

# FLORIDA BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PARTNERSHIP COUNCIL

## MEETING 5

November 3rd, 2011

### Objectives

- Review upcoming legislative issues
- Review and agree on revised concept for the BPPC, including charge, member roles and work plan (annual report and website development)
- Review and refine draft recommendations
- Approve draft Annual Report
- Identify candidate focus areas for 2011 and 2012, if appropriate

- 9:00 Welcome and introductions
- 9:15 Legislative preview
- 9:45 Review of revised charge and roles
- Concept and charge
  - Recommendations and best practices
  - Member roles and ground rules
  - Work plan and yearly cycle
- 10:30 Break
- 10:45 Presentation on and discussion of utilization of rumble stripes
- 11:15 Review and refinement of recommendations
- 12:00 Lunch
- 1:00 Review and refinement of recommendations (continued)
- 2:15 Review, revise and approve Annual Report
- 2:45 Break
- 3:00 Identification of candidate focus areas for 2012-2013
- 3:45 Public Comment
- 3:55 Next Steps
- 4:00 Adjourn

**2011 Bicycle and Pedestrian Partnership Council Members List**

**October 27, 2011**

Bob Romig, FDOT, Chair

Kathleen Neill, FDOT, Co-Chair

Major Timothy Ashley, Florida Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles

Karen Brunelle, Federal Highway Administration

Ken Bryan, Rails to Trails Conservancy

Chief Grady Carrick, Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles

Jesus Gomez, Florida Public Transportation Association

Sue Hann, Florida League of Cities

Thomas Hawkins, Florida League of Cities

Charlie Hood, Department of Education

Joey Hoover, Florida Association of Counties

Richard Hopkins, Department of Health

Laurie Koburger, Department of Elder Affairs

Timothy Bustos, Florida Bicycle Association

Zoe Mansfield, Florida League of Cities

Vacant, Pedestrian Representative

Patricia Northey, Florida Association of Counties

Jeannette Hallock-Solomon, Department of Economic Opportunity

Sara Ward, Metropolitan Planning Organization Advisory Council

Max Rothman, Transportation Disadvantaged Representative

Cyndi Stevenson, Florida Association of Counties

Jim Wood, Department of Environmental Protection

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Partnership Council**  
**Summary of Meeting**  
**August 2, 2011**

**Council Members or designees present (in alphabetical order by last name):**

<i>Council Member, Organization</i>	<i>Designee (if applicable)</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bob Romig, FDOT (Interim Chair)	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Timothy Ashley, Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles	<input type="checkbox"/> Grady Carrick
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Karen Brunelle, Federal Highway Administration	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ken Bryan, Rails to Trails Conservancy	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Jesus Gomez, Florida Public Transportation Association	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jeannette Hallock-Solomon, Department of Community Affairs	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Sue Hann, Florida League of Cities	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Thomas Hawkins, Florida League of Cities	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Charlie Hood, Department of Education	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tracey Suber
<input type="checkbox"/> Joey Hoover, Florida Association of Counties	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Richard Hopkins, Department of Health	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Laurie Koburger, Department of Elder Affairs	<input type="checkbox"/> Marcus Richartz
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mike Lasche, Florida Bicycle Association	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Malisa McCreedy, Pedestrian Representative	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Zoe Mansfield, Florida League of Cities	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Patricia Northey, Florida Association of Counties	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Max Rothman, Transportation Disadvantaged Representative	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Cyndi Stevenson, Florida Association of Counties	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Andrew Ames
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sarah Ward, Metropolitan Planning Organization Advisory Council	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jim Wood, Department of Environmental Protection	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Facilitators:**

Hal Beardall and Rafael Montalvo (FCRC Consensus Center)

**FDOT Staff:**

Kathleen Neill, Huiwei Shen, Rob Magee, David Blodgett, and Paula San Gregorio (FDOT Office of Policy Planning); Marianne Trussell, Dennis Scott, Pat Pieratte, and Providence Nagy (FDOT Safety Office); Mary Anne Koos (FDOT Office of Design); Gail Holley (FDOT State Traffic Engineering & Operations Office); Diane Quigley (FDOT Public Transit Office)

**Observers:**

Fred Milch (East Central Florida Regional Planning Council); Heather Murphy (Safe Routes to School Florida Network); Mike Neidhart (Gannett Fleming); William Roll (Tindale-Oliver); and Jo Laurie Penrose (citizen/former Council member)

**Meeting Highlights**

Please refer to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Partnership Council page on the FDOT website, <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/policy/bikeped/>, for all meeting materials, including the agenda, presentations, and summary documentation.

**Opening Remarks, Introductions, and Agenda Review**

The fourth Florida Bicycle and Pedestrian Partnership Council meeting commenced at 9:00 am at the FDOT Headquarters in the Burns Building Auditorium. Bob Romig, State Transportation Development Administrator and interim Assistant Secretary for Intermodal Systems Development, welcomed the Council members and thanked them for their participation.

Hal Beardall of the Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium (FCRC) Consensus Center provided an overview of the agenda, reminded the members that they are subject to the Sunshine law, and relayed that this is the first step in developing draft policy recommendations for the Council's Annual Report. Mr. Beardall stated each presentation will be followed by an opportunity to ask questions and/or discuss concerns.

A new Council member was introduced:

- Jeannette Hallock-Solomon, representing the Florida Department of Community Affairs.

**Review Council Charge and Council Work Plan**

Hal Beardall provided an overview of the Council's Charge and Work Plan/Schedule based on discussions at previous Council meetings. Mr. Beardall stated that all of the topics identified in the Council's Work Plan will have been addressed at the conclusion of today's meeting. The next step for the Council will be to develop key issues that will need to be addressed at future meetings. Following the overview, members were asked if there were any items needing additional clarification.

*Member Questions and Comments:*

There were no questions and/or comments raised during the discussion of the Council's Charge or Work Plan/Schedule.

**Legislative Update**

Kathy Neill, FDOT's Director of the Office of Policy Planning, provided an overview of the key legislative topics of interest to the Council that did and did not pass during the 2011 Florida legislative session. Key legislative topics included:

- FDOT bill (which would have included a pilot program to allow bicycles on selected limited access bridges) did not pass
- \$150 million sweep of the State Transportation Trust Fund
- New State Economic Enhancement and Development (SEED) Trust Fund, funded by documentary stamp revenues
  - \$75 million from State Housing Trust Fund
  - \$190 million from State Transportation Trust Fund
- SEED money will be used for job creation to fund projects that meet a strategic and/or essential State interest related to economic development
- Growth Management
  - Lessened State oversight
  - Transportation concurrency made optional

In addition, Council member Mike Lasche provided a 2-page summary of bills related to bicycles, pedestrians, and trails.

Following Ms. Neill's presentation, members were asked if there were any items needing additional clarification. Note: responses from staff are indicated in *italics*.

*Member Questions and Comments:*

Does the FDOT have a bill ready for next year's legislative session?

*The Department has not prepared a draft bill at this time. However, it is likely that next year's bill will include many of the same topics that were in this year's bill.*

**Presentations and Discussion on FDOT Strategies for Bicyclists and Pedestrians**

Presentation #1 - Elements of Successful Complete Streets Policies

Mary Anne Koos, Special Projects Coordinator for FDOT's Design Office, provided a presentation on Complete Streets policies, which touched on the issues of roadway design that accommodate both motorized and non-motorized travelers.

Following Ms. Koo's presentation, members were asked if there were any items needing additional clarification. Note: responses from staff are indicated in *italics*.

*Member Questions and Comments:*

How do we handle streets in areas that don't need Complete Streets type accommodations?

*The Complete Streets concept is applicable to nearly all roads on the State Highway System, except for limited access roads. When speeds are around 20-25 mph, compromise between motorized and non-motorized vehicles becomes natural. The idea is to create a quality environment for all users.*

How can the concept of Complete Streets be applied across large areas/populations?

*Signage, pavement markings, and reducing outside lane widths are examples of non-infrastructure Complete Streets projects that can have an effect on many people. In addition, infrastructure projects such as sidewalks and bike lanes also can have an effect on large numbers of people.*

It was noted that it can be difficult to erase existing pavement lines/markings if a road is not being resurfaced. You need to be aware of the resurfacing projects that are coming up in your local MPOs Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) so you can approach the FDOT District to discuss how Complete Streets principles can be incorporated into these types of projects.

Should we continue to implement pedestrian-activated flashing yellow lights for mid-block crossings?

*In addition to pedestrian activated mid-block crossing lights, there are other options that can be used to bring more attention to drivers to be aware of non-motorized travelers.*

There is a concern with rumble stripes on rural roads. The concern is that you lose the ability to have a bike lane on rural roads when you have a two-foot shoulder.

*Rumble stripes are very ride-able for bikes vs. the in-ground rumble strips which are not. Also, State roads typically have sufficient shoulder widths of at least 4 feet. The issue may be with local roads, which may have sub-standard shoulder widths.*

It was also noted that a performance standard should be developed that incorporates long-term maintenance.

#### Presentation #2 - Safe Mobility for Life

Gail Holley, FDOT State Traffic Engineering and Operations Office/Safe Mobility for Life Program Manager, provided a presentation on the Safe Mobility for Life Coalition, which touched on the issue of addressing Florida's aging population.

