## APPENDIX A: CITY AND COUNTY SURVEYS AND RESPONSES

Utah Foundation is producing a report that examines the benefits of investing in local Utah roads. It will also attempt to quantify the local transportation needs of Utah communities.
Your responses to this survey are essential in our ability to assess those needs.
The survey should take 5 to 10 minutes. Questions are focused on the current network, maintenance conditions, funding, and benefits.
Utah Foundation is producing this report at the request of Wasatch Front Regional Council, Mountainland Association of Governments, Utah Transit Authority, Utah Department of Transportation, Cache Metropolitan Planning Organization, Dixie Metropolitan Planning Organization, Utah League of Cities and Towns, Utah Association of Counties, and the Salt Lake Chamber of Commerce.
If you have any questions or comments please call Mallory at 801.355.1400 extension 2.

Background (page 1 of 5)
1. What is the name of your county?
2. What is your position with the county?
3. What is the size of your county?
© Fewer than 4,000
C 4,000 - 10,999
O 11,000 - 30,999
© 31,000 - 124,999
C 125,000 - 699,999
O 700,000 or more
4. What percentage of this population lives in unincorporated areas?
Percentage:
5. Do you consider your county to be (mark as many as you'd like):
☐ Rural
☐ Urban
Suburban

Existing Maintenance Conditions (page 2	? of 5)
Approximately what percentage of your road pavement condition? (column should equal 10)	
Excellent	
Good	
Fair	
Poor	
2. How you implemented an asphalt managem	ent program (like chip seal rotation)?
O Yes	
O No	
O NO	

## **Inventory of Features & Transportation Alternatives (page 3 of 5)** 1. What percentage of your transportation network features the following items? (unincorporated areas only) 0-10% 10-20% 20-30% 30-40% 40-50% 50-60% 70-80% 80-90% 100% Sidewalks Streetlights Designated bike lane Wide shoulders with signage for cyclists Safe pedestrian crossings like crosswalks, H.A.W.K.S, appropriate signage, etc. Landscaping, xeriscaping Curb and Gutter Trails 2. Ideally, what percentage of your transportation network should feature the following items? (unincorporated areas only) 0-10% 10-20% 20-30% 30-40% 40-50% 50-60% 70-80% 80-90% 100% Sidewalks Streetlights Designated bike lane Wide shoulders with signage for cyclists Safe pedestrian crossings like crosswalks, H.A.W.K.S, appropriate signage, etc. Landscaping, xeriscaping Curb and Gutter Trails 3. What percentage of intersections within your jurisdiction have sidewalks at two or more corners? (unincorporated areas only) Percentage: 4. What percentage of these intersections have curb cuts (sidewalk ramps) at two or more of the corners? (unincorporated areas only) Percentage:

## **Benefits of Transportation Investment (page 4 of 5)** 1. Please rank in order of importance the benefits of increased investment in your local transportation system? (simply drag and drop selections to rank their importance) Better maintenance of current infrastructure (roads, bridges, trails) Increased business investment Improved flow of freight, goods & services Additional active transportation facilities such as trails, sidewalks, bike lanes Free up more money for other county services like parks, police, administration [assumes more investment in transportation means additional revenue is generated specifically for transportation] Increased safety from funding for safety-related projects Improved Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) 2. On a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 being not at all beneficial and 7 being very beneficial, how beneficial do you think the following elements of the transportation network are in your community? 1 - Not at all 7 - Very 4 N/A beneficial beneficial 0 0 Better Maintained Roads 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 A complete road network with sufficient capacity 0 0 0 0 0 **Public Transportation** (buses, light rail, commuter rail), if applicable 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Sidewalks and safe pedestrian crossings 0 0 0 Bicycle facilities such as bike lanes and widening shoulders 0 Safe transportation facilities ADA facilities Information Technology Systems (ITS) infrastructure 0 0 0 0 Other Please specify if you chose "other"

3. For any element	s receiving a 4 or a	above, why do you	feel that element is	beneficial to
your community?				
	Economic development benefit	Financial benefit (cost savings)	Quality of life benefit	Other
Better Maintained Roads				
A complete road network with sufficient capacity				
Public Transportation (buses, light rail, commuter rail), if applicable				
Sidewalks and safe pedestrian crossings				
Trails				
Bicycle facilities such as bike lanes and widening shoulders				
Safe transportation facilities				
ADA facilities				
Information Technology Systems (ITS) infrastructure				
Other				
Please clarify if "other" and p	rovide additional comments	here:		
				<u>~</u>
				<u> </u>

