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Executive Summary

Connecticut’s Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) peer exchange, held on October 7-8, 2015, in New Britain, Connecticut, was a focused collaboration of stakeholders with common goals related to improving roadway safety within the state. In addition to briefing participants on ongoing safety activities and practices, the peer exchange goals were to:

- Communicate the fatal and serious injury crash types, severity, and their frequencies in Connecticut;
- Introduce the 2016 SHSP Emphasis Areas;
- Increase collaboration and establish new partnerships to enhance the opportunities for safety improvement;
- Clarify and refine effective safety strategies and identify new countermeasures;
- Identify technical, institutional, and/or political obstacles and solutions through the collaboration of multi-disciplinary participants; and
- Provide new ideas and approaches for overcoming SHSP implementation barriers.

The SHSP Steering Committee utilized data analysis findings to support six SHSP Emphasis Areas:

1. Critical Roadway Locations (Roadway Departure and Intersections)
2. Non-motorized Users
3. Driver Behavior (Substance-Involved Driving, Speed, Distracted Driving, and Occupant Protection)
4. Young Drivers
5. Motorcycle Safety
6. Traffic Incident Management

The Connecticut SHSP peer exchange provided a forum for practitioners to highlight their most effective safety practices, share the practices with others, and provide an opportunity to learn from peers and other perspectives. 160 attendees included members from each of the four Es - engineering (both State and local), education, enforcement (both State and local), and emergency medical services - in addition to other disciplines. Participants shared information face-to-face which provided an opportunity to:

- Exchange ideas and information about common challenges, emerging issues, best practices, and lessons learned;
- Make valuable peer contacts that will allow the four Es to work more closely together and share ideas in the future;
- Engage the State’s leadership in the highway safety program;
- Identify current and new champions and recruit new stakeholders; and
- Motivate existing partners and re-energize efforts to reduce the number of fatal and serious injury crashes in Connecticut.

Ultimately, the peer exchange activities will support the development, implementation, and means to evaluate Connecticut’s SHSP. The event served as a tool to collaboratively improve the quality and effectiveness of the SHSP, assist in decision-making, and define the direction for each of the six emphasis areas.

“I have never been approached by so many people to share how great a meeting the Connecticut SHSP peer exchange was.”

- Connecticut DOT Commissioner, Jim Redeker
About the Peer Exchange

On October 7-8, 2015, Connecticut DOT hosted a two-day peer exchange held at the Central Connecticut State University – Institute of Technology and Business Development Center in New Britain, Connecticut. This event focused on the update of Connecticut’s Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) which captures the long-term vision to eliminate fatalities on Connecticut roadways. The peer exchange provided an opportunity for Connecticut safety stakeholders to collaborate on the development of a data-driven, comprehensive plan and establish statewide goals, objectives, strategies, and actions to improve transportation safety in the state.

The event was attended by approximately 160 professionals representing engineering, education, enforcement, and emergency response (EMS) agencies, among others. A full list of attendees from the event is available in Appendix A.

Connecticut’s goals and objectives in holding the peer exchange included:

- Communicate the fatal and serious injury crash types, severity, and their frequencies in Connecticut;
- Introduce the 2016 SHSP Emphasis Areas;
- Increase collaboration and establish new partnerships to enhance the opportunities for safety improvement;
- Clarify and refine effective safety strategies and identify new countermeasures;
- Identify technical, institutional, and/or political obstacles and solutions through the collaboration of multi-disciplinary participants; and
- Provide new ideas and approaches for overcoming SHSP implementation barriers.

The peer exchange featured discussions of national roadway safety perspectives from FHWA, NHTSA, and FMCSA, and the state’s “State of Safety” from Connecticut DOT leadership. Attendees were introduced to the most recent 5-year data analysis trends and emphasis areas, and were encouraged to attend breakout sessions centered on peer discussion of the following emphasis areas: Critical Roadway Locations (Intersections and Roadway Departure), Non-Motorized Road Users, Young Drivers, Driver Behavior (Distracted Driving/Occupant Protection and Speed/Substance-Involved Driving), Motorcyclists, and Traffic Incident Management.

A complete agenda for the peer exchange is presented in Appendix B.

