

Comments	Response	Responsiveness to comment
Confusion with Wikimap and Data for Wikimap		
Comments about not being able to access map	The interactive crowdsourcing map (aka WikiMap) was open from November 17, 2015 to February 14, 2015.	We were unable to open the interactive crowdsourcing map (aka WikiMap) after it closed on February 14, 2015.
General comments about the need and desire for bike lanes in Burke and Lyndonville - improve Route 5	On November 17, 2015 we sent email correspondence to all public libraries, regional planning commissions, the project's steering committee and local motion to contact their members.	Users were requested to view and react to the draft Desirability map presented at the Statewide Meeting held on September 30, 2015.
bike path from Richmond to Williston that could follow route 2	As part of the email correspondence announcing the WikiMap and the On Road Bicycle Facility Plan we attached a flyer to be hung in public spaces.	Note: The VTrans Bicycle Corridor Priority Map was formerly named the Draft Desirability Map.
Route 74 is used by bike tours going to the Shoreham Inn. Rte 74 from Rte 30 to 22A has been partially repaved but not the piece Route 30 to North Bingham Road	We held a Statewide meeting introducing the public to the interactive crowdsourcing map (aka WikiMap) for input on January 9, 2015. This meeting was originally scheduled for December 9, 2014 but was postponed due to winter storm conditions.	
Route 22A also could use a consistent shoulder.	Although the WikiMap is no longer accepting input, it can be viewed at http://vtransplanning.vermont.gov/bikeplan .	
I will not ride on Route 100 or Route 7 at all because of nonexistent shoulders	All input in WikiMap has been archived and will inform future phases of this work.	
Routes 105,242, 118, 100 (basically around Jay Peak) – Roads are narrow and rough, great area for tourism		
Route 15 Johnson to Morrisville – Very unsafe in places – no shoulder. Important corridor.		
Morrisville to St. Johnsbury (rt. 15) – Important East West Corridor		
Route 2 from Montpelier to St. Johnsbury – Important corridor – no shoulder in some places.		
Route 5 Thetford to Barnet – Route 5 could be a huge boon to cycle-tourism. It is an important corridor which needs wider shoulders in many sections.		
Route 7 in Highgate - Plan bike access to link w/Quebec bike plans. Re: Extended under(?) route 35		
Rt. 2/7 split in Milton – Needs safer left turn heading Northbound		
Montpelier – Please attend to Barre-Montpelier road. This is a vital corridor		
There are safety concerns for students to get from Lyndon State College into town.		
VT 122/RT 5/VT114 (Path Around Lyndon) –wider shoulders to allow pedestrians and cyclist to complete the PAL loop, Center St along Steven loop bridge on US. At the intersection of all these roads there is a very unsafe right turn (per conversation with Doug).		
VT 30 north of Sudbury – good candidate for separated path		
VT30 and VT74- dangerous intersection		
Route 2, 314 in Grand Isle – Stay away from state highway except where it cannot be avoided.		
Tour De Farms - Route 116 from Hinesburg to Bristol and Route 17 from Bristol to New Haven		

Comments	Response	Responsiveness to comment
Confusion About Desirability		
money should be spent on the blue roads to make them desirable. Just don't call them desirable yet, because at this point they are not.	The term 'desirability' was intended to describe the current and potential bicycle use on state roads: where people ride and where they would ride if conditions were improved.	To clarify the purpose of the map. VTrans will now use the term 'use' rather than 'desirability' to indicate current and potential bicycle use. Also for clarity, the map was renamed VTrans Bicycle Corridor Priority Map (formerly Draft Desirability Map).
I think the color labels were confusing. I know that my group at the meeting interpreted the map in different ways and no one was very sure what it meant.	VTrans used an interactive crowdsourcing map as a tool (aka WikiMap) to gather information from the public about current and potential bicycle use. This was captured by asking users to select a line type when "mapping" a ride. The line types included:	The VTrans Bicycle Corridor Priority Map is the culmination of Phase 1 of this project. The high-, moderate- and low-use categories on the map represent bicycle use on state roads based on an analysis of current and potential use by bicyclists. The 'use' categories will help prioritize corridors for bicycle improvements. High-use bicycle corridors have the highest priority.
Did the colors represent what people currently think of the roads, or do the colors represent where the DOT would most focus its efforts? We hope the DOT uses the latter interpretation.		