Funding/Budget	(page 5 of 5)		
1. What is the tota 2012 2013 2014	I annual budget of your o	county (unincorporated	areas only)?
•	al local transportation bumaintenance, preservation fety)?		•
	2012	2013	2014
Percentage of total budget:			
	e of the total local transpo ch column should equal	•	mately what is spent on
Preservation and maintenance (restriping, pavement treatments, patching, etc)			
Increased capacity (widening, new roads)			
Administration			
Active transportation (sidewalks, bike lanes, widen shoulders)			
Safety (guardrail, attenuators,)			
Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), (signals, fiber optics, VMS)			
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	what percentage of your f g? (the column should eq	•	I for local roads comes
Class B&C road funds			
Other dedicated transportation funds (sales taxes dedicated to transportation, etc.)			
General fund (1% local option sales tax, property tax, etc.)			
Federal or state government (other than Class B&C road funds)			
Grants/other			

Yes			
No			
_	ne next three years to	ximately what percenta maintain your transport	
eservation and aintenance (restriping, vement treatments, tching, etc)			
creased capacity dening, new roads)			
ministration			
tive transportation dewalks, bike lanes, den shoulders)			
fety (guardrail, enuators)			
stems (ITS)(signals, fiber tics, VMS)			



	All	Not in MPO	In MPO	Difference	Statistical
Question Number of County Observations	22	12	10		significance
Section 2: Existing Maintenance Conditions					
2.1 Road Conditions					
Excellent	19%	21%	16%	_	
Good	33%	28%	39%	-11%	92%
Fair	33%	32%	34%		
Poor	21%	23%	18%		
2.2 Asphalt Management Program (Yes/No)	90%	83%	100%	-17%	90%
Section 3: Inventory of Features & Transportation Alternatives					
3.1 Current Features					
Sidewalks	36%	40%	32%		
Streetlights	35%	39%	31%		
Designated Bike Lanes	35%	39%	30%		
Wide Shoulders	33%	36%	31%		
Pedestrian Crossings	32%	39%	23%	16%	98%
Landscaping	34%	36%	31%		
Curb	33%	37%	29%		
Trails	34%	38%	29%		
3.2 Ideal Features					
Sidewalks	39%	38%	39%		
Streetlights	34%	33%	35%		
Designated Bike Lanes	37%	38%	37%		
Wide Shoulders	36%	33%	40%		
Pedestrian Crossings	36%	32%	40%		
Landscaping	29%	31%	28%		
Curb	40%	33%	47%	-14%	89%
Trails	36%	43%	29%	13%	94%
Difference between					
Sidewalks	3%	-2%	8%		
Streetlights	-1%	-6%	5%		
Designated Bike Lanes	3%	-1%	7%		
Wide Sholders	3%	-3%	9%		
Pedistrian Crossings	4%	-7%	17%		
Landscaping	-4%	-5%	-4%		
Curb	7%	-4%	18%		
Trails	3%	5%	0%		
3.3 Sidewalks at two or more Corners	32%	38%	25%	13%	93%
3.4 Sidewalk Ramps at two or more Corners	41%	43%	39%		



ion Number of County Observations	<b>All</b> 22	Not in MPO	<b>In MPO</b> 10	Difference	Statistical significand
n 4: Benefits of Transportation Investment	22	12	10		318111111111
4.1 Importance of Benefits of Increased Investment					
Better Maintenance	1.47	1.77	1.11	0.66	86
Increased business investment	3.75	3.18	4.38	-1.2	96
improved flow of freight	3.8	3.59	4.05	•	
additional active transportation	3.35	3.45	3.22		
free up money	5.05	4.5	5.77	-1.27	9
increased safety	4.15	4.59	3.61	0.98	9
ITS	6.5	6.9	6	0.9	9
4.2 Average Ranking of Beneficence					
Better Maintenance	6.5	6.16	6.8		
Sufficient Capacity	5.5	4.75	6.5	-1.75	Ç
Public Transportation	2.6	1.54	3.7	-2.16	10
Pedestrian facilities	4.4	3.9	4.9	-1	ç
Trails	4.4	3.66	5.3	-1.64	ç
Bicycle facilities	4.9	4.5	5.4	-0.9	Ç
Safe transportation facilities	5.3	4.7	5.9	-1.2	Q
ADA facilities	4.2	3.27	5.3	-2.03	10
ITS infrastructure	3.2	2.63	3.8	-1.17	g
4.3 For any elements receiving a 4 or above, why do you feel that ele	ement is beneficial to y	our community?			
Percent of Entities who thought the following items were benefi					
Better Maintenance	54%	58%	50%		
Sufficient Capacity	73%	67%	80%		
Public Transportation	23%	8%	40%	-31%	g
Pedestrian facilities	18%	25%	10%	•	
Trails	36%	50%	20%	30%	Q
Bicycle facilities	45%	85%	30%	28%	Ç
Safe transportation facilities	41%	42%	40%		
ADA facilities	9%	8%	10%		
ITS infrastructure	14%	16%	10%		
Percent of Entities who thought the following items were benefi	cial for Financial Benef	its			
Better Maintenance	82%	75%	90%		
Sufficient Capacity	41%	33%	5%		
Public Transportation	14%	0%	30%	-30%	(
Pedestrian facilities	14%	8%	20%	22.70	
Trails	14%	17%	10%		
Bicycle facilities	5%	0%	10%	-10%	8
Safe transportation facilities	27%	25%	30%	. 370	9