Following Ms. Holley's presentation, members were asked if there were any items needing additional clarification. Note: responses from staff are indicated in *italics*.

#### *Member Questions and Comments:*

Is there a plan for FDOT to install countdown signals on local roads?

*Safety funds are being spent on both State and local roads.*

The discussion touched on the need to think about Performance Measures and their relationship to people, not the number of "things" built or installed. A broader question for discussion is what percentage of the population (maybe relevant population) would benefit from the implemented measures?

## Review Preliminary Guidance Statements from Previous Council Discussions

Rafael Montalvo of the Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium (FCRC) Consensus Center presented a series of statements that were drawn principally from notes of previous Council meetings—statements related to developing policy guidance, recommendations, or comments to appropriate entities involved in bicycle and pedestrian issues, which may be used to as the basis for further Council discussion and for development of draft Council recommendations.

Council members were asked to rate many of the statements using an “Initial Acceptability” scale that ranged from 1 to 3, with 1 representing “I can support this as is” (from “wholehearted support” to “I can live with this”), 2 representing “I can support this, but would like to see the following changes....”, and 3 representing “I cannot support this unless serious concern(s) are addressed as follows....”. (Note: time constraints did not allow rating of the Coordination and Funding Statements.)

Members’ initial ratings were compiled during the meeting through a show of hands as a starting point for discussion. It is important to note the ratings were not votes, but rather a tool to help identify concerns about the draft statements and to focus discussion on how the statements might be refined. The ratings also help clarify members’ level of support for each statement as originally drafted. At future meetings, members will be asked to identify possible recommendations related to topics under review at the conclusion of each discussion. The following section presents members’ ratings of each item, where applicable, and summarizes members’ comments.

### INVESTMENT PRIORITIES (IP)

**IP 1** -- Develop conceptual models that suggest the benefits to be obtained from each category of bicycle and pedestrian investment, for use by advocates and decision-makers in seeking funding.

Initial Acceptability Rating	1	2	3
No. of Members	2	7	0

#### Comments and suggestions on draft policy statement based on initial rating:

- Need to address issues raised in earlier discussions
- Need to clarify what is included in a “conceptual model”
- Need to address different facility types
- Need to clarify what funding is being sought for
- Need to clarify the types of benefits, such as fiscal, safety, etc.
- There are different kinds of benefits, cannot maximize all of them - there are trade-offs/choices regarding which benefits are more important
- This statement doesn’t speak to individual projects, whereas IP2 does

**IP 2** -- Develop district-by-district “gap analyses” that help identify needed system components.

Initial Acceptability Rating	1	2	3
No. of Members	2	8	1

Comments and suggestions on draft policy statement based on initial rating:

- Keep interconnections between districts in mind
- The term “gap” needs to be defined, since this term can mean different things
- Is this analysis applicable only to State roads, or would local roads be included as well?

**IP 3** -- Prioritize investments that complete linkages between components of bicycle and pedestrian facility systems, in order to derive the most benefit from investment dollars.

Initial Acceptability Rating	1	2	3
No. of Members	5	2	2

Comments and suggestions on draft policy statement based on initial rating:

- Procedurally this seems out of order - need to prioritize missing project “gaps” before we prioritize investments
- Need to know what the “needs” are first, then we can build the case for funding
- Need to know what the level of funding is
- Need to give priority to investments that complete the system
- Need to give priority to segments that provide linkages/interconnections
- May need to plug in FDOT’s identified needs
- The Office of Greenways and Trails has attempted to quantify “needs”

**IP 4** - Others

Comments and suggestions:

- Consider policies that have the greatest impact on the greatest number of people

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES (PM)**

**PM 1** -- Develop quantitative and qualitative performance measures for use state-wide. Possibilities include:

- Counts of crosswalk users.
- Number of counties with bicycle and pedestrian plans.
- Degree to which these plans are reflected in 5-year capital improvements plans.
- Inventory/percentages of roads that have bicycle facilities or sidewalks.

Initial Acceptability Rating	1	2	3
No. of Members	3	7	0

Comments and suggestions on draft policy statement based on initial rating:

- Consistent with IP3, need to look at creating linkages between the contribution of investment and utilization – may need to create a set of measurable performance standards

- Certain roadway types generate more traffic – therefore, usage of different facility types should be considered along with crashes / injuries
- Clarify by linking to increased utilization
- Need to include context sensitive design as a performance measure
- Consider the number of cities and counties that have trail and pathway plans
- Need to measure the difference between plans in place and plans that are funded
- Examples in the state are limited
- Inventory does not necessarily capture the conditions, i.e. whether or not facilities are being maintained
- The purpose of the performance measures is not specified. Will they be used to evaluate the success of something?
- Add performance measure for “mode shift,” number of destinations on links that attract people, quality of facilities, and define “destinations”

**PM 2 – Other**

Comments and Suggestions:

- None

**SAFETY (S)**

**S 1 - Develop measures of bicycle and pedestrian safety.**

<b>Initial Acceptability Rating</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
No. of Members	1	11	0

Comments and suggestions on draft policy statement based on initial rating:

- From a Public Health point of view, we are interested in more than just “safety.” We are interested in increasing biking/walking aside from reducing crashes, i.e. we are interested in the wellness benefits from these activities
- Want other options for other modes
- Develop or continue with refining measures we have for vulnerable groups?
- Is this different from the “vulnerable users” already included in the Strategic Highway Safety Plan?
- Need to include exposure rates into measures of bicycle and pedestrian safety, e.g., Gainesville has a high number of crashes, but also a higher level of activity/usage
- Including exposure rates (and weather data) would be beneficial when we do state-to-state comparisons
- Need to include clear zone violations
- This policy statement is too broad – what will it be used for, and for what purpose?
- Department of Health is finalizing its behavioral analysis questionnaire, which will be administered to 10,000 FL adults. The Council may want to consider including a question if it could help in determining utilization rates – the cost is roughly \$3,000 per question

**S 2** - Develop and implement bicycle and pedestrian safety education programs that focus on safety awareness and low cost measures.

Initial Acceptability Rating	1	2	3
No. of Members	7	3	0

Comments and suggestions on draft policy statement based on initial rating:

- Add “effective” before the phrase “low cost”
- Need to have the “Walk Your Child to School” program implemented in all elementary schools

**S 3** - Continue to develop and implement a bicycle and pedestrian safety component for law enforcement officer training.

Initial Acceptability Rating	1	2	3
No. of Members	8	2	0

Comments and suggestions on draft policy statement based on initial rating:

- Need to be inclusive of the judiciary, the Department of Motor Vehicles, and schools
- Clarify that we are addressing the behavior/attitudes of law enforcement officers – which includes increased enforcement activities such as enforcing the “3 foot” rule
- Is this about the safe behavior of bicyclist and pedestrians or the behavior of all travelers, including motorists and others that can affect bicyclist and pedestrians
- Need to change from the generic term “safety” to “injury prevention”
- Need to include the concept of “reduction of conflict points” between motorized and non-motorized travelers

**S 4** - Other

Comments and suggestions:

- None

**COORDINATION (C)**

**C 1** -- Develop mechanisms to improve coordination between public and private stakeholders involved in bicycle and pedestrian planning. *(No rating taken due to time constraints.)*

Comments and suggestions on draft policy statement:

- Add other coordinating agencies as an example, DEP, DOE, etc.
- Add coordination with local comprehensive plans

**C 2** - Other

Comments and suggestions on draft policy statement:

- None

## FUNDING (F)

**F 1** -- Streamline Safe Routes to School application process to increase access to this source of funding. *(No rating taken due to time constraints.)*

### Comments and suggestions on draft policy statement:

- Need to reaffirm that funding for this program will continue into the future, which may mean use of State funds if this program is eliminated in the next federal transportation reauthorization bill

**F 2** - FDOT, MPOs and other partner agencies should increase the priority and protection of bicycle and pedestrian projects within the Transportation Enhancement funds decision-making process. *(No rating taken due to time constraints.)*

### Comments and suggestions on draft policy statement:

- None

## **F 3 - Other**

### Comments and suggestions:

- None

## **Presentations and Discussions on Related Planning Programs**

This section encompassed a series of five presentations all related to bicycle and pedestrian planning, but from the perspective of different partnering agencies. These presentations were meant to convey a collective sense that each partner organization shares overlapping responsibilities in the broader context of improving access to bicycle and pedestrian facilities while also improving user safety.

The facilitators asked members to identify questions that may help them develop policy recommendations – recommendations that would be applicable to all partnering agencies.

### Presentation #1 - Local Government Comprehensive Plans

Jeannette Hallock-Solomon, Florida Department of Community Affairs Division of Community Planning and new Council member, provided a presentation on the bicycle and pedestrian planning activities from a local government comprehensive planning perspective.

Following Ms. Hallock-Solomon's presentation, members were asked if there were any items needing additional clarification that may facilitate the development of potential policy statements.

### ***Potential Policy Statements:***

*There were no questions, comments, or policy statements offered during the discussion of local government comprehensive plans presentation.*

### Presentation #2 - Metropolitan Planning Organizations

Sarah Ward, Pinellas County MPO and Council member, provided a presentation on bicycle and pedestrian planning activities from a metropolitan planning organization (MPO) perspective.