In addition to previously mentioned objectives, the peer exchange was also an opportunity to forge new partnerships with safety stakeholders and identify synergies between those organizations and activities. The peer exchange represented a wide spectrum of disciplines, interests, and markets in which to draw ideas and creative energies, compound previous successes, and improve Connecticut’s state of transportation safety.
Among those attending the peer exchange, the following disciplines or interests were present:

- Educators of older driver training courses
- Trauma center medical staff
- Marketing, outreach, and communication partners
- State and local police
- Emergency responders
- Engineers; representing safety, project development, traffic and operations, etc.
- Local transportation agencies
- Elected officials
- Partner planning agencies
- Transportation safety researchers
- Motorcycle advocacy members
- Personal injury law
- Behavior analysts
- Maintenance Officials

More than 20 new partners indicated at the peer exchange that they were interested in becoming active in specific emphasis area teams.
Preparing and Planning for Connecticut’s SHSP Update and Peer Exchange Event

Background on and Status of Connecticut’s SHSP

In 2006, Connecticut drafted a SHSP in response to the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users’ (SAFETEA-LU) requirement for receiving funding through HSIP. In 2010 and again in 2013, the state analyzed the most current traffic safety data, and SHSP stakeholders were challenged with revamping previous plans. The plans were to be data-driven, include strategies to target the State’s Emphasis Areas, and garner support from highway safety partners.

Preparing for SHSP Update

Connecticut DOT and its contractor studied crash history and trends to identify the most common crash contributors in the state.

For the 2016 SHSP, safety leadership has an opportunity to consider modifying EAs to best fit with the objective of the SHSP to reduce fatalities and severe injuries. The following table illustrates the recommended EAs for the 2016 SHSP, the criteria for each EA’s selection, and the predominant disciplines for each EA.

Table 1. Emphasis Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emphasis Areas</th>
<th>Criteria for Selection</th>
<th>Disciplines Directly Impacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crash History</td>
<td>Emerging Need</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Roadway Locations</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Roadway Departure and Intersections)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-motorized Users</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance-involved Driving</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distracted Driving</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupant Protection</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Drivers</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle Safety</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Incident Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planning for SHSP Peer Exchange

A successful peer exchange starts with the planning process and the formulation of a strong, dedicated, and enthusiastic team of partners and stakeholders to plan and coordinate the event. Attention to detail and the issues at hand play an important role in the success or failure of the proceedings—as does being on time, on target, and on budget.

On October 9, 2014 the SHSP Peer Exchange Planning Committee convened to begin discussing the purpose and objective of the peer exchange and potential dates and locations. Using the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Report 764: Using Peer Exchanges to Improve the Effectiveness of Strategic Highway Safety Plans to guide planning efforts, over the next 12 months the Planning Committee met monthly to progressively define and refine the logistics associated with the event, including:

- Identifying the peer exchange objectives, agenda, and topics.
- Soliciting potential dates and venues.
- Defining the SHSP schedule, including peer exchange planning and SHSP development.
- Inviting speakers, facilitators, and participants.
- Coordinating invitational travel.
- Preparing and distributing a “Save the Date” notification, shown in Figure 1.
- Obtaining e-copies of presentations, Emphasis Area Fact Sheets (included in Appendix C), and supporting materials.
- Planning breakout sessions, including format and topics.
- Discussing logistics associated with registration, meals, handouts, room organization and set up, etc.
- Developing and managing an online registration tool for the purposes of registration ease and tracking capabilities and maintaining the registration website.
- Developing a reception packet for attendees, including a folder with the agenda, note-taking pads, a layout of the location facilities, speaker bios, contact information for all attendees, an evaluation form, and supporting materials.
- Developing, collecting, and analyzing evaluation forms that assessed the quality of speakers, facilitators, and the facility.

SHSP Peer Exchange Planning Committee Meetings were held on:
- October 9, 2014
- December 8, 2014
- January 28, 2015
- February 25, 2015
- March 25, 2015
- May 27, 2015
- June 24, 2015
- July 22, 2015
- August 26, 2015
- September 23, 2015
- October 23, 2015
The Committee developed a “4E” stakeholders list and communicated to potential attendees through email blasts and by asking partner agencies to spread the word using their own communication channels. The communications directed potential attendees to register for the peer exchange online using Eventbrite.com as a registration host.