			All	Not in MPO	In MPO	Difference	Statistical
Question	Number of County Observations		22	12	10		significance
	ADA facilities		0%	0%	0%		
	ITS infrastructure		23%	8%	40%	-32%	96%
	Percent of Entities who thought the following items were benefi	cial fo	r the Quality of L	ife		•	
	Better Maintenance		68%	75%	60%		
	Sufficient Capacity		64%	58%	70%		
	Public Transportation		32%	17%	50%	-33%	95%
	Pedestrian facilities		68%	50%	90%	-40%	98%
	Trails		72%	50%	100%	-50%	100%
	Bicycle facilities		77%	58%	100%	-42%	99%
	Safe transportation facilities		68%	58%	80%	-22%	85%
	ADA facilities		68%	42%	100%	-58%	100%
	ITS infrastructure		27%	25%	30%	•	
	Percent of Entities who thought the following items were benefi	cial fo	r Other Reasons				
	Better Maintenance		0%	0%	0%		
	Sufficient Capacity		0%	0%	0%		
	Public Transportation		5%	8%	0%		
	Pedestrian facilities		5%	0%	10%	-10%	86%
	Trails		0%	0%	0%		
	Bicycle facilities		0%	0%	0%		
	Safe transportation facilities		0%	0%	0%		
	ADA facilities		0%	0%	0%		
	ITS infrastructure		5%	0%	10%	-10%	86%
Section 5: F	unding/Budget						
	Number of respondents		14	6	8		
5	.1 Average Budget Size						
	201	2 \$	26,900,000	11,300,000	\$ 38,600,000	\$ (27,300,000)	96%
		3 \$	28,700,000		\$ 39,500,000	\$ (25,200,000)	94%
	201	4 \$	27,100,000	11,100,000	\$ 39,100,000	\$ (28,000,000)	96%
5	.2 What is your total local transportation budget as a percentage o	f your		dget?			
	201		29%	29%	29%		
	201		29%	29%	29%		
	201	4	29%	29%	30%		



			All	Not in MPO	In MPO	Difference	Statistical
Question	Number of County Observations		22	12	10		significance
	unding/Budget						
5.3	3 What percentage of the local transportation budget	is spent on the fo	ollowing?				
	Maintenance					_	
		2012	64%	74%	53%	21%	94%
		2013	63%	73%	52%	21%	94%
		2014	65%	75%	54%	22%	95%
	Increasing Capacity						
		2012	14%	16%	12%		
		2013	12%	15%	9%		
		2014	12%	13%	11%		
	Administration						
		2012	12%	9%	14%		
		2013	13%	9%	16%		
		2014	13%	9%	16%		
	Pedestrian Services						
		2012	3%	0%	6%	-6%	94%
		2013	4%	0%	8%	-8%	97%
		2014	4%	0%	9%	-9%	999
	Safety					<u>-</u>	
	•	2012	4%	2%	6%	-4%	919
		2013	4%	4%	5%	•	
		2014	4%	4%	4%		
	ITSL						
		2012	1%	7%	1%		
		2013	1%	7%	1%		
		2014	1%	7%	1%		
5.	4 Breakdown of funding sources				. 70		
5.	B&C Roads		56%	57%	56%		
	Other Transportation Funds		1%	10%	9%		
	General Fund		22%	8%	33%	-24%	960
	Federal/State		15%	19%	10%	2770	
	Grants		5%	10%	0%	10%	1009
Е	5 Percent individuals who believe spending is sufficier	nt to meet needs		1 0 70	070	1070	100
5.	Counties	it to meet needs	5%	10%	0%		
	Counties			10%	<u> </u>		



			All	Not in MPO	In MPO	Difference	Statistical
Question	Number of County Observations		22	12	10		significance
Section 5:	Funding/Budget						
5	5.6 Percent Increase in Funding needed to maintain a	mong those who th	ink transportatio	n spending is not enoι	ıgh		
	Maintenance						
		2015	30%	31%	29%		
		2016	28%	28%	28%		
		2017	29%	32%	27%	30%	28%
	Increasing Capacity						
		2015	22%	24%	20%		
		2016	22%	23%	22%		
		2017	23%	24%	23%	24%	21%
	Administration						
		2015	10%	13%	8%		
		2016	12%	14%	11%		
		2017	12%	15%	9%	14%	9%
	Pedestrian Services						
		2015	18%	19%	17%		
		2016	20%	20%	19%		
		2017	22%	23%	22%	21%	19%
	Safety						
		2015	10%	13%	8%		
		2016	12%	14%	10%		
		2017	13%	17%	10%	15%	9%
	ITSL						
		2015	3%	2%	3%		
		2016	4%	2%	6%		
		2017	6%	2%	9%	2%	6%