Following Ms. Ward's presentation, members were asked if there were any items needing additional clarification that may facilitate the development of potential policy statements.

#### ***Potential Policy Statements:***

*Statement #1: Need for collaboration from different agencies or departments within agencies so there aren't turf battles*

*Statement #2: Encourage cooperation between MPOs and school districts*

### Presentation #3 - Public Transportation

Diane Quigley, Florida Department of Transportation Public Transit Office, provided a presentation on the bicycle and pedestrian planning activities from a public transportation perspective.

Following Ms. Quigley's presentation, members were asked if there were any items needing additional clarification that may facilitate the development of potential policy statements.

#### ***Potential Policy Statements:***

*Statement #1: There were no questions, comments, or policy statements offered during the discussion of local government comprehensive plans presentation.*

### Presentation #4 - School Transportation

Tracy Suber, Florida Department of Education Educational Consultant-Growth Management Liaison, provided a presentation on the bicycle and pedestrian planning activities from a local school perspective.

Following Ms. Suber's presentation, members were asked if there were any items needing additional clarification that may facilitate the development of potential policy statements.

#### ***Potential Policy Statements:***

*Statement #1: Have the legislature enhance or encourage cooperation between school districts and local transit providers.*

### Presentation #5 - Strategic Regional Policy Plans

Fred Milch, East Central Florida Regional Planning Council, provided a presentation on the bicycle and pedestrian planning activities from a Regional Planning Council perspective as part of the region's Strategic Regional Policy Plan.

#### ***Potential Policy Statements:***

*Statement #1: Encourage consistency between planning (conceptual plans and PD&E documents) and design of bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Many times the design does not encompass the entirety of facility location and type in the final design.*

*Statement #2: Need to consider the economic benefits of bicycle and pedestrian facilities.*

### **Presentation and Discussion on the State Pedestrian Safety Action Plan**

William Roll, Tindale-Oliver & Associates, Inc., provided a status update on the State's Pedestrian Safety Action Plan. Following Mr. Roll's presentation, members were asked if there were any items needing additional clarification. Note: responses from are indicated in *italics*.

*Member Questions and Comments:*

Can you discuss the problem of mid-block crossings?

*Many of our roadways (and land uses) are not designed for pedestrian to cross at mid-block. To safely cross mid-block our roads (and land use) need to be designed appropriately.*

How far along is this project? When can this group have input on the Plan so we can contribute in a meaningful way?

*We are wrapping up stakeholder interviews. There will be time for the Council to provide input.*

How do you address people's perception that roads are dangerous places to bicycle and walk? How do we get over the bigger perceived issue of lack of safety to get more people bicycling and walking?

*If we have a safe road system, more people will want to bicycle and walk.*

If the road looks pretty (and is well designed), the perception is that walking and biking are safer. Overall, we need to encourage the culture of walking and biking.

We need to change the perception that walking and biking is dangerous. If we can reduce the sense of danger, we can increase use and improve safety by raising awareness.

The Safe Routes to School program get kids walking together in "trains," which helps to keep kids safe while helping to change attitudes/perceptions of walking and biking.

In Public Health we try to change behavior over time. The reduction in smoking is an example of a successful campaign that has taken a generation to change behavior and the perception of what is safe and acceptable. There is an ability to change behavior even though it may take a long time. Maybe this is an area we can collaborate with FDOT by working together to change people's behavior/perception.

### **Discussion / Guidance on the Council's Annual Report**

Mike Neidhart, Gannett Fleming, Inc., provided an overview on a proposed draft of the Council's Annual Report. Following Mr. Neidhart's presentation, members were asked if there were any items needing additional clarification. Note: responses from are indicated in *italics*.

*Member Questions and Comments:*

The suggestion was made that the Annual Report should remove the statement that bicycle and pedestrian facilities are the sole purpose of the Council.

## Public Comment

No public comment at this time

## Discussion / Guidance on Future Council Meetings

With the conclusion of this meeting, the facilitators reminded Council members that they have completed their deliberation of the initial set of issues that were identified in creating their first year's Work Plan. The Chair asked members for their input on what they see the Council accomplishing in the future. The following bullet points are discussions items generated from the Chair's question.

- Providing input on legislative issues - being part of the Department's legislative development process
- The Council should be involved in broader safety issues such as the Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP), the State Pedestrian Safety Action Plan (SPSAP), and Florida's Aging Road User Strategic Safety Plan
- To be effective the Council needs to know who its recommendations are for
- The Council should be involved in changing the behavior of both motorized and non-motorized travelers
- The Council needs a "concrete" purpose, i.e., tasks or instructions - to know how each partner agency can help achieve the Council's broader goals
- The Council needs deadlines/guidance for achieving its Charge
- There was a concern over the high turnover rate of Council members - lack of continuity makes it difficult to fully address issues
- Some members stated that they liked the term "injury prevention" versus "safety" - the term safety has the connotation of blaming the victim
- The Council should look at issues that would promote access to facilities statewide
- The Council should look into developing a series of "Best Practices" examples
- Need improved data collection
- We may want to revisit the Council's Charge - include guidance on how the Council will advise the Department as well as all of the partner agencies - advice should be geared toward all of the partner agencies
- We should not handicap ourselves by limiting our discussion to what is in current State statute, the Council should be pro-active in helping develop new statutes and regulations

## Next Steps

Based on these comments, the facilitators highlighted the following topics for future meetings:

- Input on next year's legislative session
- Safety
- Funding
- Cultural/Behavioral Change
- Enforcement
- Completing the System

- Council is not bound to the existing Charge
- Provide additional / new policy guidance statements for Council review
- Council Options:
  - Option 1: Council focus on a few key topics / issues – have definitive deadlines and update Annual Report with broad range of topics with potential guidance statements
  - Option 2: Council focus more narrowly on a single issue, i.e. safety or related plans
- Annual Report Options
  - Option 1: Finalize the 2010/2011 Annual Report based on the Council's current status
  - Option 2: Revise Annual Report in 2012 (after the 2012 legislative session)
- Two more meetings this fiscal year – one in November 2011 and another after the 2012 legislative session
- Focus of next 2 meetings
  - Completing the Annual Report
  - Address in some form the topics listed above

Possible November Agenda items:

- Next year's Florida legislative session
- Federal authorization
- Look at safety and broader behavioral culture attitudes – use policy guidance to address funding and opportunities for coordination

The next meeting will likely be scheduled sometime in November/December, with another meeting after the 2012 legislative session.

Meeting Evaluation Survey

Hal Beardall asked members to fill out the meeting evaluation form (see results in Appendix A).

**Adjourn**

The Chair thanked members for their participation. Hearing no additional comments or issues to be discussed, the meeting was adjourned at 4:31 pm.

**APPENDIX A: Meeting Evaluation Summary**  
**Bicycle and Pedestrian Partnership Council**  
**4<sup>th</sup> Council Meeting**  
Tallahassee, Florida

August 4, 2011 – 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

	☺	☹	⊗			
	<u>Agree</u>		<u>Disagree</u>			
	<i>CIRCLE ONE</i>					
	5	4	3	2	1	Summary
<b><u>WERE THE MEETING OBJECTIVES MET?</u></b>						
To receive informational briefings on and discuss selected FDOT strategies for bicyclists and pedestrians.	6	1	1	0	0	<b>4.63</b>
To review, discuss and revise preliminary guidance statements drawn from previous Council discussions.	5	2	1	0	0	<b>4.50</b>
To review and discuss related planning programs, including: local government comprehensive plans; MPOs; public transportation; and, school transportation.	7	0	1	0	0	<b>4.75</b>
To receive informational briefing on and discuss the State Pedestrian Safety Action Plan.	7	1	0	0	0	<b>4.88</b>
To discuss and provide guidance on an annual report from the Council.	3	3	2	0	0	<b>4.13</b>
To discuss and provide guidance on future Council meetings.	5	2	1	0	0	<b>4.50</b>
<b>MEETING ORGANIZATION</b>						
Background and agenda packet were helpful	6	2	0	0	0	<b>4.75</b>
Presentations were effective and informative	6	2	0	0	0	<b>4.75</b>
Plenary discussion format was effective	7	1	0	0	0	<b>4.88</b>
Facilitator guided participant efforts effective	6	2	0	0	0	<b>4.75</b>
Participation was balanced	7	1	0	0	0	<b>4.88</b>

**What Did You Like Best About the Meeting?**

- Presentations and discussion between participants
- Interaction; loved the various colored sheets
- Open discussions; opportunity to learn
- The variety and subject knowledge of participants
- Policy guidance discussion
- Full participation by all Council members. Relaxed atmosphere

**What Could Be Improved?**

- Set dates for future meetings
- Need materials in advance of the meeting if possible
- Remember to ask for input from the folks on the video conference
- Nothing this time
- I think next time it might help to have more brainstorming to bring out ideas.
- Would help to have materials in advance for things we need to provide input into.
- Projection equipment
- Provide draft progress report before hand.

**Other Comments (use the back if necessary)**

- Great job!

DRAFT

## FDOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Partnership Council Charge

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) has established a standing statewide “Partnership Council” on bicycle and pedestrian mobility. The Council includes key agency representatives and external stakeholders. The Council will provide guidance to the Department and its partner agencies on policy matters affecting the bicycle and pedestrian transportation needs of the State of Florida.

The FDOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Partnership Council duties also include facilitating increased coordination and collaboration by advising the Department on all statewide transportation planning and safety activities, including the Florida Transportation Plan (FTP). The Council will also report annually on the status towards making Florida and its communities more pedestrian and bicycle friendly. The Council will review and provide policy recommendations or comments, as appropriate, on issues and reports including but not limited to:

- Design:
  - FDOT’s *Manual of Uniform Minimum Standards for Design, Construction and Maintenance for Streets and Highways* (commonly known as the “Florida Greenbook”)<sup>1</sup>
  - FDOT’s Plans Preparation Manual and Design Standards
  - Revisions to Traffic Engineering Manual regarding pedestrian crosswalks, use of countdown signals, rapid flashing beacons and pedestrian hybrid signals
- Planning:
  - Identify best practices for local communities (e.g., land development codes, school siting), metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs), and regional planning councils (RPCs) to enhance bicycle and pedestrian mobility through planning and design criteria and practices.
  - FDOT plans (Strategic Intermodal Systems plan, 2060 FTP) and partner plans (e.g., local comprehensive plans, MPOs, RPCs)
  - Department of Community Affairs growth management rules
- Safety:
  - Strategic Highway Safety Plan and vulnerable road users (e.g., pedestrians, cyclists)
  - Safety Office Programs (School Crossing Guard, Safe Routes to School, Florida Traffic and Bicycle Safety Education, Pedestrian Safety Resource Center)
  - Highway Safety Grant Program

---

<sup>1</sup> Partnership Council recommendations or comments on the “Florida Greenbook” will be made to the Greenbook Advisory Committee (which is charged in F.S. 336.045 with developing “uniform minimum standards and criteria for the design, construction, and maintenance of all public streets, roads, highways, bridges, sidewalks, curbs and curb ramps, crosswalks, where feasible, bicycle ways, underpasses, and overpasses used by the public for vehicular and pedestrian traffic”).

- Measures and Data:
  - Identify opportunities for incorporating other data into planning and decision making (e.g., bicycle and pedestrian injury data, exposure to risk)
  - Identify performance measures for improving access and reducing accidents
- Programs and Funding:
  - Review of Pedestrian & Bicycle Program, Transit Office, and Rail Office procedures and programs
  - Establish policies for use of existing funds such as Statewide Transportation Enhancements
  - Review and make recommendations for encouraging consistency with and securing funding opportunities from federal initiatives to promote more livable communities and well connected walking and bicycling networks

EXISTING

## **Florida Bicycle and Pedestrian Partnership Council Charge**

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) has established a standing statewide “Partnership Council” on bicycle and pedestrian mobility. The Council includes key partners and other stakeholders. The Council will serve as a forum to provide guidance to the FDOT, its partner and other stakeholders on policy matters and issues affecting the bicycle and pedestrian transportation needs of the State of Florida. The Council’s functions include the following:

- Provide policy recommendations to bicycle and pedestrian partners and stakeholders, including FDOT, on selected issues of importance to the bicycle and pedestrian community.
- Provide advice and input to bicycle pedestrian partners and stakeholders, including FDOT, on bicycle and pedestrian issues, plans and operations.
- Support bicycle and pedestrian advocates in identifying and promoting best practices.
- Provide an opportunity for bicycle and pedestrian advocates to exchange and understand policy information relevant to the bicycle and pedestrian community.
- Provide a conduit for information and policy recommendations between FDOT and its partners and the bicycle and pedestrian community.

The Council will be a standing body. It will identify focus areas for recommendations and best practices on a yearly basis. Focus areas, best practices and recommendations will normally be organized consistent with the “4 Es” – education, encouragement, enforcement and engineering.

The Florida Bicycle and Pedestrian Partnership Council functions also include facilitating increased coordination and collaboration by advising the FDOT, partners and stakeholders on all transportation planning and safety activities, including the Florida Transportation Plan (FTP). The Council will report annually on the Council’s discussions and policy recommendations for that year’s focus areas.

## **Bicycle and Pedestrian Partnership Council Work Plan and Schedule**

### **June 28, 2010 - 1<sup>st</sup> Council Meeting, Tallahassee**

- Receive informational briefings on roles/responsibilities for bike/pedestrian infrastructure, statewide transportation planning
- Review Council responsibilities and initial charge
- Identify and discuss potential major issues to be addressed by the Council
- Provide guidance on next steps, assignments, and the preparation for the 2<sup>nd</sup> Council Meeting to be held in fall 2010

### **October 14, 2010 - 2<sup>nd</sup> Council Meeting, DeLand**

- Review the revised Bicycle and Pedestrian Partnership Council charge, Work Plan and Schedule
- Review and provide input to the draft statewide transportation plans
- Receive informational briefings on design standards for pedestrian and bicycle facilities and transportation funding
- Provide guidance on next steps, assignments and preparation for the 3<sup>rd</sup> Council Meeting to be held in winter of 2011

### **February 7, 2011 - 3<sup>rd</sup> Council Meeting, Tallahassee**

- Receive informational briefings on and discuss specific program funding
- Receive informational briefings on and discuss consumer cost of using transportation system (*e.g., benefits of investment in bicycle/pedestrian facilities*)
- Receive an update on the Strategic Highway Safety Plan
- Review and discuss available crash data and system data
- Review information about pedestrian and bicycle facilities on the State Highway System
- Review and discuss design issues
- Receive informational briefing and discuss how Counties, Cities and MPOs make bicycle and pedestrian improvements

## **August 2, 2011 - 4<sup>th</sup> Council Meeting, Tallahassee**

- Review and discuss related planning processes, including:
  - Local government comprehensive plans
  - School siting and transportation coordination
  - Strategic Regional Policy Plans
  - Transit (e.g., role of bicycle/pedestrian infrastructure on usage)
  - Other processes
- Identify and discuss opportunities for improving stakeholder coordination and enhancing implementation
- Review and discuss specific design issues in coordination with land use
- Provide guidance on annual report on the status of making Florida and its communities more pedestrian and bicycle friendly
- Provide guidance on future Council meetings

## **Bicycle and Pedestrian Partnership Council**

### **Roles and Responsibilities**

**Chair.** The Bicycle and Pedestrian Partnership Council chair is responsible for guiding the Council meetings, directing technical staff and facilitators in meeting the Council's responsibilities and bringing draft language to the full Council.

**Members.** Bicycle and Pedestrian Partnership Council members will serve on the committee representing key stakeholder interests. Members are responsible for engaging in the process of discussion and developing draft recommendations for full Council consideration. Members will be expected to convey the perspectives of the organizations and groups they represent to the Council, and to ensure that their organizations and groups are aware of discussions and recommendations of the Council.

**FDOT Staff and Consultants** will assist the Bicycle and Pedestrian Partnership Council with their meetings; support technical and information needs, including data and information gathering and distribution; and draft recommendation language as directed for full Council consideration.

**General Public** will be invited to offer input and make suggestions for the Council to consider at all meetings.

**Professional Facilitation.** The Bicycle and Pedestrian Partnership Council will have a facilitator assigned to assist the chair in agenda design, produce meeting summaries and facilitate the Council's efforts to build consensus on its recommendations.

## **Bicycle and Pedestrian Partnership Council**

### **Procedures and Guidelines**

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Partnership Council will seek consensus decisions on its recommendations to bicycle and pedestrian partners, including FDOT. General consensus is a participatory process whereby, on matters of substance, the members strive for agreements which all of the members can accept, support, live with or agree not to oppose. The Council will develop its recommendations using consensus building techniques with the assistance of facilitators, such as the use of brainstorming, acceptability ratings and prioritizing approaches. In instances where, after vigorously exploring possible ways to enhance the members' support for the final decision on a package of recommendations, the committee finds 100 percent acceptance or support is not achievable, final decisions will require at least an 80 percent favorable vote of all members present and voting. This super-majority decision rule underscores the importance of actively developing consensus throughout the process on substantive issues with the participation of all members to arrive at final recommendations with which all members can agree.

The Council chair will work with the facilitators to design both efficient and effective agendas. The Council chair will be responsible, in consultation with the Council members and facilitators, for proposing meeting agenda topics. The Council meetings will be led by the chair and the use of a facilitator will enable the chair to participate directly in the substantive process of seeking agreement on recommendations. FDOT staff and consultants will help the Council with information and meeting logistics.

Council members will be given full opportunity to rank, discuss and develop consensus on all recommendations. Draft recommendations developed by the Council will ultimately be compiled into an annual report for the Council's review and approval.

# FLORIDA BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PARTNERSHIP COUNCIL

## MEETING 5

November 3, 2011

### DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS WORKSHEET

#### Introduction

One element of the BPPC's charge is to develop recommendations to entities (including MPOs, RPCs, local governments, FDOT, partner agencies and NGOs) involved in bicycle and pedestrian issues.

The language below has been developed by staff based on the draft policy statements reviewed by members at Meeting 4, and the comments offered by members in response to those drafts. At Meeting 5, members will be asked to review and refine them further, and indicate whether, as refined during the meeting, they are acceptable as Council recommendations emerging from members' deliberations to-date.

