4. Does your policy cover only State DOT or are other agencies included? (Transit providers, parks & recreation agency, education, health department, etc. List all that apply)

No answer

5. Is your bicycle/pedestrian policy linked to other statewide policy issues? (ADA, health, safety, energy, environment, etc. List all that apply)

No answer

6. Does your policy adoption process require legislative action or approval outside of DOT?

RIDOT initiated this Rhode Island General Law in 1997:

<http://www.rilin.state.ri.us/Statutes/TITLE31/31-18/31-18-21.HTM> in cooperation with the Narragansett Bay Wheelmen www.nbwclub.org under the administration of former RIDOT Director William D. Ankner, Ph.D.

7. What administrative or organizational processes are in place to support the policy? i.e.: State Bicycle/pedestrian Advisory Council or Task Force

RIDOT Bicycle Coordinator attends regular meetings of the following statewide advocacy groups:

- Greenways Alliance of RI <http://www.rigreenways.org>
- Narragansett Bay Wheelmen: www.nbwclub.org
- Providence Bicycle Coalition: <http://bikeprovidence.org/why-commute-by-bicycle>

8. How do you communicate your policy to key stakeholders and the public?

Media Releases, meetings with advocacy groups and Bike Rhode Island web site: www.dot.state.ri.us/bikeri.

9. How did your policy get initiated and adopted? Who were the key leaders in the process?

Referencing question six – former RIDOT Director Bill Ankner was instrumental in supporting this 1997 legislation, he was very supportive of inter-modal transportation.

10. Has the state developed its own bicycle and pedestrian guidelines in addition to the national guidelines? Is there an internal education process to inform the design, operations and engineering staff about routine bicycle and pedestrian accommodations? Is there a standard review process that all projects must undergo to identify opportunities for bicycle and pedestrian amenities?

RIDOT design engineers generally refer to the AASHTO Guide to the Development Facilities for roadway and bikeway design treatment.

11. How many of your staff are committed full or part time to bicycle/pedestrian efforts?

One full time employee

12. Do you have a stand alone bicycle/pedestrian plan or is it integrated into an overall state transportation plan?

N/A

13. Does the plan include specific performance measures and/or a project lists to help measure progress toward implementation of the plan? Does the plan include regional and local level tasks? (Please provide copy)

N/A

14. Is your plan updated on a regular basis?

N/A

15. How are the state's Safe Routes to School and Recreational Trails Programs linked with the bicycle and pedestrian programs?

RI SRTS Program is administered by the Office of Statewide Planning Programs <http://www.planning.ri.gov/transportation/srts/srts.htm> with RIDOT providing design technical reviews.

<http://www.planning.ri.gov/transportation/srts/srts.htm> with RIDOT providing design technical reviews.

16. Does the state have any dedicated funding sources, in addition to federal programs for bicycle, or bicycle and pedestrian projects? If yes, how much funding is available?

No state dedicated funding sources.

17. What percentage of the following federal funding programs is typically spent on bicycling projects?

a. Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) 15%

b. Surface Transportation, not including Transportation Enhancements 25%

c. Transportation Enhancements 10%

d. Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)

HPP (High Priority Projects- federal funding) 25%

PLH (Public Lands Highway) – 25%

18. Is there a statewide bicycle map or other resource that is available to the public? If so, does the map include suitability ratings, or information on conditions that impact bicycling like traffic volume and shoulder widths? (Please provide a copy)

RIDOT's bicycle map is available for on-line viewing: www.dot.state.ri.us/bikeri

19. Is there anything else that you would like to add?

RIDOT has committed significant federal and state funding resources to bicycle projects for the past 20+ years, before the advent of the first comprehensive federal transportation bill ISTEA was

enacted in 1991. The STIP has continually funded and prioritized bikeway projects with the support of the state Transportation Advisory Committee.

Vermont:

1. What is your state's current bicycle/pedestrian policy? (Please provide copy)

The recently adopted pedestrian/bicycle policy plan can be found at the following link:

<http://www.aot.state.vt.us/planning/PBPP.htm>

Also, in our VTrans Pedestrian/Bicycle Design Manual, you will find:

VTrans Pedestrian Policy:

Whereas,

- Everyone is a pedestrian;
- Walking is a part of every trip;
- Pedestrian travel is to be expected on all highways except where prohibited by state law; and
- Pedestrian travel is an integral part of the Agency's transportation program.

VTrans is committed to assuming a leadership role in promoting pedestrian improvement to:

- Encourage more walking;
- Reduce the number of pedestrian-motor vehicle crashes and injuries;
- Better address walking as a mode of transportation for all residents and visitors;
- Contribute to the U.S. Department of Transportation goal by helping to double the percentage of walking in the U.S.; and
- Contribute to national health objectives by providing opportunities for walking as a matter of lifestyle through the creation of pedestrian-friendly facilities, compact growth centers and active community environments.