Utah Foundation is producing a report that examines the benefits of investing in local Utah roads. It will also attempt to quantify the local transportation needs of Utah communities.
Your responses to this survey are essential in our ability to assess those needs.
The survey should take 5 to 10 minutes. Questions are focused on the current network, maintenance conditions, funding, and benefits.
Utah Foundation is producing this report at the request of Wasatch Front Regional Council, Mountainland Association of Governments, Utah Transit Authority, Utah Department of Transportation, Cache Metropolitan Planning Organization, Dixie Metropolitan Planning Organization, Utah League of Cities and Towns, Utah Association of Counties, and the Salt Lake Chamber of Commerce.
If you have any questions or comments please call Mallory at 801.355.1400 extension 2.

Background (page 1 of 5)
1. What is the name of your city or town?
2. What is your position with the city or town?
3. What is the size of your city or town?
© Fewer than 1,000
O 1,000 - 9,999
© 10,000 - 29,999
O 30,000 - 64,999
© 65,000 - 99,999
O 100,000 or more
4. Do you consider your city or town to be (mark as many as you'd like):
Rural
☐ Urban
Suburban

Existing Maintenance Conditions (page 2 of 5)
Approximately what percentage of your roads fall in each of the following categories of pavement condition? (column should equal 100%)
Good Good
Poor Poor
2. How you implemented an asphalt management program (like chip seal rotation)?  Yes  No

Sidewalks	0-10%	10-20%	20-30%	30-40%	40-50%	50-60%	70-80%	80-90%	100%			
Streetlights	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Designated bike lane	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Wide shoulders with signage for cyclists	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Safe pedestrian crossings like crosswalks, H.A.W.K.S, appropriate signage, etc.	О	0	0	O	О	О	O	О	0			
_andscaping, xeriscaping	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Curb and Gutter	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Trails	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
2. Ideally, what percentage of your transportation network should feature the following												
tems?	<b>3</b> -	<b>,</b> , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,							<b>9</b>			
	0-10%	10-20%	20-30%	30-40%	40-50%	50-60%	70-80%	80-90%	100%			
Sidewalks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Streetlights	0	$\circ$	0	0	$\circ$	0	0	0	0			
Designated bike lane	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Nide shoulders with signage for cyclists	0	0	0	0	O	O	0	O	O			
Safe pedestrian crossings like crosswalks, H.A.W.K.S, appropriate signage, etc.	0	0	0	0	О	0	0	0	O			
_andscaping, xeriscaping	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Curb and Gutter	0	0	0	0	0	0	O	0	0			
Trails	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
. What percentage	of inter	sections	within	vour iuri	sdiction	have si	dewalks	at two c	or more			
corners?	Of IIICI	Scotions	, with j	your juin	Saiotion	nave si	acwants	at two c	,, ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			
Percentage:						1						
o.comage.												
. What percentage	of these	e interse	ctions h	ave curl	cuts (s	idewalk	ramps)	at two o	r more			
of the corners?												
Percentage:						1						

## **Benefits of Transportation Investment (page 4 of 5)** 1. Please rank in order of importance the benefits of increased investment in your local transportation system? (simply drag and drop selections to rank their importance) Better maintenance of current infrastructure (roads, bridges, trails) Increased business investment Improved flow of freight, goods & services Additional active transportation facilities such as trails, sidewalks, bike lanes Free up more money for other city services like parks, police, administration [assumes more investment in transportation means additional revenue is generated specifically for transportation] Increased safety from funding for safety-related projects Improved Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) 2. On a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 being not at all beneficial and 7 being very beneficial, how beneficial do you think the following elements of the transportation network are in your community? 1 - Not at all 7 - Very 4 N/A beneficial beneficial 0 0 Better Maintained Roads 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 A complete road network with sufficient capacity 0 0 0 0 0 **Public Transportation** (buses, light rail, commuter rail), if applicable 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Sidewalks and safe pedestrian crossings 0 0 0 Bicycle facilities such as bike lanes and widening shoulders 0 Safe transportation facilities ADA facilities Information Technology Systems (ITS) infrastructure 0 0 0 0 Other Please specify if you chose "other"

3. For any element	s receiving a 4 or a	above, why do you	feel that element is	beneficial to
your community?				
	Economic development benefit	Financial benefit (cost savings)	Quality of life benefit	Other
Better Maintained Roads				
A complete road network with sufficient capacity				
Public Transportation (buses, light rail, commuter rail), if applicable				
Sidewalks and safe pedestrian crossings				
Trails				
Bicycle facilities such as bike lanes and widening shoulders				
Safe transportation facilities				
ADA facilities				
Information Technology Systems (ITS) infrastructure				
Other				
Please clarify if "other" and p	rovide additional comments	here:		
				_
				<u> </u>