#### Instructions

Please review each draft recommendation; then use the following scale and this worksheet to rate its initial acceptability.

*Initial Acceptability scale:*

- 3= "I can support this as is" (from "wholehearted support" to "I can live with this.")
- 2= "I can support this, but would like to see the following changes..."
- 1= "I cannot support this unless serious concern(s) are addressed as follows..."

Once you have rated each draft recommendation, please use the space provided for notes on concerns or possible refinements that you would like the Council to consider.

To facilitate rating, the draft recommendations are presented first in a clean format displaying only the most recent version of each. For comparison, immediately following each clean version is the earlier version reviewed by the Council in May, along with Council ratings and comments from that meeting.

The worksheets are for your use in preparing for Council discussion of these items. While we will compile members' initial ratings during the meeting through a show of hands as a starting point for those discussions, we will not collect the worksheets.

## INVESTMENT PRIORITIES – POTENTIAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Introductory text to this section will reference the concept of giving priority to investments that will provide the greatest benefit to the greatest number of users.

**IP 1** – Bicycle and pedestrian partners working with FDOT, should develop tools that suggest the benefits to be obtained from each type of bicycle and pedestrian investment, for use by advocates and decision-makers in promoting projects and seeking funding. These tools should clearly identify types of facilities and the kinds of benefits (including but not limited to safety, connectivity, increased utilization, economic development and fiscal efficiency) to be obtained from investment in each type of facility.

*Initial acceptability of potential recommendation as drafted (place an “X” in box):*

	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

**Comments on rating** \_\_\_\_\_

*May Version IP 1 -- Develop conceptual models that suggest the benefits to be obtained from each category of bicycle and pedestrian investment, for use by advocates and decision-makers in seeking funding.*

<i>Initial Acceptability</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>No. of Members</i>	2	7	0

Comments and suggestions on draft policy statement based on initial rating:

- *Need to address issues raised in earlier discussions*
- *Need to clarify what is included in a “conceptual model”*
- *Need to address different facility types*
- *Need to clarify what funding is being sought for*
- *Need to clarify the types of benefits, such as fiscal, safety, etc.*
- *There are different kinds of benefits, cannot maximize all of them – there are trade-offs/choices regarding which benefits are more important*
- *This statement doesn’t speak to individual projects, whereas IP2 does*

**IP 2** – FDOT districts together with their MPOs and local governments should develop and implement a methodology to identify and prioritize where bicycle and pedestrian facilities are needed to connect or complete existing systems within districts and between districts.

*Initial acceptability of potential recommendation as drafted (place an "X" in box):*

	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

**Comments on rating** \_\_\_\_\_

*May Version IP 2 -- Develop district-by-district "gap analyses" that help identify needed system components.*

<i>Initial Acceptability</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>No. of Members</i>	2	8	1

Comments and suggestions on draft policy statement based on initial rating:

- *Keep interconnections between districts in mind*
- *The term "gap" needs to be defined, since this term can mean different things*
- *Is this analysis applicable only to State roads, or would local roads be included as well?*

**IP 3** – Local governments, MPOs, FDOT and other funding partners as appropriate should give high priority to investments that complete linkages between components of bicycle and pedestrian facility systems, in order to derive the most benefit from dollars invested in bicycle and pedestrian improvements.

*Initial acceptability of potential recommendation as drafted (place an "X" in box):*

	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

**Comments on rating** \_\_\_\_\_

*May Version IP 3 -- Prioritize investments that complete linkages between components of bicycle and pedestrian facility systems, in order to derive the most benefit from investment dollars.*

<i>Initial Acceptability</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>No. of Members</i>	5	2	2

Comments and suggestions on draft policy statement based on initial rating:

- *Procedurally this seems out of order - need to prioritize missing project "gaps" before we prioritize investments*

- Need to know what the “needs” are first, then we can build the case for funding
- Need to know what the level of funding is
- Need to give priority to investments that complete the system
- Need to give priority to segments that provide linkages/interconnections
- May need to plug in FDOT’s identified needs
- The Office of Greenways and Trails has attempted to quantify “needs”

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES – POTENTIAL RECOMMENDATIONS**

**PM 1** – FDOT should develop quantitative and qualitative bicycle and pedestrian system performance measures for use in Florida Transportation Plan and Florida Strategic Highway Safety Plan implementation and in evaluating and enhancing efforts in each district and statewide. *Potential measures* to be considered include but are not limited to:

- Number/percentage of cities and counties with current bicycle and pedestrian plans.
- Degree to which these plans are reflected in 5-year capital improvements plans.
- Degree to which systems and facilities are context sensitive.
- Inventory/percentages of roads that have bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
- Condition of existing facilities.
- Number of trips made by walking and bicycling.
- Facility utilization,
- Modal split and projected mode shift produced by proposed projects and systems. (Additional data would be needed to develop this measure.)

*Initial acceptability of potential recommendation as drafted (place an “X” in box):*

	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

**Comments on rating** \_\_\_\_\_

*May Version PM 1 -- Develop quantitative and qualitative performance measures for use state-wide. Possibilities include:*

- Counts of crosswalk users.
- Number of counties with bicycle and pedestrian plans.
- Degree to which these plans are reflected in 5-year capital improvements plans.
- Inventory/percentages of roads that have bicycle facilities or sidewalks.

<i>Initial Acceptability</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
No. of Members	3	7	0

Comments and suggestions on draft policy statement based on initial rating:

- Consistent with IP3, need to look at creating linkages between the contribution of investment and utilization – may need to create a set of measurable performance standards
- Certain roadway types generate more traffic – therefore, usage of different facility types should be considered along with crashes / injuries
- Clarify by linking to increased utilization
- Need to include context sensitive design as a performance measure
- Consider the number of cities and counties that have trail and pathway plans
- Need to measure the difference between plans in place and plans that are funded
- Examples in the state are limited
- Inventory does not necessarily capture the conditions, i.e. whether or not facilities are being maintained
- The purpose of the performance measures is not specified. Will they be used to evaluate the success of something?
- Add performance measure for “mode shift,” number of destinations on links that attract people, quality of facilities, and define “destinations”

**SAFETY – POTENTIAL RECOMMENDATIONS**

**S 1** – FDOT and partners should cooperate to gather exposure data (data on bicycle and pedestrian usage of facilities or systems for which crash data is available) that can be used to develop more meaningful measures of bicycle and pedestrian safety.

*Initial acceptability of potential recommendation as drafted (place an “X” in box):*

	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

**Comments on rating** \_\_\_\_\_

*May Version S 1 – None. New recommendation needed to implement S2, based on member input.*

**S 2** – FDOT should develop facility and system measures of bicycle and pedestrian safety to inform bicycle and pedestrian plan preparation and facility design and for use in Florida Transportation Plan and Florida Strategic Highway Safety Plan implementation.

*Initial acceptability of potential recommendation as drafted (place an "X" in box):*

	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

**Comments on rating** \_\_\_\_\_

---

*May Version S 2 (formerly S1) - Develop measures of bicycle and pedestrian safety.*

<i>Initial Acceptability</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>No. of Members</i>	1	11	0

*Comments and suggestions on draft policy statement based on initial rating:*

- *From a Public Health point of view, we are interested in more than just "safety." We are interested in increasing biking/walking aside from reducing crashes, i.e. we are interested in the wellness benefits from these activities*
- *Want other options for other modes*
- *Develop or continue with refining measures we have for vulnerable groups?*
- *Is this different from the "vulnerable users" already included in the Strategic Highway Safety Plan?*
- *Need to include exposure rates into measures of bicycle and pedestrian safety, e.g., Gainesville has a high number of crashes, but also a higher level of activity/usage*
- *Including exposure rates (and weather data) would be beneficial when we do state-to-state comparisons*
- *Need to include clear zone violations*
- *This policy statement is too broad – what will it be used for, and for what purpose?*
- *Department of Health is finalizing its behavioral analysis questionnaire, which will be administered to 10,000 FL adults. The Council may want to consider including a question if it could help in determining utilization rates – the cost is roughly \$3,000 per question*

**S 3** – FDOT and partners should coordinate to develop and implement complementary bicycle and pedestrian safety education and enforcement programs that focus on safety awareness and effective low cost measures.

*Initial acceptability of potential recommendation as drafted (place an "X" in box):*

	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

**Comments on rating** \_\_\_\_\_

---

*May Version S 3 (formerly S 2) - Develop and implement bicycle and pedestrian safety education programs that focus on safety awareness and low cost measures.*

<i>Initial Acceptability</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
No. of Members	7	3	0

Comments and suggestions on draft policy statement based on initial rating:

- Add “effective” before the phrase “low cost”
- Need to have the “Walk Your Child to School” program implemented in all elementary schools

**S 4** – FDOT and partners should coordinate efforts to continue to develop and implement bicycle and pedestrian safety components to be included in training materials and programs for the following groups:

- law enforcement;
- Department of Motor Vehicles;
- schools;

*Initial acceptability of potential recommendation as drafted (place an “X” in box):*

	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

**Comments on rating** \_\_\_\_\_

*May Version S 4 (formerly S 3) - Continue to develop and implement a bicycle and pedestrian safety component for law enforcement officer training.*

<i>Initial Acceptability</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
No. of Members	8	2	0

Comments and suggestions on draft policy statement based on initial rating:

- Need to be inclusive of the judiciary, the Department of Motor Vehicles, and schools
- Clarify that we are addressing the behavior/attitudes of law enforcement officers – which includes increased enforcement activities such as enforcing the “3 foot” rule
- Is this about the safe behavior of bicyclist and pedestrians or the behavior of all travelers, including motorists and others that can affect bicyclist and pedestrians
- Need to change from the generic term “safety” to “injury prevention”
- Need to include the concept of “reduction of conflict points” between motorized and non-motorized travelers

**COORDINATION – POTENTIAL RECOMMENDATIONS**

**C 1** – MPOs and local governments, working together with other bicycle and pedestrian partners should strengthen or develop mechanisms to improve coordination between public and private stakeholders involved in bicycle and pedestrian planning, including but not limited to FDOT, MPOs, local government, FDEP, and FDOE.