To achieve these goals, VTrans will:

- Address pedestrian issues in all transportation plans developed with state or federal funds;
- Incorporate pedestrian facilities in all transportation projects and programs, where applicable.
- Ensure safe routes of travel for all pedestrians;
- Promote a connected network of pedestrian facilities in compact villages and urban centers;
- Enhance pedestrian mobility and safety in rural areas;
- Reinforce a sense of neighborhood and community with transportation designs that encourage pedestrian use;
- Encourage land use and transportation development that accommodate pedestrians;
- Enhance intermodal access for individuals with impaired mobility;
- Maintain the transportation system so pedestrian use is maximized;
- Define jurisdictional roles for providing and maintaining pedestrian facilities;
- Encourage towns and villages to use these guidelines in local planning and development; and
- Promote pedestrian safety initiatives and public awareness of the benefits that can be derived from walking.
- Improve data collection and evaluation techniques of existing and proposed facilities.

VTrans Bicycle Policy:

Whereas:

- Bicyclists have the same mobility needs as every other user of the transportation system and use the highway system as their primary means of access to jobs, services and recreational activities;

- To varying extent, bicycles will be used on all highways except where prohibited by state law; and
- Bicycle travel is an integral part of the Agency's transportation program.

VTrans is committed to assuming a leadership role in promoting bicycle improvements to:

- Encourage more bicycling;
- Reduce the number of bicycle-motor vehicle crashes and injuries;
- Better accommodate those who are dependent upon bicycling as their primary mode of transportation;
- Contribute to the U.S. Department of Transportation goal by helping to double the percentage of total trips made by bicycle in the U.S.; and
- Contribute to national health objectives of providing opportunities for bicycling as a matter of lifestyle through the creation of bicycle-friendly facilities, compact growth centers and active community environments.

To achieve these goals, VTrans will:

- Address bicycling issues in all long range transportation plans developed with state or federal funds;
- Incorporate bicycle facilities in the implementation of all transportation projects and programs, where applicable.
- Design, construct and maintain all streets and highways where bicyclists are permitted under the assumption that they will be used by bicyclists;
- Promote a connected network of bicycle facilities in compact villages and urban centers;
- Enhance bicyclists' mobility and safety in rural areas;
- Reinforce a sense of neighborhood and community with transportation designs that encourage bicycle use;
- Encourage land use and transportation development that accommodate bicyclists;

- Define jurisdictional roles for the provision of bicycle facilities;
- Define jurisdictional roles for the maintenance of bicycle facilities so bicycle use is maximized;
- Encourage towns and villages to use these guidelines in local planning and development; and
- Promote bicycle safety initiatives and public awareness of the benefits that can be derived from bicycling.
- Promote improved data collection and evaluation techniques of existing and proposed facilities.

Although neither was adopted as a policy with formal recognition.

2. Do you also have a Complete Streets policy? (Please provide copy)

No.

3. Does the agency have a specific sidewalk policy which determines the installation of sidewalks along highways or other rural roadways?

No. Again, our Pedestrian/Bicycle design manual has guidance on this, but it is not a formal policy.

Table 3-4.

Recommended Walkway Locations:

- Commercial centers and downtowns both sides of all streets.
- Major residential streets preferably on both sides.
- Local residential streets preferably on both sides, but at least one side.
- Low-density residential (1-4 units/ac) preferably on both sides, but at least one side with appropriate shoulder on other side.
- Rural residential (less than 1 unit/ac) preferably on one side with appropriate

shoulder on other side, but at least a shoulder on both sides.

Adapted from Design and Safety of Pedestrian Facilities, Institute of Transportation Engineers.

4. Does your policy cover only State DOT or are other agencies included? (Transit providers, parks & recreation agency, education, health department, etc. List all that apply)

Our policy would only cover the DOT, although we sometimes offer testimony on development going through the state's Act 250 land use permitting process. We might suggest sidewalks as part of that process.

5. Is your bicycle/pedestrian policy linked to other statewide policy issues? (ADA, health, safety, energy, environment, etc. List all that apply)

Not especially.

6. Does your policy adoption process require legislative action or approval outside of DOT?

No. The exception would be if we were adopting administrative rules, which requires legislative action. Or if we were trying to change statute, of course.