Funding/Budget	(page 5 of 5)		
1. What is the tota	I annual budget of your o	city or town?	
2012			
2013			
2014			
•	al local transportation but maintenance, preservation fety)?		•
,	2012	2013	2014
Percentage of total budget:			
	e of the total local transports of the total local column should equal	•	imately what is spent on 2014
Preservation and maintenance (restriping, pavement treatments, patching, etc)			
Increased capacity (widening, new roads)			
Administration			
Active transportation (sidewalks, bike lanes, widen shoulders)			
Safety (guardrail, attenuators,)			
Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), (signals, fiber optics, VMS)			
	what percentage of your ? (the column should eq		d for local roads comes
Class B&C road funds			
Other dedicated transportation funds (sales taxes dedicated to transportation, etc.)			
General fund (1% local option sales tax, property tax, etc.)			
Federal or state government (other than Class B&C road funds)			
Grants/other			

Yes  No  No  If you answered "no" to number 5, approximately what percentage increase per year would you need for the next three years to maintain your transportation infrastructure in a desirable state of repair?  2015  2016  2017  Preservation and	5. Is your transportat system?	ion spending sufficier	nt to meet the needs of y	our transportation
b. If you answered "no" to number 5, approximately what percentage increase per year would you need for the next three years to maintain your transportation infrastructure in a desirable state of repair?  2015  2016  2017  Preservation and				
vould you need for the next three years to maintain your transportation infrastructure in a desirable state of repair?  2015  2016  2017  Preservation and maintenance (restriping, pavement treatments, patching, etc)  Increased capacity (widening, new roads)  Administration  Active transportation (sidewalks, bike lanes, widen shoulders)  Safety (guardrail, attenuators)  Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)(signals, fiber optics, VMS)  If more than 100% increase for any single option, please indicate the percentage increase here	O No			
Preservation and maintenance (restriping, pavement treatments, patching, etc)  Increased capacity (widening, new roads)  Administration	would you need for th	ne next three years to pair?	maintain your transport	ation infrastructure in a
(widening, new roads)  Administration  Active transportation (sidewalks, bike lanes, widen shoulders)  Safety (guardrail, attenuators)  Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)(signals, fiber optics, VMS)  If more than 100% increase for any single option, please indicate the percentage increase here	Preservation and maintenance (restriping, pavement treatments, patching, etc)			
Active transportation (sidewalks, bike lanes, widen shoulders)  Safety (guardrail, attenuators)  Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)(signals, fiber optics, VMS)  If more than 100% increase for any single option, please indicate the percentage increase here	Increased capacity (widening, new roads)			
(sidewalks, bike lanes, widen shoulders)  Safety (guardrail, attenuators)  Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)(signals, fiber optics, VMS)  If more than 100% increase for any single option, please indicate the percentage increase here	Administration			
attenuators)  Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)(signals, fiber optics, VMS)  f more than 100% increase for any single option, please indicate the percentage increase here	Active transportation (sidewalks, bike lanes, widen shoulders)			
Systems (ITS)(signals, fiber optics, VMS)  f more than 100% increase for any single option, please indicate the percentage increase here	Safety (guardrail, attenuators)			
f more than 100% increase for any single option, please indicate the percentage increase here	Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)(signals, fiber optics, VMS)			



		All	Rural	Urban	Suburban							
							Difference between		Difference between		Difference between	
Question	Number of City Observations	105	68	30	27		Rural and non-rural	Statistical Signifcance	Rural and non-rural	Statistical Signifcance	Rural and non-rural	Statistical Signifcance
Section 2: Exi	isting Maintenance Conditions											
2.1	Road Conditions											
	Excellent		22%	22%	28%	19%			9%	97%	<mark>6</mark>	
	Good		34%	26%	32%	34%						
	Fair		31%	33%	26%	30%	5%	90%	-26%	96%	<mark>6</mark>	
	Poor		24%	26%	21%	20%	6%	94%				
2.2 /	Asphalt Management Program (Y)		82%	76%	97%	89%	-16%	98%	21%	99%	<mark>6</mark>	
Section 3: Inv	ventory of Features & Transporta	tion Alterna	atives									
3.1	Current features											
i	Sidewalks		54%	44%	72%	63%	-27%	100%	25%	100%	<mark>6</mark> 12%	99%
	Streetlights		56%	42%	60%	64%	-13%	100%	-8%	98%	<mark>6</mark> 10%	97%
	Designated Bike Lanes		39%	42%	34%	36%	6%	95%	-9%	99%	<mark>6</mark>	
	Wide Sholders		40%	41%	34%	36%						
	Pedistrian Crossings		42%	42%	45%	38%						
	Landscaping		45%	43%	48%	46%						
	Curb		52%	43%	72%	61%	-28%	100%	28%	100%	<mark>6</mark> 11%	98%
	Trails		38%	39%	39%	33%					-7%	95%
3.2 l	ldeal Features											
	Sidewalks		69%	59%	89%	83%	-30%	100%	28%	100%	<mark>6</mark> 19%	100%
	Streetlights		71%	63%	80%	80%	-21%	100%	13%	98%	<mark>6</mark> 12%	97%
	Designated Bike Lanes		38%	39%	41%	34%			_		-6%	90%
	Wide Sholders		38%	39%	37%	31%					-10%	98%
	Pedistrian Crossings		55%	50%	63%	63%	-13%	99%	12%	97%	<mark>6</mark> 11%	95%
	Landscaping		49%	43%	57%	53%	-15%	100%	12%	98%	<mark>6</mark>	
	Curb		68%	58%	89%	86%	-30%	100%	28%	100%	<mark>6</mark> 19%	100%
	Trails		39%	38%	43%	34%			_		-7%	91%
	Difference between current and ide	al										
	Sidewalks		15%	15%	17%	20%						
	Streetlights		15%	22%	21%	16%						
	Designated Bike Lanes		-1%	-3%	7%	-2%						
	Wide Sholders		-2%	-2%	3%	-5%						
	Pedistrian Crossings		13%	8%	18%	26%						
	Landscaping		4%	0%	9%	7%						
	Curb		16%	15%	16%	25%						
	Trails		1%	-1%	4%	1%						
3.3 5	Sidewalks at two or more Corners		57%	48%	75%	65%	-25%	100%	25%	100%	<mark>6</mark> 10%	99%
3.4 9	Sidewalk Ramps at two or more Cor	r	59%	55%	63%	72%	-11%	99%			17%	100%