The Planning Committee was responsible for each detail, consideration, and decision behind the SHSP Peer Exchange in the 12 months leading up to the exchange and during the 2-day event.
Peer Exchange Proceedings
The peer exchange brought together a diverse set of partners and stakeholders to discuss, provide input to, and collaborate about:

- Assess the effectiveness of their SHSP program activities and investment decisions.
- Introduce Emphasis Areas for stakeholder input.
- Provide new ideas and approaches for overcoming SHSP implementation barriers.
- Clarify and refine effective safety strategies and identify new and effective countermeasures.
- Identify technical, institutional, and/or political concerns and potential solutions.
- Increase collaboration and establish new partnerships to enhance the opportunities for safety improvement.
- Provide opportunities for stakeholder and partner networking.
- Continue to engage leadership in the safety program.
- Track performance metrics and continue to save lives and reduce severe injuries.
- Maintain momentum and constantly improve the program.
- Provide guidance in updating, implementing, and evaluating the SHSP document.

The peer exchange included three diverse tracks of information sharing:

- **Plenary sessions with speakers and invited guests** who discussed the current state of transportation safety within Connecticut and motivated participants to generate discussion and ideas,
- **Emphasis Area-specific breakout sessions** where interested parties generated strategies and recommendations for the Emphasis Area action plans within the upcoming SHSP, and
- **Networking breaks** where participants were given the opportunity to make lasting connections, between both their and other disciplines that will transcend the peer exchange.

The peer exchange provided an opportunity for the four Es of each emphasis area to share occupation-specific knowledge, build upon past successes, and define the next series of steps to be taken as the SHSP is developed and implemented.

Speakers
The Planning Committee invited guest speakers based on current involvement in improving roadway safety and potential contribution to motivate others to do the same in Connecticut. Speakers were asked to address peer exchange attendees and were given general topics, direction, and presentation lengths to prepare. The following section shows the major exchange segments over the two day event. A complete peer exchange agenda is found in Appendix B.

Welcome and Opening Remarks
Connecticut DOT Deputy Commissioner Anna Barry and Commissioner James Redeker opened the exchange, welcomed attendees, and encouraged participants to make the most of their time and opportunities at the event. Deputy Commissioner Barry served as emcee and moderator of the peer exchange.
Federal Perspective on Safety
Following the welcome and kick-off, several Federal agency partners gave their agency’s national and state perspective on safety, including:

- Amy Jackson-Grove, Federal Highway Administration, Division Administrator
- Michael Geraci, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, New England Regional Administrator
- Christopher Henry, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Division Administrator

State of Safety

Lunch Speakers
Brian Chandler, Leidos Safety Program Director, spoke during lunch on the first day, informing attendees of Connecticut’s Crash Data Overview and Emphasis Areas. For many, this was their first opportunity to understand the crash types occurring on Connecticut’s roads and learn how crashes contributed in determining the 2016 SHSP Emphasis Areas.

Ted Minall, the Region 1 Law Enforcement Liaison for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, addressed attendees on how they can Work Together to Reduce Unrestrained Crashes during lunch on the exchange’s second day.

Keynote Speaker
The keynote speaker was Timothy Hollister, a teen driving safety advocate, who lost his son Reed in a car crash. Tim spoke about the Impertinent Questions about Safe Driving and how parents can get involved in preparing their children for the responsibility of driving.

Panel Discussion
The closing session related to shaping “Creative Partnerships” and was moderated by Craig Allred from FHWA’s Resource Center on Safety and Design. This session included panelists with perspectives from a local transportation agency, a trauma center, transportation safety research, and older drivers.