The terms "least, moderately and most desirable" were very confusing. Most people in Middlebury interpreted these terms differently.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Road I like to Bike (representing current use) • State Road I bike but could be improved (representing current use) • State road I'd like to use, but needs improvement (representing potential use) 	
I would suggest have a complete definition attached to each statement to minimize confusion		
Your labeling of roads as "most desirable" to "least desirable" is very misleading.		
Many sections marked "least desirable" that are, in fact, very desirable places to ride - if they were safer.		The map will be used to inform future phases of the project. As part of the next phase, corridors will be analyzed to identify critical gaps in their condition.
It is unclear how this map (desirability) will be interpreted or used. It does not make sense to me.		
It is confusing what demand means. Demand levels = the ideal or the most needed/currently used?		In response to public comment and confusion, we developed a FAQ document and webpage (http://vtransplanning.vermont.gov/bikeplan/faq).
map does not represent "desirable" routes. The majority of the most desirable routes shown (blue) are around the most populated areas. These routes would be better classified as routes that need the most work to make them biker friendly.		See the project report for more information on project background defining the score system used to determine the 'use' corridors.
Color code is confusing about what action VTrans will take based upon desirability.		

Comments	Response	Responsiveness to comment
General Questions/Concerns		
Why doesn't VT 127 in Burlington/Colchester show as desirable? Is it the availability of a path along the road or is it because it's a limited access highway?	Some state-managed roads that are limited access were included such as VT- 289 and the St. Albans State Highway because a suitable adjacent alternative bicycle facility does not exist in those locations.	No change necessary
Why does VT 289 shown as desirable even though it's a limited access highway?		
Susie Wilson Road and Bypass – In reading the criteria it says to include sections of Town Highways functioning as State Highways. We think Susie Wilson meets this criterion but we are not sure about the desirability of this route.	Susie Wilson Rd and Bypass were identified as an important route by a number of people who contributed to the Wikimap. Given this comment the most appropriate designation in context of the Wikimap would have been "State road I'd like to use, but needs improvement"	No change necessary
Unclear how "least, moderate, most desirable" relates to original wiki tags of "route I like to bike/ route I bike could be improved/routes needs improvement to use"	<p>The interactive crowdsourcing map (aka WikiMap) was used as a tool (aka WikiMap) to gather information from the public about current and potential bicycle use. This was captured by asking users to select a line type when "mapping" a ride. The line types included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Road I like to Bike (representing current use) • State Road I bike but could be improved (representing current use) • State road I'd like to use, but needs improvement (representing potential use) <p>The line types do not correspond directly to the 'use' categories (formerly desirability tiers), the WikiMap line type were one source of data used to calculate 'use' levels.</p>	<p>In response to public comment and confusion, we developed a FAQ document and webpage (http://vtransplanning.vermont.gov/bikeplan/faq).</p> <p>See the project report for more information on project background defining the score system used to determine the 'use' corridors.</p>
Is there a State road with no use and no desire?	No	No change necessary

Comments	Response	Responsiveness to comment		
Methodology Questions/Concerns				
I do know you use Strava but once again most of our roads do not have internet service.	Strava relies on GPS technology and NOT cellular technology. In the event the data cannot be downloaded due to lack of adequate satellite coverage the data is stored and downloaded when the device is within range. Therefore data is compiled from throughout the state regardless of the availability of cellular coverage.	We have confirmed with Strava the ability to gather data throughout the state and will continue to rely on this data source. Coincidentally, Strava reports some of the highest use locations in VT occur in the NEK in relationship to Kingdom Trails network.		
My concerns focus on the spotty nature of the desirability categories on state roads in the Northeast Kingdom and really anywhere outside the greater Burlington Area. Is this spotty nature due to the data being not Vermont in nature or by the fact that Strava by its nature will not be capturing complete trip info due to the lack of a cohesive cell network (certainly in the NEK)				
Spotty data and/or methodology seems to make short "desirability" corridors.				
Entire corridors should maintain at least "Moderately Desirable" classification, including designated scenic roads	Changes in 'use' (formerly desirability) could be due to local road use (high counts of cyclist drop off), the final score of a segment is at threshold score (limit between cutoff of each 'use' category) or because of land use changes (density decreasing along a corridor).	VTrans has developed a methodology for smoothing the scores and to introduce consistency along a corridor where appropriate. The "smoothing" used a combination of professional judgement, experience with managing state roads and the following guidelines.		
Also that there should be some attempt to smooth out the results so that a coherent network of state highway infrastructure focused on cyclists will result.				