Section 4: Benefits of Transportation Investment										
4.1 Importance of Benefits of Increased Investm	ent									
Better Maintenece	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.3						
Increased business investment	4.1	4	4.5	4			0.5	91%		
Impropved flow of freithgt	4.7	4.5	4.8	5.1	-0.5	91%			0.5	90%
Additional active transportation	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.9						
Free up money	4.3	4.1	5	4.1			1.0	100%		
Increased safety	3.7	3.8	3.5	3.6						
ITS	6	6.3	5.22	5.7	0.9	100%	-1.2	100%	-0.4	90%
4.2 Average Ranking of Beneficence						'				-
Better Maintenece	6.7	6.6	5.89	6.8	-0.2	92%				
Sufficent Capacioty	5.9	5.7	6.1	6.5					0.9	99%
Public Transportation	3.9	3.1	4.8	5.1	-2.0	100%	1.3	100%	1.6	100%
Pedestrian facilities	5.7	5.1	6.58	6.5	-1.4	100%	1.2	100%	1.1	100%
Trails	4.5	4.2	4.96	5.2	-0.9	99%	0.6	91%	1.0	99%
Bicycle facilities	4.2	3.8	4.6	5	-1.0	100%			1.1	100%
Safe transportation facilities	5.4	4.7	6.48	6.3	-1.6	100%	1.5	100%	1.3	100%
ADA facilities	5.3	4.9	6.1	6	-1.1	100%	1.1	100%	1.0	99%
ITS infrastructure	4	3.3	5.1	4.6	-1.5	100%	1.7	100%	0.9	97%



Benefits of Transportation Investment										
1.3 For any elements receiving a 4 or above, w		· ·	•							
Percent of Entities who thought the follow	ring items were benefic	ial for Economic Deve	elopment							
Better Maintenece	52%	51%	50%	70%					24%	
Sufficent Capacioty	58%	51%	70%	78%	-19%	97%	17%	94%	26%	
Public Transportation	33%	28%	33%	67%	-15%	94%			45%	
Pedestrian facilities	22%	19%	27%	30%						
Trails	23%	24%	13%	26%			-13%	93%		
Bicycle facilities	20%	19%	20%	22%						
Safe transportation facilities	32%	25%	43%	48%	-21%	99%	15%	94%	21%	
ADA facilities	23%	24%	17%	26%						
ITS infrastructure	26%	21%	40%	30%	-15%	95%	20%	98%		
Percent of Entities who thought the follow	ing items were benefic	cial for Financial Bene	fits							
Better Maintenece	64%	56%	80%	70%	-22%	99%	23%	99%		
Sufficent Capacioty	27%	24%	37%	44%			14%	93%	24%	
Public Transportation	14%	12%	20%	26%					16%	
Pedestrian facilities	14%	10%	17%	22%	-11%	94%			11%	
Trails	8%	4%	10%	11%	-9%	95%				
Bicycle facilities	10%	10%	10%	15%						
Safe transportation facilities	27%	21%	33%	33%	-17%	97%				
ADA facilities	14%	15%	17%	15%						
ITS infrastructure	30%	22%	53%	44%	-24%	99%	32%	100%	19%	
Percent of Entities who thought the follow	ing items were benefic	ial for the Quality of I	_ife							
Better Maintenece	78%	81%	67%	93%			-16%	96%	20%	
Sufficent Capacioty	70%	65%	73%	89%	-16%	96%			25%	
Public Transportation	50%	38%	63%	67%	-35%	100%	18%	95%	22%	
Pedestrian facilities	80%	69%	70%	96%	-31%	100%	23%	100%	22%	
Trails	70%	60%	83%	93%	-29%	100%	18%	97%	30%	
Bicycle facilities	65%	54%	77%	93%	-29%	100%	17%	95%	37%	
Safe transportation facilities	65%	56%	80%	81%	-25%	100%	21%	98%	23%	
ADA facilities	75%	65%	93%	89%	-30%	100%	25%	100%	18%	
ITS infrastructure	35%	28%	43%	52%	-21%	98%			22%	
Percent of Entities who thought the follow	ving items were benefic									
Better Maintenece	0%	0%	0%	0%						
Sufficent Capacioty	0%	0%	0%	0%						
Public Transportation	3%	3%	3%	0%						
Pedestrian facilities	3%	4%	0%	0%	4%	90%				
Trails	1%	1%	0%	0%	.,•					
Bicycle facilities	3%	3%	0%	4%						
Safe transportation facilities	2%	2%	0%	4%						
ADA facilities	1%	2%	0%	0%						
ITS infrastructure	4%	1%	0%	4%	6%	93%				