7. What administrative or organizational processes are in place to support the policy? i.e.: State Bicycle/pedestrian Advisory Council or Task Force

State Bicycle/pedestrian Program Manager (i.e. Coordinator)

8. How do you communicate your policy to key stakeholders and the public?

We have done technical sessions to consultants and municipalities. Documents are available on the Agency web site. We have done some out-

reach through state and regional bicycle/pedestrian advocacy organizations.

9. How did your policy get initiated and adopted? Who were the key leaders in the process?

For the bicycle/pedestrian policy plan, it was initiated by the bicycle/pedestrian coordinator in cooperation with the planning division. Those two entities, with a diverse steering committee were the leaders in the process. It was reviewed by DOT executive staff (all the division directors) before approval ultimately by the Secretary of Transportation. There was an extensive public involvement process during the development of the plan.

10. Has the state developed its own bicycle and pedestrian guidelines in addition to the national guidelines? Is there an internal education process to inform the design, operations and engineering staff about routine bicycle and pedestrian accommodations? Is there a standard review process that all projects must undergo to identify opportunities for bicycle and pedestrian amenities?

Yes. The aforementioned VTrans Pedestrian/Bicycle Design Manual which can be found at <http://www.aot.state.vt.us/progdev/Documents/LTF/FinalPedestrianAndBicycleFacility/PedBikeTOC.html>. We have done some in-reach, but need to do it again and on an ongoing basis to account for turnover, lack of use, etc. The Bicycle/Pedestrian Coordinator reviews all pavement management plans for pedestrian/bicycle needs. The Bicycle/Pedestrian Coordinator is a member of the Project Definition Team which reviews large (\$) projects. There is not a standard process to review all roads and bridge projects, but it something we have considered and may try to work towards in the next year or so.

11. How many of your staff are committed full or part time to bicycle/pedestrian efforts?

Tough question. One full time Bicycle/Pedestrian Program Manager. One full time SRTS Coordinator. One full time TE Program Manager (approximately 50% bicycle/pedestrian projects). Seven-eight project managers and supervisors working with communities at least part time to implement locally managed bicycle/pedestrian and Transportation Enhancement projects.

12. Do you have a stand alone bicycle/pedestrian plan or is it integrated into an overall state transportation plan?

Stand-alone Bicycle/Pedestrian Policy Plan.

13. Does the plan include specific performance measures and/or a project lists to help measure progress toward implementation of the plan? Does the plan include regional and local level tasks? (Please provide copy)

Yes. Performance measures are included. Regional/local and other level tasks are identified. See plan link in Question One.

14. Is your plan updated on a regular basis?

Yes. We strive for the typical five-year update cycle.

15. How are the state's Safe Routes to School and Recreational Trails Programs linked with the bicycle and pedestrian programs?

SRTS is within the bicycle/pedestrian program and the coordinator is overseen by the Bicycle/Pedestrian Coordinator. Recreational Trails is administered out of the state department of Forests, Parks and Recreational with input from DOT staff on project selection.

16. Does the state have any dedicated funding sources, in addition to federal programs for bicycle, or bicycle and

pedestrian projects? If yes, how much funding is available?

No.

17. What percentage of the following federal funding programs is typically spent on bicycling projects?

a. Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) – 0 – all goes to Public Transit in VT

b. Surface Transportation, not including Transportation Enhancements – At this point, no new STP funds spent on standalone bicycle/pedestrian projects. See the attached report about expenditures on shoulders, sidewalks and other bicycle/pedestrian features as part of other programs. For a number of years, ending in 2005, we had a standalone STP funded bicycle/pedestrian program that solicited approximately \$2M in projects each year. Many of those projects are still in the pipeline, but no new ones are solicited at this time.

c. Transportation Enhancements – roughly 50%

d. HSIP -0

18. Is there a statewide bicycle map or other resource that is available to the public? If so, does the map include suitability ratings, or information on conditions that impact bicycling like traffic volume and shoulder widths? (Please provide a copy)

None produced by the state. Various regional bicycle maps exist. See <http://www.vermontvacation.com/recreation/biking.asp> for more info.

19. Is there anything else that you would like to add?

Wisconsin:

1. What is your state's current bicycle/pedestrian policy? (Please provide copy)

Oddly, we do not have a free-standing policy. We have integrated aspects of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) policy in our Facilities Development Manual, but so many things are scattered about in different resources.

2. Do you also have a Complete Streets policy? (Please provide copy)

This also goes back to Question One. We following the FHWA Mainstreaming policy, which incidentally has been used as a component to some of the complete streets policy statements I have read recently.

3. Does the agency have a specific sidewalk policy which determines the installation of sidewalks along highways or other rural roadways?