Other areas – I'll be interested to see how things are smoothed out. For my region I think the smoothing should be done on a macroscale – more about 5-10 miles per				
What are you proposing to do with relatively short sections of roadway that differ in desirability from their surrounding sections? They look like little islands on the map it doesn't make sense to have the "least desirable" between sections of "most".			Entire segments of corridors will be treated consistently.	Bicycle Corridor Priority Map Smoothing Guidelines:
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blend very small segments with adjacent segments • Use logical connections or terminus (e.g. intersections with major state or local roads or roads known to be a suitable alternative to a state route or known as a popular route with bicyclist) • Significant land use changes (e.g. Municipal boundary, City limits, existing school or recreation area, etc.) • Resort or significant trip generators (e.g. tourist destinations, four season resort etc.) • International or State border crossings • Designated Scenic Byway, Rail Trail or existing signed bicycle route
Safety should have been weighted much more heavily as a factor in the equation - VTrans sidestepped the issue of safety	The goal of Phase 1 is to categorize the state highway system into high-use, moderate-use and low-use corridors based upon existing and potential use as illustrated in the VTrans Bicycle Corridor Priority Map (formerly called the Draft Desirability Map).	Future phases will include an analysis of reported bicycle crashes and examine the safety data entered in the Phase 1 interactive crowdsourcing map.		
Why did VTrans looks at desirability and not safety?	Safety is very important to VTrans, and the overarching goal of this project is to ensure safer roads for all users. We implicitly received safety information in Phase 1 using the interactive map by asking users to draw lines on state roads they "would like to use but need improvement."			
Was cycling crash data used?				

Comments	Response	Responsiveness to comment
Methodology Questions/Concerns		
All the roads in yellow in Addison County are very desirable to ride on IF they were safe. (but they are not!) We think methodology did not reflect our thoughts.	<p>VTrans used this crowdsourcing tool to gather information from the public about current and potential bicycle use. This was captured by asking users to select a line type when mapping a ride. The line types included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Road I like to Bike • State Road I bike but could be improved • State road I'd like to use, but needs improvement <p>Rides designated as "State road I'd like to use, but needs improvement " addresses your concern. This designation was used in the methodology to categorize the state roads when creating the VTransBicycle Corridor Priority Map (formerly called the Draft Desirability Map).</p>	No change necessary.
Was Lake Champlain Bikeways map used?	We reviewed a large range of data sets for this project and decided the data used: interactive crowdsourcing map data, land use patterns data, Strava data, and interviewing bicycle touring companies) were the best to achieve the goal of Phase 1 (categorize the state highway system into high-, moderate- and low-use corridors based upon existing and potential use).	Yes, the Lake Champlain Bikeways (LCB) map was considered during the "smoothing" exercise and actual use of the LCB route appears in both the Strava data and on the interactive crowdsourcing map (aka Wikimap).
Was SRTS info included in your methodology (such as the travel plans)?		
The state needs to know what local roads are best for biking and then see which state roads are essential connections to these local roads. These state road linkages should be the priority for real improvements.	The VTrans Bicycle Corridor Priority Map (formerly called the Draft Desirability Map) is the culmination of Phase 1 and will be used to help prioritize improvements and maintenance activities by VTrans on state roads. The high-, moderate- and low-use bicycle corridors on the map represent state roads based on an analysis of current and potential use by transportation and recreation bicyclists. Therefore, the 'use' categories reflect higher-, moderate- and lower-priority corridors for bicycle improvements. The map will also be used to inform future phases of the project.	We have created FAQs. The FAQ "How will the VTrans Bicycle Corridor Priority Map be used?" address this confusion. See response at http://vtransplanning.vermont.gov/bikeplan/faq#6
Need a map that clearly shows what roads will be improved		
What weight do these findings have in prioritization?		
Overall, I noticed there is a noticeable slant toward uses which are for utility in my region, rather than recreational. Recreational riding is far stronger here – and it is strong. Not sure how to address that, although maybe one or more of my later comments might help re-balance things.	<p>The methodology considers two different types of riding: land use based "transportation" and recreation based.</p> <p>Land use based is more likely near village centers; recreation riding is more likely on rural roads. Both are important and both have been included. The presented methodology at Statewide Meeting #2 (April 30, 2015) did rely a bit more heavily on the Land Use-based score component. In response to this feedback, we have adjusted the methodology to give equal weight to recreational and utilitarian uses.</p>	<p>In response to feedback, we have adjusted the methodology in two ways.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The interactive crowdsourcing map (aka WikiMap) line type "Roads I would like to ride but need improvements" was incorporated into the recreation score as potential use. <p>This change to the methodology was added so that potential use was a component of the recreation score.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We added a weight to the Recreation Score to ensure that the maximum number of points a segment could receive from Land Use-based riding and from Recreation riding are the same. In other words, differing "types" of bicycle trips are weighted equally.