5: Funding/Budget											
Number of Respondents		88	54	28	24						
5.1 Average Budget Size											
	2012 \$	18,400,000.00 \$	5,877,830.00 \$	40,300,000.00 \$	28,900,000.00	######	100%	######	100%	######	g
	2013 \$	19,900,000.00 \$	6,451,649.00 \$	44,100,000.00 \$	29,900,000.00	######	100%	######	100%	######	ç
	2014 \$	20,000,000.00 \$	6,959,840.00 \$	44,200,000.00 \$	29,400,000.00	######	100%	######	100%	#######	9
5.2 What is your total local trans	portation b	udget as a percentage	of your total annu	al budget?							
	2012	51%	57%	41%	38%						
	2013	50%	57%	41%	35%						
	2014	50%	57%	39%	34%						
5.3 What percentage of the loca	l transporta	tion budget is spent o	n the following?								
Maintainence		- ,	_								
	2012	64%	68%	51%	61%	12%	98%	-18%	100%		
	2013	62%	66%	49%	28%	12%	98%	-19%	100%		
	2014	59%	64%	44%	56%	14%	99%	-21%	100%		
Increasing Capacity											
<b>3</b> . ,	2012	9%	8%	13%	13%			5%	94%	6%	ç
	2013	11%	9%	13%	18%	-5%	91%			10%	10
	2014	14%	12%	19%	17%	-6%	92%	8%	97%		
Administration											
	2012	15%	11%	22%	16%	-9%	99%	11%	100%		
	2013	15%	12%	23%	16%	-9%	99%	11%	100%		
	2014	13%	11%	18%	15%	-7%	99%	7%	99%		
Pedistrian Services						-					
	2012	8%	6%	12%	5%	-6%	99%	5%	97%		
	2013	8%	6%	11%	7%	-7%	100%	4%	93%		
	2014	9%	6%	12%	11%			5%	98%	3%	g
Safety											
	2012	2%	2%	3%	2%						
	2013	3%	3%	4%	3%						
	2014	4%	4%	3%	3%						
ITSL			.,,	3,0	370						
	2012	1%	0%	3%	3%	-3%	100%	2%	100%	2%	9
	2013	1%	0%	3%	2%	-2%	100%	3%	100%	270	_
	2014	2%	0%	3%	3%	270	10070	2%	94%		
5.4 Breakdwon of funding source					3.0				3.70		
B&C Roads		63%	67%	61%	53%	12%	97%			-13%	C
Other Transportation Fu	nds	7%	8%	8%	8%	1270	37.70			1370	
General Fund		31%	24%	37%	34%	-17%	100%	8%	92%		
Federal/State		5%	4%	6%	5%	1770		0,0	J270		
Grants		7%	7%	5%	5%						
5.5 Percent individuals who beli	ve snending			570	370						
Cities	ve sperialing	18%	26%	13%	8%	21%	99%			-14%	g