Again, we don't have a strongly stated policy statement and for sidewalks, we can't. We have a very favorable cost share arrangement – we pay for about 90 percent of new sidewalks on our jobs, BUT maintenance is the responsibility of the cities/villages. We need an agreement from them that they will maintain the sidewalks. If they don't want the sidewalks, they can refuse to sign the agreement, and we have lost of our leverage. The vast majority of communities are happy to accept our terms.

4. Does your policy cover only State DOT or are other agencies included? (Transit providers, parks & recreation agency, education, health department, etc. List all that apply)

Our policies and practices generally only apply to our jobs or to jobs on the local system where federal funds are used.

5. Is your bicycle/pedestrian policy linked to other statewide policy issues? (ADA, health, safety, energy, environment, etc. List all that apply)

Our pedestrian policies are inherently linked to ADA. All of our policies are linked in some way to safety.

6. Does your policy adoption process require legislative action or approval outside of DOT?

No outside approval at this point.

7. What administrative or organizational processes are in place to support the policy? i.e.: State Bicycle/pedestrian Advisory Council or Task Force

We have a state bicycle council that is pushing for a more formal complete streets policy or law.

8. How do you communicate your policy to key stakeholders and the public?

Yes, we always try to communicate our policies and practices to stakeholders, many times, not well enough.

9. How did your policy get initiated and adopted? Who were the key leaders in the process?

No

10. Has the state developed its own bicycle and pedestrian guidelines in addition to the national guidelines? Is there an internal education process to inform the design, operations and engineering staff about routine bicycle and pedestrian accommodations? Is there a standard review process that all projects must un-

dergo to identify opportunities for bicycle and pedestrian amenities?

Yes, we have our own bicycle guide. There is not on-going education process. Yes, there is a standard review process on our state highways.

11. How many of your staff are committed full or part time to bicycle/pedestrian efforts?

Two

12. Do you have a stand alone bicycle/pedestrian plan or is it integrated into an overall state transportation plan?

We have two stand-alone plans.

13. Does the plan include specific performance measures and/or a project lists to help measure progress toward implementation of the plan? Does the plan include regional and local level tasks? (Please provide copy)

Yes, includes performance measures.

14. Is your plan updated on a regular basis?

Yes

15. How are the state's Safe Routes to School and Recreational Trails Programs linked with the bicycle and pedestrian programs?

16. Does the state have any dedicated funding sources, in addition to federal programs for bicycle, or bicycle and pedestrian projects? If yes, how much funding is available?

No dedicated state funds.

17. What percentage of the following federal funding programs is typically spent on bicycling projects?

- a. Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) 25%
- b. Surface Transportation, not including Transportation Enhancements?
- c. Transportation Enhancements 75%
- d. Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) – less than 5%

18. Is there a statewide bicycle map or other resource that is available to the public? If so, does the map include suitability ratings, or information on conditions that impact bicycling like traffic volume and shoulder widths?

Yes, there is a map. Yes, see <http://www.dot.wisconsin.gov/travel/bike-foot/countymaps.htm>.

19. Is there anything else that you would like to add?

League of American Bicyclists' Bicycle Friendly State Rankings

The League of American Bicyclists has announced the first annual ranking of Bicycle Friendly States, scoring all 50 states on more than 70 factors. The states were scored on responses to a questionnaire evaluating their commitment to bicycling and covering 6 key areas: legislation; policies and programs; infrastructure; education and encouragement; evaluation and planning; and enforcement.

Connecticut's State Rank was 42 out of 50. The League cited in its reasons for the ranking that Connecticut's carbon reduction plan includes bicycling, but there is currently no state funding for bicycle education programs and no state bicycle map.*

The overall 2008 State Rankings are listed below with benchmarking states highlighted:

1 Washington	26 Louisiana
2 Wisconsin	27 Rhode Island
3 Arizona	28 Missouri
4 Oregon	29 Kentucky
5 Minnesota	30 Texas
6 Maine	31 Delaware
7 California	32 Ohio
8 Illinois	33 Nebraska
9 New Jersey	34 New York
10 New Hampshire	35 Maryland
11 Utah	36 Tennessee
12 Michigan	37 Idaho
13 North Carolina	38 Pennsylvania
14 Hawaii	39 Arkansas
15 South Carolina	40 Alaska
16 Massachusetts	41 South Dakota
17 Vermont	42 Connecticut
18 Wyoming	43 Oklahoma
19 Nevada	44 Montana
20 Florida	45 New Mexico
21 Iowa	46 North Dakota
22 Colorado	47 Mississippi
23 Virginia	48 Alabama
24 Indiana	49 Georgia
25 Kansas	50 West Virginia

* As noted, Connecticut has supported and participated in bicycle and pedestrian education programs, and publishes a state bicycle map. The map is available on the CTDOT website and paper copies are distributed.