I think that the land use analysis that you mentioned in the presentation last week might be falsely elevating status of certain areas. Around here to go 1-2 miles to work is incredibly rare. But an easy 5 mile bicycle ride to work is possible on our roads. Could the analysis be tweak to reflect land use character – so very urban areas apply the 1-2 mile model while the more rural areas apply the 5 mile model? On that note, have you explored the LEHD data? I think it could be really helpful for understanding true commuter patterns. See attached for more info about LEHD and other travel pattern data.		

Comments	Response	Responsiveness to comment
Methodology Questions/Concerns		
I think it is also concerning that the desirability map statewide but very much in the NEK is showing low or no "desire" for connectivity between population centers (likely because of the methodology that looks at employment and residential locations...which are dispersed in VT as a whole but even more so in the NEK)	The purpose of the VTrans Bicycle Corridor Priority Map (formerly called the Draft Desirability Map) is to identify the roads on which people want to ride their bicycles so VTrans can work to ensure maintenance and improvement projects are focused most efficiently.	In response to feedback, we have adjusted the methodology in two ways. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The interactive crowdsourcing map (aka WikiMap) line type "Roads I would like to ride but need improvements" was incorporated into the recreation score as potential use. • The recreation score and transportation score are weighted equally, where previously the transportation score was scaled.
I do understand that VTrans has to use the best available data, however I want to express my concern that the inherent weaknesses (at least my perception of it) in the data used in the methodology in determining desirability (though it may be the best available) will necessarily show less desire in the more rural regions of the state.	This map will be one component in a decision-making process, which will also include local input, RPC information, Safe Routes to Schools information, and presence of suitable alternative bicycle routes.	
Rural areas seem to get overlooked and the limited state funds will be directed towards more desirable routes and these are all concentrated in urban areas	Because VTrans methodology relied on land use patterns, population inherently affects the potential use of state roads for bicycles.	See the project report for more information on project background and defining the score system.
Rural areas have fewer destinations, an inherent problem with the methodology. In many cases, rural area also have fewer options for travel routes, forcing folks to ride on state routes .		
I would hope that there is a discussion in the final report detailing the limitations of the data used for this methodology.	Yes	Please see project report
Lastly, it appears our old Urban Functional Classification Area is being used on the map (see dark gray shaded municipalities). I think our newly established areas (statewide) should be used. Sarah Kepchar can provide these.	Correction Noted	Change made
How do we get data to RPCs?	We will be making the data available to RPCs, municipalities, etc. upon request. The data needs to be better understood by VTrans before providing a date and mechanism for data delivery.	No change necessary

Comments	Response	Responsiveness to comment
Specific Map Comments		
Addison County should generally be more favorable	Thank you for your feedback.	We were unable to open the interactive crowdsourcing map (aka WikiMap) after it closed on February 14, 2015.
VT 125 from Addison to Middlebury – make blue		
Vt. 125 in Middlebury, Bridport and Addison between Lake St. and the Lake Champlain Bridge	The VTrans Bicycle Corridor Priority Map (formerly called the Draft Desirability Map) is the culmination of Phase 1 of this project. The high-use, moderate-use and low-use bicycle corridors on the map represent bicycle use on state roads based on an analysis of current and potential use by bicyclists.	Users were requested to view and react to the draft Desirability map presented at the Statewide Meeting held on September 30, 2015.
T 74 between Shoreham and West Cornwall and Rt 125 from 22a to Middlebury		
RT 74 between Shoreham and West Cornwall		
Vt. 74 from Vt. 30 to Vt. 22A;		
Vt. 53 around Lake Dunmore		
Vt. 17 in Addison, Bristol, New Haven	Use was quantified on a statewide basis rather than individual corridors. The analysis included land use patterns, bicycle access to state roads, proximity to destinations, data collected on recreational bicycling (Strava data), and 2,100+ users providing public input through the project's interactive crowdsourcing map (aka WikiMap).	Note: The VTrans Bicycle Corridor Priority Map was formerly named the Draft Desirability Map.