			P							
ding needed to main	tain among those wh	no think transportation	on spending is not ei	nough						
										99%
			40%				-19%			99%
2017	52%	52%	39%	65%			-19%	99%	19%	99%
2015	38%	46%	20%	48%	17%	96%	-28%	100%	15%	93%
2016	38%	47%	18%	46%	20%	98%	-31%	100%		
2017	37%	44%	19%	47%	14%	93%	-30%	100%	15%	93%
2015	11%	13%	9%	11%						
2016	12%	15%	9%	13%						
2017	12%	14%	10%	12%						
2015	34%	37%	27%	49%					22%	99%
2016	32%	32%	27%	47%					22%	99%
2017	32%	33%	26%	44%						98%
2015	17%	19%	13%	16%						
2016		18%		13%						
		2070								
2015	15%	16%	15%	23%					11%	93%
									1170	2270
	2015 2016 2017 2015 2016 2017 2015 2016 2017 2015 2016 2017	2015 54% 2016 53% 2017 52%  2015 38% 2016 38% 2017 37%  2015 11% 2016 12% 2017 12%  2015 34% 2016 32% 2017 32%  2015 17% 2016 15% 2017 17%  2015 17% 2016 15% 2017 17%	2015       54%       54%         2016       53%       53%         2017       52%       52%         2015       38%       46%         2016       38%       47%         2017       37%       44%         2015       11%       13%         2016       12%       15%         2017       12%       14%         2015       34%       37%         2016       32%       32%         2017       32%       33%         2015       17%       19%         2016       15%       18%         2017       17%       20%         2015       15%       16%         2016       15%       16%         2016       15%       16%	2015       54%       54%       42%         2016       53%       53%       40%         2017       52%       52%       39%         2015       38%       46%       20%         2016       38%       47%       18%         2017       37%       44%       19%         2015       11%       13%       9%         2016       12%       15%       9%         2017       12%       14%       10%         2015       34%       37%       27%         2016       32%       32%       27%         2017       32%       33%       26%         2015       17%       19%       13%         2016       15%       18%       11%         2017       17%       20%       11%         2015       15%       16%       15%         2015       15%       16%       15%         2016       15%       16%       15%	2016       53%       53%       40%       68%         2017       52%       52%       39%       65%         2015       38%       46%       20%       48%         2016       38%       47%       18%       46%         2017       37%       44%       19%       47%         2015       11%       13%       9%       11%         2016       12%       15%       9%       13%         2017       12%       14%       10%       12%         2015       34%       37%       27%       49%         2016       32%       32%       27%       47%         2017       32%       33%       26%       44%         2015       17%       19%       13%       16%         2016       15%       18%       11%       13%         2017       17%       20%       11%       14%	2015       54%       54%       42%       68%         2016       53%       53%       40%       68%         2017       52%       52%       39%       65%         2015       38%       46%       20%       48%       17%         2016       38%       47%       18%       46%       20%         2017       37%       44%       19%       47%       14%         2015       11%       13%       9%       11%         2016       12%       15%       9%       13%         2017       12%       14%       10%       12%         2017       32%       37%       27%       49%         2016       32%       32%       27%       47%         2016       32%       32%       27%       47%         2017       32%       33%       26%       44%         2015       17%       19%       13%       16%         2016       15%       18%       11%       13%         2016       15%       18%       11%       13%         2017       17%       20%       11%       14%         2016<	2015       54%       54%       42%       68%         2016       53%       53%       40%       68%         2017       52%       52%       39%       65%         2015       38%       46%       20%       48%       17%       96%         2016       38%       47%       18%       46%       20%       98%         2017       37%       44%       19%       47%       14%       93%         2015       11%       13%       9%       11%         2016       12%       15%       9%       13%         2017       12%       14%       10%       12%         2017       34%       37%       27%       49%         2016       32%       32%       27%       47%         2016       32%       33%       26%       44%         2015       17%       19%       13%       16%         2016       15%       18%       11%       13%         2017       17%       20%       11%       14%	2015 54% 54% 42% 68% -18% 2016 53% 53% 40% 68% -19% 2017 52% 52% 39% 65% -19% 2015 38% 46% 20% 48% 17% 96% -28% 2016 38% 47% 18% 46% 20% 98% -31% 2017 37% 44% 19% 47% 14% 93% -30% 2015 11% 13% 9% 11% 2016 12% 15% 9% 13% 2017 12% 14% 10% 12% 2016 32% 32% 27% 47% 2016 32% 32% 27% 47% 2017 32% 33% 26% 44% 2017 32% 33% 26% 44% 2017 32% 33% 26% 44% 2017 32% 33% 26% 44% 2017 32% 33% 26% 44% 2017 32% 33% 26% 32% 27% 47% 2017 32% 33% 26% 44% 2017 32% 33% 26% 32% 27% 47% 2017 32% 33% 26% 32% 27% 47% 2017 32% 33% 26% 44% 2015 15% 15% 16% 15% 23% 2017 17% 20% 11% 14% 2016 15% 15% 20% 20%	2015	2015 54% 54% 42% 68% -18% 99% 20% 2016 53% 53% 40% 68% -19% 99% 21% 2017 52% 52% 39% 65% -19% 99% 19% 2015 38% 46% 20% 48% 17% 96% -28% 100% 15% 2016 38% 47% 18% 46% 20% 98% -31% 100% 15% 2017 37% 44% 19% 47% 14% 93% -30% 100% 15% 2015 11% 13% 9% 11% 2016 12% 14% 10% 12% 22% 22% 2017 32% 33% 26% 44% 49% 20% 40% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 2