*Initial acceptability of potential recommendation as drafted (place an “X” in box):*

	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

**Comments on rating** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

*May Verion C 1 -- Develop mechanisms to improve coordination between public and private stakeholders involved in bicycle and pedestrian planning. (No rating taken due to time constraints.)*

Comments and suggestions on draft policy statement:

- Add other coordinating agencies as an example, DEP, DOE, etc.
- Add coordination with local comprehensive plans

**FUNDING – POTENTIAL RECOMMENDATIONS**

**F 1** – FDOT should streamline the Safe Routes to School process to increase the number of projects and programs implemented.

*Initial acceptability of potential recommendation as drafted (place an “X” in box):*

	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

**Comments on rating** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

*May Version F 1 -- Streamline Safe Routes to School application process to increase access to this source of funding. (No rating taken due to time constraints.)*

Comments and suggestions on draft policy statement:

- Need to reaffirm that funding for this program will continue into the future, which may mean use of State funds if this program is eliminated in the next federal transportation reauthorization bill

**F 2** – FDOT should continue funding bicycle and pedestrian projects that are now eligible for funding through the Transportation Enhancement and Safe Routes to School programs if these programs are not reauthorized by Congress in the next multi-year federal transportation bill.

*Initial acceptability of potential recommendation as drafted (place an “X” in box):*

	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

**Comments on rating** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

*May Version F 2 – None. New recommendation based on member input at May meeting.*

**F 3** – In the event of rescission of federal funds, impacts to each category of federal funds should be proportional to the percentage of the total comprised by that category.

*Initial acceptability of potential recommendation as drafted (place an “X” in box):*

	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

**Comments on rating** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

*May Version F 2 – FDOT, MPOs and other partner agencies should increase the priority and protection of bicycle and pedestrian projects within the Transportation Enhancement funds decision-making process. (No rating taken due to time constraints.)*

Comments and suggestions on draft policy statement:

- None



# The Florida Bicycle and Pedestrian Partnership Council: 2010/2011 Annual Progress Report



Florida Department of Transportation  
November 2011

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	iii
Introduction .....	1
The Florida Bicycle and Pedestrian Partnership Council: Overview.....	1
Council Charge – Original .....	1
Council Charge – Revised (Placeholder).....	3
Council Work Plan & Schedule .....	3
Council Procedures (Placeholder).....	4
Council Membership .....	4
Summary of Meetings .....	5
Meeting 1: June 28, 2010.....	6
Meeting 2: October 14, 2010 .....	7
Meeting 3: February 7, 2011.....	8
Meeting 4: August 2, 2011 .....	10
Meeting 5: November 3, 2011 .....	12
Additional Meeting Materials.....	12
Council Recommendations .....	12
Future Role.....	12

DRAFT

## Executive Summary

An Executive Summary will be prepared and inserted into the Annual Report after the Council's November meeting.

DRAFT

## Introduction

In April 2010 the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) announced the establishment of a statewide initiative on bicycle and pedestrian mobility. The Florida Bicycle and Pedestrian Partnership Council was convened to make policy recommendations to FDOT and its transportation partners throughout Florida on the state's walking, bicycling and trail facilities. The Council's mission is to assemble the many different partners needed to make statewide improvements in safety and facility integration.

This report details the Florida Bicycle and Pedestrian Partnership Council's activity from June 2010 through November 2011—providing a “snapshot” of the Council's activity over the past year. Details of the Council's charge and work plan will be outlined, as well as a summary of the membership constituency throughout this timeframe, as well as a summary of the five meetings that were held over the past year.

Through the review of work completed to date, as well as the progress of meetings and membership orientation, future roles for the Council to play in the development, design, implementation, and regulation of bicycle and pedestrian policies and facilities throughout the state, and policy recommendations are provided.

## The Florida Bicycle and Pedestrian Partnership Council: Overview

The Florida Bicycle and Pedestrian Partnership Council's overarching mission is to improve access to bicycle and pedestrian facilities, while simultaneously advancing user safety. The first meeting of the Council was convened on June 28, 2010. One of the first items the Council discussed and took action was the adoption of its *Charge*. In addition to the Charge, the Council developed a *Work Plan* for the coming year. These two items were the foundation for the activities the Council undertook in its first year.

As part of the Overview, the following sub-sections includes a description of the Council's Charge, a document that explains the Council's duties; the Council's Work Plan, a document that expresses the meeting schedule and planned actions for the Council throughout the year; and a list of the Council's collective membership over the course of the past year.

### Council Charge – Original

The FDOT has established a standing statewide “Partnership Council” on bicycle and pedestrian mobility. The Council includes key agency representatives and external stakeholders. The Council will provide guidance to the Department and its partner agencies on policy matters affecting the bicycle and pedestrian transportation needs of the State of Florida.

The FDOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Partnership Council duties also include facilitating increased coordination and collaboration by advising the Department on all statewide

transportation planning and safety activities, including the Florida Transportation Plan (FTP). The Council will also report annually on the status towards making Florida and its communities more pedestrian and bicycle friendly. The Council will review and provide policy recommendations or comments, as appropriate, on issues and reports including but not limited to:

Design:

- FDOT's *Manual of Uniform Minimum Standards for Design, Construction and Maintenance for Streets and Highways* (commonly known as the "Florida Greenbook")<sup>1</sup>
- FDOT's Plans Preparation Manual and Design Standards
- Revisions to Traffic Engineering Manual regarding pedestrian crosswalks, use of countdown signals, rapid flashing beacons and pedestrian hybrid signals

Planning:

- Identify best practices for local communities (e.g., land development codes, school siting), metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs), and regional planning councils (RPCs) to enhance bicycle and pedestrian mobility through planning and design criteria and practices.
- FDOT plans (Strategic Intermodal Systems plan, 2060 FTP) and partner plans (e.g., local comprehensive plans, MPOs, RPCs)
- Department of Community Affairs growth management rules

Safety:

- Strategic Highway Safety Plan and vulnerable road users (e.g., pedestrians, cyclists)
- Safety Office Programs (School Crossing Guard, Safe Routes to School, Florida Traffic and Bicycle Safety Education, Pedestrian Safety Resource Center)
- Highway Safety Grant Program

Measures and Data:

- Identify opportunities for incorporating other data into planning and decision making (e.g., bicycle and pedestrian injury data, exposure to risk)
- Identify performance measures for improving access and reducing accidents

Programs and Funding:

- Review of Pedestrian & Bicycle Program, Transit Office, and Rail Office procedures and programs

---

<sup>1</sup> Partnership Council recommendations or comments on the "Florida Greenbook" will be made to the Greenbook Advisory Committee (which is charged in F.S. 336.045 with developing "uniform minimum standards and criteria for the design, construction, and maintenance of all public streets, roads, highways, bridges, sidewalks, curbs and curb ramps, crosswalks, where feasible, bicycle ways, underpasses, and overpasses used by the public for vehicular and pedestrian traffic").

- Establish policies for use of existing funds such as Statewide Transportation Enhancements
- Review and make recommendations for encouraging consistency with and securing funding opportunities from federal initiatives to promote more livable communities and well connected walking and bicycling networks

### Council Charge – Revised (Placeholder)

An initial version of a *Charge* was presented for review and comment at the Council's first meeting. Based on the input that was received a revised version was accepted by the Council, along with a few minor amendments that were made throughout the past year.

A new revised Charge will be presented for review and approval at the Council's November 2011 meeting. Based on input received at the November meeting a final revised version will be inserted into the Annual Report in place of the original Charge.

### Council Work Plan & Schedule

The Council's schedule from June 2010 through August 2011 was based on the Council's scheduled meetings, as well as the action items yielded from each of the gatherings. The following bullet points below outline the Council's Work Plan as coordinated with the meeting schedule.