Rte 78 between Alburgh and Swanton.		
VT-131 is one of the most desirable locations in our region. Currently it is all shown as least or moderately. I think it should all be either moderately or most. Regularly used by local riders and visiting riders.		
Ferry Road/F-5 in Charlotte.		
Route 100 through Granville/Warren – Major Importance! Should be at least to Hancock & Rochester		
Rte 100 between Waitsfield and Morrisville.		
Rte 15 between Johnson and St. Johnsbury.		
Rte 5 between St. Johnsbury and Hartford.		
Rt. 5 Lyndon to St. Jay – this stretch may score blue if road conditions were better. Shoulders need cleaning and widening.		
Short yellow section of Route 5 between Hartland and White River Junction be changed from yellow to green, so that the green roads to the south and to the north would be connected		
5A should be at least moderately desirable		
Route 14 between Calais and Barre		
Rt. 14 in Williamstown/Brookfield – Williamstown gulf – lowest elevation for cross Vermont access. Needs better attention than this process provides(?)		
Vt. 116 east of Bristol;		
VT 116 from Bristol to Hinesburg – make blue (focus on 116 not RT7)		
VT116 from Bristol to Middlebury – entire section should be blue		
116 and 17 South of Hinesburg - important 'bridge' segment to most desirable routes. Also, both are included in or provide access to popular recreation routes		
Rte. 105 From Derby-Brighton		
Addison County generally should be more favorable		
Rte 30 in Addison Co.		
Rt 30, Bomoseen		
Route 12 near Northfield Falls		
Include parts of Adventure Cycling's Northern Tier route and Green Mountain Loop. (Sojour says "No!")		
Rt 314 heading northwest from Rt 2 to the Ferry should be labeled desirable.		
I live in Rutland Town has too much yellow, not enough green and blue.		
Parts of Rte 7		
The route 7 corridor between Middlebury and Burlington is a major work commute roadway; can you imagine what it would be like to majorly improve safety (eg an off road bike path) and reduce this road's driving pressure? It seems to be low priority here because so many feel major highways (like rt 7) are inherently unsafe. Please prove this idea wrong!		
Middlebury (VT 125) and Lincoln (VT 73) gaps between US 7 and VT 100		
VT 73 Orwell to Brandon- make green		

Comments	Response	Responsiveness to comment
Specific Map Comments		
All portions and segments of the state-designated Scenic Byways		
Bikeway routes designated by Lake Champlain Bikeways and the Lake Champlain National Heritage Area.		
Route 111 through Morgan – Desirable but dangerous (narrow)		
St. Johnsbury – I think this (the yellow near the ST. Johnsbury label on the desire map) indicates road conditions .		
VT 114 East Burke and Lydonville- this should be one stretch (all blue) right now goes from blue to green. This is high desire route but low use because it is unsafe. People would like to safely bike from Lyndon to the Kingdom Trails (per conversation with Doug).		
Fairhaven Area (cluster on map with RT. 4, VT 4A and Vt 22A was circled with comment) – growing up in this area, I know there is not a cycling culture but this does not mean there should not be positive change here. This is a major equity issue in these “findings”. There is a college there with major potential for users.		
VT-103 in Ludlow – This is one of the most desirable – so should fill in the gap with “most”		
VT-44 and VT-44A in Windsor and West Windsor – should be “most”. Regularly used by 2 different bike shop weekly rides, as many other local riders. There are also a good number of bike enthusiasts who come to the area – either for local road riding, the mountain biking trails on the western side of Ascutney or to be mad enough to cycle up the 2300ft of Ascutney Mountain Road.		
VT 133 in the Rutland Region is a popular route and not considered highly desirable. It should be.		

Comments	Response	Responsiveness to comment
General Feedback: Public Input Process		
<p>Phase 1-A is needed and that it should incorporate public input and make adjustments before going on to Phase 2.</p>	<p>We are adjusting the methodology based on public comment. These changes will be completed as part of Phase 1 of this project.</p> <p>Public input has and will continue to significantly influence the outcome of this project. Public involvement was a primary component of this phase of the project.</p> <p>Public input for the current phase of this project (Phase 1) included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collection of Strava data for 10,459 users • Crowdsourced interactive map (aka the (No Suggestions)) input from 2,123 users • Two Statewide Public Meetings using VIT technology and broadcast to the web with attendance of 66 participants at meeting #1 and 51 participants at meeting #2. • A stakeholder committee that included representatives from Regional Planning Commissions, Tourism & Marketing, Agency of Commerce & Community Development, Vermont Bike & Pedestrian Coalition / Local Motion, VBT Bicycling & Walking Vacations, Green Mountain Bicycle Club, American Council of Engineering Consultants • A dedicated email address (Vermontbike@gmail.com) for project comments that received 144 email correspondences • The VTrans On Road Bicycle Plan project website that included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Archived videos of both statewide public meetings o Key project information • Project materials were provided to state libraries throughout Vermont to post statewide public meeting information on their bulletin boards and social media pages. <p>If you have a comment that hasn't yet been shared, we encourage you to email us at vermontbike@gmail.com.</p>	<p>In response to feedback, we have adjusted the methodology in two ways.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The interactive crowdsourced map (the WikiMap) category "Roads I would like to ride but be need improvements" was incorporated into the recreation score as potential use. • The recreation score and transportation are equally important, where previously the transportation score was scaled. <p>See the project report for more information on project background and defining the score system.</p> <p>Public involvement will be sought throughout all phases of the project.</p>
Concerned that public input was not understood		
Very innovative and engaging input process (interactive map, meetings)		
Why was hardly anybody from the public not at this meeting? Does this count as public input?		
General Feedback: Support		
Thanks for getting back to me so quickly. Looks like my road has been well noticed. Good luck with the project.	No response needed	No change necessary
I also wanted to say that the methodology for acquiring data to inform and guide the department's work was overall very sound.		
Rt 2 from Jonesville to Waterbury – Thank you for the fresh Pavement!		
Finally I want to express my appreciation for the effort that went into this study. VTrans faces a real challenge in addressing the lack of suitable bicycle friendly State Highways. In rural parts of the state it is not as easy as just adding a shoulder. Many areas will need significant investment to achieve the goal of a safer and more desirable bicycle friendly state highway system. I do think this effort will be beneficial in the difficult task of prioritizing routes for investment and I look forward to participating in future stages of this process.		

Comments	Response	Responsiveness to comment
General Feedback: Questions		
How will VTrans deal with Class 1 roads/municipal decisions?	The data collected for this project includes Class 1 Town Highways (those road segments of town highways functioning as an extension of State roads) as part of Phase 1 methodology. This information is available to municipalities for their use and will be consulted during Class Town 1 Highways projects.	No change necessary
How is out of state (Canadians in Addison County) input getting compiled?	We are using Strava data as input to our methodology. According to the Strava data set 12 % of the users are located in Canada (1308 users out of 10459 total). In addition, nothing would prevent a Canadian visitor from having participated in the interactive Wikimap.	No change necessary
Some areas are underrepresented for recreation. Bethany used an example of her region and tourist from Canada.		No change necessary
General Feedback: Ideas		
I would love to see a program where the state works with towns to identify key biking roads and then provides technical and financial assistance to make those roads better where they need to be.	VTrans currently provides technical assistance to towns via the Bicycle and Pedestrian, the Transportation Alternatives and the Safe Routes to School Programs by providing funding to assist towns with planning, designing and constructing bicycle improvements. In addition, VTrans Bicycle & Pedestrian Program staff are available to provide technical assistance directly to towns.	No change necessary
General Feedback: Economy		
I do think communities such as Hardwick, Orleans, Lyndonville, Newport and St Johnsbury ect. are also in need of transportation redevelopment. Its the underserved post-industrial towns that could benefit the most from multiple transportation options. Every economy around the globe has seen growth and development with infrastructure redevelopment. Vermont is a wonderful state as you must know and the addition of protected bicycle ways in smaller cities might be just the right step to improving the lifestyles of so many in need. Thank you for allowing me to comment.	We agree that providing quality roads for bicycling makes economic sense among other reasons. See the 2012 study Economic Impact of Bicycling and Walking in Vermont: http://vtransengineering.vermont.gov/sites/aot_program_development/files/documents/ltf/BikePedFinal%20Report%20Econ%20Impact%20Walking%20and%20Biking2012.pdf	No change necessary
There have been multiple research studies done in other countries and states that indicate that bicycle tourists are one of the largest per diem spenders. The last study I read stated that the average income of bicycle tourists is close to \$100,000. Vermont needs to ensure that our roads/bike paths are safe to encourage for both Vermont residents and tourists.	Also view: https://www.youtube.com/watch?t=10&v=BoO_eS0eg-A	
A US brand manager for a cycling simulator company... Sometimes I think we should add a disclaimer to video routes we post from this area so that tourists don't come here to ride and find unsafe, cracked pavement and too narrow or non-existent shoulders.		