June 28, 2010 – 1<sup>st</sup> Council Meeting, Tallahassee

- Receive informational briefings on roles/responsibilities for bike/pedestrian infrastructure, statewide transportation planning
- Review Council responsibilities and initial charge
- Identify and discuss potential major issues to be addressed by the Council
- Provide guidance on next steps, assignments, and the preparation for the 2<sup>nd</sup> Council Meeting to be held in fall 2010

October 14, 2010 - 2<sup>nd</sup> Council Meeting, DeLand

- Review the revised Bicycle and Pedestrian Partnership Council charge, Work Plan and Schedule
- Review and provide input to the draft statewide transportation plans
- Receive informational briefings on design standards for pedestrian and bicycle facilities and transportation funding
- Provide guidance on next steps, assignments and preparation for the 3<sup>rd</sup> Council Meeting to be held in winter of 2011

February 7, 2011 – 3<sup>rd</sup> Council Meeting, Tallahassee

- Receive informational briefings on and discuss specific program funding
- Receive informational briefings on and discuss consumer cost of using transportation system (e.g., benefits of investment in bicycle/pedestrian facilities)
- Receive an update on the Strategic Highway Safety Plan

- Review and discuss available crash data and system data
- Review information about pedestrian and bicycle facilities on the State Highway System
- Review and discuss design issues (identified during October discussion)
- Receive informational briefing and discuss how Counties, Cities and MPOs make bicycle and pedestrian improvements

August 2, 2011 – 4<sup>th</sup> Council Meeting, Tallahassee

- Review and discuss related planning processes, including:
  - Local government comprehensive plans
  - School siting and transportation coordination
  - Strategic Regional Policy Plans
  - Transit (e.g., role of bicycle/pedestrian infrastructure on usage)
  - Other processes
- Identify and discuss opportunities for improving stakeholder coordination and enhancing implementation
- Review and discuss specific design issues in coordination with land use
- Provide guidance on annual report on the status of making Florida and its communities more pedestrian and bicycle friendly
- Provide guidance on future Council meetings

A complete list of meeting presentations, materials, and summaries for the Florida Bicycle and Pedestrian Partnership Council can be found and downloaded at the following website address: <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/policy/bikeped/>.

### Council Procedures (Placeholder)

At the November 2011 meeting the Council will be presented for review and approval a new set of procedures. Based on input received at the November meeting a final version will be inserted into the Annual Report.

### Council Membership

The Council's membership evolved throughout the course of the year, as certain members became unable to continue their participation, while other members were added to the Council. Additionally, not all members were able to attend each meeting; therefore, designated persons from within the absentees' respective organizations attended in lieu of the specific Council member. Names indicated with an asterisk (\*) denote a current member as of the November 2011 Council meeting. Members and their designees are listed below.

- Bob Romig\*, FDOT (Chair)
- Debbie Hunt, FDOT (Chair)
- Kathleen Neill\*, FDOT (Co-Chair)

- Major Timothy Ashley\*, Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles (Designee: Chief Grady Carrick)
- Jenna Brooks, Department of Environmental Protection
- Karen Brunelle\*, Federal Highway Administration
- Ken Bryan\*, Rails to Trails Conservancy
- Timothy Bustos\*, Florida Bicycle Association (Designee: Ted Wendler)
- Jesus Gomez\*, Florida Public Transportation Association
- Jeannette Hallock-Solomon\*, Department of Economic Opportunity
- Sue Hann\*, Florida League of Cities
- Thomas Hawkins\*, Florida League of Cities
- Charlie Hood\*, Department of Education (Designee: Tracey Suber)
- Joey Hoover\*, Florida Association of Counties
- Richard Hopkins\*, Department of Health
- Laurie Koburger\*, Department of Elder Affairs (Designee: Marcus Richartz)
- Mike Lasche, Florida Bicycle Association
- Zoe Mansfield\*, Florida League of Cities
- Malisa McCreedy, Pedestrian Representative
- Patricia Northey\*, Florida Association of Counties
- Jo Penrose, Department of Community Affairs
- Bob Rackleff, Metropolitan Planning Organization Advisory Council
- Max Rothman\*, Transportation Disadvantaged Representative
- Cyndi Stevenson\*, Florida Association of Counties (Designee: Andrew Ames)
- Sarah Ward\*, Metropolitan Planning Organization Advisory Council
- Jim Wood\*, Department of Environmental Protection
- Vacant, Pedestrian Representative

Each member of the Council brings a special perspective by representing critical demographics, constituencies, and partner agencies. The Council's membership, dedicated participation, and contributions are critical to the success of the Partnership Council's efforts.

## Summary of Meetings

The Council held five meetings between June 2010 and November 2011, which has been detailed in this report to document the Council's progress over the course of the past year. Meetings were held in June and October of 2010, as well as in February, August, and November of 2011. Meetings have taken place in Tallahassee and DeLand and are typically full-day meetings. Attendees aside from Council Members include one or more facilitators, FDOT staff members, and observers from planning organizations, additional state partner agencies, and relevant stakeholders.

## Meeting 1: June 28, 2010

This meeting was the official first meeting of the Council held at the FDOT Central Office Burns Building Auditorium. The meeting opened with introductions by Council members and statements of expectations and desired outcomes for the year. Overall goals included improving infrastructure, walkability, connectivity to transit, safety, integration with land use planning, law enforcement, education, accessibility, bicycle and pedestrian-friendly policy development, and agency coordination.

During the meeting, the Sunshine Law was discussed, informing the Council members of regulations pertaining to meeting minutes, public notice, and restrictions regarding the discussion of Council issues outside of Council meetings. Additionally, the roles and responsibilities related to the transportation decision-making process, from the federal to local level were presented by FDOT Staff.

The initial draft of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Council Charge was the main item on the agenda during this meeting. An overview of the draft was provided, and a group discussion then followed to develop a formal understanding of the group's role.

The Charge indicated that the Council's job is to not only advise the FDOT, but also its partner agencies. It stated that the minutes of Council meetings would be published, as well as a report with their recommendations. It was recommended that the Charge should have a time frame for deliverables or action items. It was also noted that the policies and documents referenced in the Charge were only targeted to FDOT, and documents and policies of other partner organizations should be reviewed to integrate regional planning council plans. It was dually noted that collaboration with cities and counties will be critical to making Council recommendations.

Other suggestions for adjustment of the Charge included the consideration of persons with disabilities and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance issues and the discussion of design, planning, and safety programs for livable communities. Further review of the Charge included the Design, Planning, Safety, Measures & Data, and Programs & Funding sections that were outlined in the summary of the approved Charge.

Later in the meeting, a representative of the State's Pedestrian/Bicycle Coordinators provided an overview of safety trends and the Strategic Highway Safety Plan. It was noted that the SHSP includes information based on population, but no data relating to miles traveled. Crash data is broken down by age, jurisdiction, county, and lighting and mapped to identify areas with high volumes of pedestrian crashes. The Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicle website also includes crash data summaries.

The final presentation at the June meeting was given by a representation from the State Transportation Development Administrator, which provided an overview of the transportation planning process. Discussions on both sea level rise and funding issues followed this presentation.

Finally, the Council discussed and reviewed their next steps and assignments as delegated throughout the course of the meeting. Members were asked to fill out evaluation forms, while FDOT staff agreed to distribute a calendar to identify the next meeting time, proposed for late September or early October. It was determined that the Council would meet quarterly, and FDOT staff would communicate with members in the interim to maintain both communication and momentum. FDOT staff also agreed to work with the Chair to revise the charge, identify materials to address *Parking Lot Issues* (which were re-named *Bike Rack Issues* at the October 2011 meeting), and continue to work on the whitepaper to provide background information on related policies and procedures.

It was decided that the focus of the next meeting would review of the revised charge, presentation of *Parking Lot Issues* and discussion of the whitepaper.

### Meeting 2: October 14, 2010

The second Council meeting took place in the FDOT District 5 Cypress Room Auditorium, in DeLand, Florida. The purpose of the meeting was to provide the Council with an opportunity to collaborate and share issues and concerns, while developing a common understanding related to transportation decision-making.

The first presentation by FDOT staff involved the review of the revised Council Charge based on discussions at Council's June 28<sup>th</sup> meeting. Comments regarding the revised Charge included:

- The need for additional performance measures to track crashes, which may require analytical help from the Department of Health;
- "Human factors" research is currently being conducted for parking lots injuries;
- The possibility of developing bicycle and pedestrian data that includes exposure to risk using Emergency Medical Service (EMS) data;
- The possibility for law enforcement to note crash locations and any other notes of interest as part of the crash narrative; and
- The need to include an additional bullet on the topic of measures and data.
- The inclusion of a discussion of the conceptualization of the Council's final report and recommendations that will eventually be voted on; and
- The discussion of air quality/conformity analysis for non-attainment areas and the use of Congestion Mitigation funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects.

The first presentation by FDOT was the review of the Draft Council Work Plan entitled *Bike Rack Issues*. The first draft of the *Bike Rack Issues*, formerly called the *Parking Lot Issues*, was used to prepare a proposed Work Plan and Schedule. Comments regarding the Work Plan included:

- The need for the addition of neighborhood design guidelines. (It was noted that the Chapter Committee is working on developing a handbook on traditional neighborhood design to supplement the new *Florida Greenbook* chapter within the

next few years that may help address the need for a discussion on mobility and land use issues specifically at the neighborhood and site level.)

- The addition of the Regional Planning Council's strategic regional policy plans, which can be used to protect bicycle and pedestrian corridors as a topic for the spring meeting.
- The inclusion of a presentation from a transit agency representative on the effects of land use, roadway design, and ridership at the spring meeting.