Please help keep all of the cyclists alive (they keep the economy alive...).		
Bikes take up too much space and cost too much		
The State has spent a lot of effort on the Byway Program so making these routes as bike-friendly as possible- highly desirable-is preferable, to attract all modes to use these roads which we promote.	Designated scenic byways were analyzed the same as the rest of the State roads in the initial analysis however they were taken into consideration during the "smoothing" exercise.	No change necessary

Comments	Response	Responsiveness to comment
General Feedback: Safety		
Vermont needs to pass a law that cars must stay three feet away from bicyclists. It is unfortunate that in this state there is no law regulating the distance a car needs to give bikes.	<p>We have a safe passing law but it does not specify a distance.</p> <p>Motor vehicle “shall exercise due care, which includes increasing clearance” - 23 V.S.A. §1033(b)</p>	No change necessary
Signage is important. Bike routes should be signed (e.g., as Lake Champlain Bikeways is signed). Numbering bike routes with signs, as other states have done, would be great.	<p>Signs may not always be the appropriate. Our bicycle sign placement guidance is available here: http://vtransengineering.vermont.gov/sites/aot_program_development/files/documents/ltf/PedestrianandBicycleFacilityDesignManual.pdf</p> <p>See Chapter 8 for VTrans guidance on Signs, Pavement Markings and signals.</p> <p>Note a disadvantage of “Bike Route” signs are some drivers of motor vehicles, may infer that bicyclists have no rights traveling on roads not formally marked as a “bicycle route”.</p>	No change necessary
Safety should have been weighted much more heavily as a factor in the equation - VTrans sidestepped the issue of safety	<p>Safety is very important and the underlying goal of this project is to ensure a safe environment for all users however, the purpose of Phase 1 is to categorize the state roads into high-, moderate and low-use.</p> <p>Safety is very important to VTrans, and the overarching goal of this project is to ensure safer roads for all users.</p> <p>We implicitly received safety information in Phase 1 using the interactive crowdsourcing map by asking users to draw lines on state roads they “would like to use but need improvement.”</p>	<p>Future phases will include an analysis of reported bicycle crashes and examine the safety data entered in the Phase 1 interactive crowdsourcing map (aka Wikimap).</p> <p>More on next phases at http://vtransplanning.vermont.gov/bikeplan/faq#2</p>
Also, the more signs about bicycling there are, the more motorists might realize that bikes belong too - legitimizes bicycling	<p>Signs may not always be the appropriate. Our bicycle sign placement guidance is available here: http://vtransengineering.vermont.gov/sites/aot_program_development/files/documents/ltf/PedestrianandBicycleFacilityDesignManual.pdf</p> <p>See Chapter 8 for VTrans guidance on Signs, Pavement Markings and signals.</p> <p>See page 8-13 for information on where SHARE THE ROAD sign may be appropriate include.</p> <p>Note, SHARE THE ROAD signs can be ambiguous and actually contribute to conflict and confusion. Interestingly, Delaware has done away with their use.</p>	No change necessary

Comments	Response	Responsiveness to comment
General Feedback: Safety		
Overall, Vermont is a great place to cycle but we need more separated bike paths and wider shoulders on the roads.	We agree. We are addressing the need for wider shoulders by conducting the On Road Bicycle Facility Plan. We will use the information from the Plan to increase shoulder widths during pavement activities. We have also funded (either in development or in use) over 100 of miles of shared use paths in the State including the rail trails.	No change necessary
No shoulder creates hazards with cars passing bikes. When I am driving my car in one direction and a bicyclist is riding in the other direction, cars behind them will drive into my lane to pass instead of waiting the five or ten seconds for me to go by. I have almost been hit by cars doing this several times.	<p>We understand the importance of driver and bicyclist education. We have an educational brochure here: http://vtransengineering.vermont.gov/sites/aot_program_development/files/documents/ltf/BikePedShareTheRoad05032011.pdf</p> <p>VTrans has also contracted w/Local Motion for next 2-yrs. to provide assistance in Bicycle and Pedestrian safety education and outreach in three areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Level Support • Law Enforcement Training • Driver Education Training 	No change necessary

Comments	Response	Responsiveness to comment
General Feedback: Connectivity		