A Briefing and Discussion regarding Draft Statewide Transportation Plans was the next item on the agenda, which included the *2060 Florida Transportation Plan (FTP)* and the *Strategic Highway Safety Plan*.

FDOT gave a presentation on the draft *2060 FTP* and encouraged the Council members to review and comment on the draft plan. An email with a link to the draft *2060 FTP* was sent to Council members for reference. FDOT staff then also provided a presentation on the status of updating the State's *Strategic Highway Safety Plan*. Input was received via a random survey that was distributed to FDOT's partners in August 2010.

The next presentation given was about the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility Design Standards, which included reviews of the Design Standards for *The Florida Greenbook* and *The Florida Plans Preparation Manual*.

It was explained that *The Florida Greenbook* includes the minimum standards for county roads and local city streets along with some design criteria local governments should consider (but are not required). *The Florida Greenbook* gives local governments discretion in how they can apply the criteria, including exceptions for when recommendations are not reasonable. *The Plans Preparation Manual*, on the other hand, includes design standards and criteria for state highways.

The final presentation included an overview of federal, state, and local Transportation Funding sources that are available to fund bicycle and pedestrian projects. The presentation also included a discussion on the recent rescission of federal funds.

At the conclusion of the meeting, each member was asked to identify best practices in five states other than Florida (including other countries) in his/her area of expertise and how these practices were funded—amounts and funding sources. The Council members were asked to be prepared to discuss this at the next meeting and prepare a one page write-up for each topic.

### Meeting 3: February 7, 2011

The third Florida Bicycle and Pedestrian Partnership Council meeting was held at the FDOT Headquarters in the Burns Building Auditorium. The first item on the agenda was a review of a revised draft of the Council Charge and Council Work Plan. FDOT provided an overview of the modifications made to the Council's Charge and Work Plan/Schedule based

on discussions at Council's October 14<sup>th</sup> meeting. There were no questions or comments raised by Council members during the discussion of the revised Council's Charge or Work Plan/Schedule.

The next topic of discussion was a review of recent updates to the *Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP)* and *2060 Florida Transportation Plan (FTP)*. The FDOT Safety Office provided a brief presentation on the status of *The State's Strategic Highway Safety Plan*. Following this presentation, the FDOT Office of Policy Planning gave a brief presentation on the newly adopted *2060 FTP*.

The next topic on the agenda was the presentation and discussion of bicycle and pedestrian funding programs for highways, transit, enhancements, congestion mitigation and air quality (CMAQ), recreational trails, and safety. It was suggested that the Department prepare estimates of bicycle and pedestrian funding taking into account recent federal and state discussions related to future program and funding levels to develop scenarios that provide a range of funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects.

The Safe Routes to School program was discussed, as well as the application process and the need to streamline the process to help schools and communities. The Highway Safety Improvement Program was then reviewed with regard to funding sources, project ranking processes, and the priority of preserving funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects needs to be a priority.

The next presentation included the discussion of benefits from investments in bicycle and pedestrian facilities, which was directly followed by a presentation on the "Conserve by Bicycling and Walking" study. The Council then discussed the development of conceptual models that can relate investment in bicycle/pedestrian facilities to specific benefits. The discussion emphasized investments that complete or create key linkages between components of the overall transportation system in order to get the most benefit from investment dollars.

Next, the Office of Policy Planning provided an overview of the availability and coverage of Bicycle and Pedestrian facilities on the State Highway System. It was determined that a map would be prepared that visualizes the connectivity of bicycle and pedestrian facilities on the State Highway System, as well as a bike lane and sidewalk maps of several urban areas throughout the State to illustrate the connectivity of facilities in urban and rural areas.

With regard to the maintenance of existing transportation facilities, key objectives included: maintaining a state of good repair for transportation assets for all modes; reducing the vulnerability and increasing the resilience of critical infrastructure to the impacts of climate trends and events; minimizing damage to infrastructure from transportation vehicles; and optimizing the efficiency of the transportation system for all modes.

The next presentation on safety and system data was provided by FDOT's Design Office. The presentation included an update on a research study examining the interaction between vehicles and bicyclists utilizing existing pavement. The facilitators requested that the Council members consider how they and the agencies they represent as partners make the best use of data and how they share data with others.

The FDOT's State Roadway Design Engineer then provided a presentation on three bicycle and pedestrian design topics: Plans Preparation Manual & Florida Greenbook, Design Exceptions & Variations, and Pilot Projects.

After this presentation, FDOT provided an overview of a survey sent to all MPOs/TPOs in Florida regarding their involvement in bicycle and pedestrian planning. It was agreed that the FDOT would provide a summary of the survey data to the Council for further review.

The meeting concluded with a review and discussion of the Member Identified Best Practices from Other States (the previous meeting's "Homework Assignment"). After reviewing this past assignment, the facilitators requested that Council members to consider how they might use the information discussed during the meeting to formulate or support recommendations to be developed at future meetings. It was noted that a topic of interest was the connection between bicyclists/pedestrians and transit.

The next meeting was scheduled for August 2011, after the 2011 legislative session. FDOT asked Council members to fill out the meeting evaluation form. FDOT also reminded the Council members to sign-up for the FDOT TranPlan e-News post.

#### Meeting 4: August 2, 2011

The fourth Florida Bicycle and Pedestrian Partnership Council meeting was held at the FDOT Headquarters in the Burns Building Auditorium. The first item on the agenda was the review of the Council's Charge and Work Plan/Schedule based on discussions at previous Council meetings. The goal of the meeting was to address the topics identified in the Council's Work Plan at its conclusion, and the next step established was to develop the key issues to be addressed at future meetings.

The second item on the agenda was an overview of the key legislative topics of interest to the Council that did and did not pass during the 2011 Florida legislative session, which included: the FDOT bill (which did not pass); the \$150 million sweep of the State Transportation Trust Fund; the New State Economic Enhancement and Development (SEED) Trust Fund; SEED money use for job creation to fund projects that meet a strategic interest related to economic development; and the Growth Management bill. In addition, a two-page summary of bills related to bicycles, pedestrians, and trails was distributed to Council members.

Next, two presentations were given on FDOT's strategies for bicyclists and pedestrians. The first presentation, *Elements of Successful Complete Streets Policies*, touched upon

issues related to roadway designs that accommodate both motorized and non-motorized travel. The second presentation, *Safe Mobility for Life*, addressed issues related to Florida's aging population. Both discussions also touched on the need to think about performance measures and their relationship to people rather than constructed facilities.

The fourth item on the agenda was a review of the Preliminary Guidance Statements from previous Council discussions. Statements drawn from previous Council meetings were presented for review and discussion. Council members were asked to rate many of the statements using an "Initial Acceptability" scale. The initial ratings were compiled during the meeting through a show of hands as a starting point for discussion. These ratings were intended for application as a tool to help identify concerns about the draft statements and to focus efforts on how the statements might be refined. The specific ratings can be located in the meeting minutes on the FDOT website.

Next on the agenda, a series of five presentations were given related to bicycle and pedestrian planning from the perspective of different partnering agencies. The purpose of these presentations were meant to convey a collective sense that each partner organization shares overlapping responsibilities in the broader context of improving access to bicycle and pedestrian facilities while also improving user safety. These presentations included:

- *Local Government Comprehensive Plans*, representing the Florida Department of Community Affairs, Division of Community Planning
- *Metropolitan Planning Organizations*, representing MPO's
- *Public Transportation*, representing FDOT's Public Transit Office
- *School Transportation*, representing the Florida Department of Education
- *Strategic Regional Policy Plans*, representing Regional Planning Council's

The last two presentations included an update on the State Pedestrian Safety Action Plan and an overview on the Council's draft Annual Report.

At the conclusion of the meeting, the facilitators reminded Council members that they have completed their deliberation of the initial set of issues in the first year's Work Plan and asked members for their input on what they see the Council accomplishing in the future. Based on these comments, the facilitators highlighted the following topics for future meetings: input on next year's legislative session; safety; funding; cultural/behavioral change; enforcement; completing the system; and providing additional and new policy guidance statements for Council review.

The Council discussed potential options regarding their group's focus. One option was to focus on a few key issues and develop definitive deadlines to update the Annual Report within this broad range of topics. The second option would be for the Council to focus more narrowly on a single issue. Additionally, options pertaining to the Annual Report were discussed. One option included finalizing the 2010/2011 Annual Report based on the Council's current status, while the other involved revising the Annual Report in 2012 (after the 2012 legislative session).

The Focus of the Council's next meetings will be selecting between these options, completing the Annual Report, and addressing as many of the topics brought up by members, as discussed above.

### Meeting 5: November 3, 2011

A summary of the Council's fifth meeting will be inserted into the Annual Report after the November meeting.

### Additional Meeting Materials

For additional information regarding the presentations, materials, and summaries, please reference the Bicycle and Pedestrian Partnership Council's website located at: <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/policy/bikeped/>.

### Council Recommendations

During the August 2011 meeting, Council members were presented with an initial set of policy guidance statements, which were drawn from previous Council discussions. Members provided feedback on these statements, which were then refined into a set of recommendations. Based on input received at the November meeting a final version will be inserted into the Annual Report.

### Future Role

The November meeting will include a discussion of the Council's future role. Based on input received at the November meeting a final version will be inserted into the Annual Report.