My first comment is about bike/pedestrian paths: while there are several great paths in the state, locally they are very segmented into a mile here, a few miles there. The paths should be contiguous and follow road routes so you don't have to go so far out of the way to get anywhere.	<p>We agree, this is why VTtrans has a Bicycle and Pedestrian Program. The program is to improve access and safety for bicyclists and/or pedestrians through the planning, design and construction of infrastructure projects.</p> <p>Example of eligible projects for scoping or design/construction are bicycle lanes, widening road shoulders and shared-use paths (designed for use by both bicyclists and pedestrians).</p>	No change necessary
Considering the number of cyclists that travel to Vermont to ride and enjoy the trails or the roads, I cant believe that bike lanes would even be something to debate.	<p>Note: General guidance is for bicycle lanes (where appropriate) in urban areas and villages, while paved shoulders are typically used in rural areas.</p>	No change necessary
What also needs to happen is give towns money to widen roads/put in bike lanes in downtown areas so that people can commute more safely to work.	<p>VTtrans has allocated \$8-10M/yr. towards improving bike/ped infrastructure, this includes connections.</p> <p>Also, the Regional Planning Commissions coordinate with towns in their regions to improve non-motorized connections.</p> <p>For more information go to: http://vtransengineering.vermont.gov/bureaus/mab/local-projects/bike-ped</p>	No change necessary
The strategy of making state highways safer in and around town centers makes the most sense.	<p>We agree the areas around towns/villages are important and have incorporated a land use component in our analysis of priority bicycle corridors.</p>	No change necessary
Corridors should maintain the same level of desirability	<p>Segments of roads will maintain the same level of desirability (now termed 'use')however some corridors may not if parallel routes or intersecting roads may change the desirability throughout a corridor.</p>	No change necessary
I think there is a desire of residents to be able to bike on State Highways between villages and towns but that there is also a reticence to do so because of fear based on lack of adequate shoulders.	<p>We agree and this is the reason we are developing the On Road Bicycle Plan. We also recognize we have limited resources and need to direct those resources to the highest priority bicycle corridors.</p>	No change necessary

Comments	Response	Responsiveness to comment
General Feedback: Culture		
<p>I have found over the last ten years drivers are increasingly disrespectful of bicyclists, some downright and intentionally confrontational. they have NO understanding that WE have rights to the road, too. I've been driven off the roads, cut off, brakes slammed in my face, and told I have no right to the road as a cyclist.</p>	<p>It is important that all road users model proper behavior. We have an educational brochure here: http://vtransengineering.vermont.gov/sites/aot_program_development/files/documents/ltf/BikePedShareTheRoad05032011.pdf</p> <p>VTrans has also contracted w/Local Motion for next 2-yrs. to provide assistance in Bicycle and Pedestrian safety education and outreach in three areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Level Support • Law Enforcement Training • Driver Education Training 	<p>No change necessary</p>
<p>he state needs to lay the ground rules, when I grew up there were public information announcements, and law enforcement needs to politely speak with cyclists, pedestrian and drivers about shades responsibilities.</p>	<p>We agree, that is why we have undertaken this project. VTrans has also contracted w/Local Motion for next 2-yrs. to provide assistance in Bicycle and Pedestrian safety education and outreach in three areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Level Support • Law Enforcement Training • Driver Education Training 	<p>No change necessary</p>
<p>Our state is one of the best places to ride bikes in the country, and I know because I have ridden in other "meccas" - Colorado (my childhood home), California, Utah, Nevada and Minnesota - none compares to the beauty, variety and (generally) the politeness of drivers. This resource needs to be built up and marketed - but first the roads need work.</p>	<p>We agree, that is why we have undertaken this project.</p>	<p>No change necessary</p>
General Feedback: Facility Design		
<p>What standards will be used for "improvements"? A 3ft shoulder is not enough and is UNSAFE.</p>	<p>The Vermont State Standards</p>	<p>No change necessary</p>
<p>Will this be used for / applied to complete streets?</p>	<p>This effort compliments complete streets and will be applied in combination with the complete streets law.</p>	<p>No change necessary</p>
<p>Scott Bascom asked how this is related to the Vermont Pedestrian and Bicycle Policy Plan document.</p>	<p>The On Road Bicycle Plan will compliment this document.</p>	<p>No change necessary</p>
General Feedback: VTrans Policy		
<p>How does this project fit in with Asset Management?</p>	<p>This project will be incorporated into the prioritization process to help manage our assets for all roadway users.</p>	<p>No change necessary</p>