Breakout Sessions (Emphasis Areas)
Two breakouts sessions were held for each of the six Emphasis Areas, totaling twelve sessions. A brief summary from each Emphasis Areas’ sessions is discussed below, including information about the EA Champion, co-Champion (if applicable), Leidos Liaison, and key topics covered. Detailed breakout session notes and SWOT (strength, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats) analyses are found in Appendix D.
Critical Roadway Locations (Intersections and Roadway Departure)

**Emphasis Area Champion:** Joseph Ouellette

**Leidos Liaison:** Joseph Jones

**Key Discussion Items for Roadway Departure**
- Curbs effect on roadway departure crashes.
- Improve delineation treatments:
  - Object Markers on utility poles.
  - Reflectors on guardrail.
- Improve pavement treatments:
  - Statewide rumble strips on limited access highways.
  - Transverse rumble strips in advance of difficult geometric features.
  - HFST on curves and ramps. Keep an inventory.
  - Improve pavement markings on local roads.
  - Illuminated pavement markings.
  - Wet reflective markings.
- Technological improvements:
  - Lane Departure Warning Systems.

**Key Discussion Items for Intersections**
- Motorcycles are not detected by traffic signal video detection. Improve camera detection.
- Increase left-turn phase in order to help trucks clear the intersection.
- Flashing yellow arrow.
- Roundabouts.

**Key Discussion Items Related to both Areas**
- Use enforcement data in systemic analysis.
- Training and Education (incentive base encouragement)
  - Defensive driving courses.
  - Older driver training courses.
  - Roundabout outreach and marketing.
  - Coordinate between CT Transit and school for bus stop locations.
**Non-Motorized Road Users**

**Emphasis Area Champion:** Melanie Zimyeski  
**Leidos Liaison:** Richard Retting

**Key Discussion Items:**
- The use of data as a key component in receiving Federal funding (Vermont's Bike/Ped Safety Plan was used as an example)

**Legislation**
- Enforce snow removal on sidewalks, thus eliminating the need for pedestrians and school children to walk in the street  
- Use SHSP EA Committee to leverage information and action  
- Get private developers to fund offsite improvements (e.g., rather than fund sidewalk construction in a small cul-de-sac, use the same funds for sidewalk construction on connecting streets)

**Design Changes**
- Utilize Complete Streets policy and implement more complete streets.  
- Offer cities and towns help with sidewalk repair  
- Encourage adoption of municipal master plans for sidewalks  
- Install or replace traffic signals with audible and countdown pedestrian signals  
- Use apps as a monitoring tool for bike/pedestrian traffic  
- Tap into existing DOT monitoring devices to track bike traffic  
- Pursue opportunities for Road Diets; apply for FHWA technical assistance for implementing road diets

**Enforcement**
- Use the presence of law enforcement officers to deter speeding (a major contributor to bike/pedestrian crashes and fatalities)  
- Encourage the use of bike patrol officers

**Education**
- Incorporate bike/pedestrian info into the driver refresher course given through AAA and AARP  
- Insure that bike/pedestrian safety is part of the Physical Education Curriculum in schools (South Windsor, Simsbury already incorporate this into their PE classes)  
- Enlist volunteers and Police bike patrols to educate the public through community based programs  
- Continue to educate crossing guards (refresher classes) on the proper way to cross the street (no diagonal crossing)  
- Use local Boards' of Education as an educational tool to highlight the benefits and safety of walking and biking to school  
- Offer EMT classes to organized cycling groups and clubs
Outreach Campaigns

- Use social media, posting surveys, or pop quizzes that incorporate bike/pedestrian safety
- Provide technical assistance through the CTDOT to towns and municipalities
- Study university bicycle/pedestrian safety plans (UConn was used as an example)
- Change culture/perception with regard to cyclists and pedestrians (ex. "roads are for cars", "children aren't safe walking or biking to school")
- Initiate media campaigns geared to both motorists and bicyclists
- Create a "Hotline" for motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians as a quick reference to changes in laws and overall safety tips
- Work with nonprofits on outreach opportunities (e.g., Center for Latino Progress; Head Start)
- Provide a FHWA link to ped/bike videos developed for specific age groups
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**Driver Behavior**

*Distracted Driving*

**Emphasis Area Champion: Aaron Swanson**
**Leidos Liaison: Karen Sprattler**

**Key Discussion Items:**
- Adjust penalties. The first tier fine should be lowered and the third and fourth tier fines should be increased. Require education for first time offenders.
- Discourage hands-free driving through legislation. Research says distraction is in your head. It doesn’t have to do with you dexterity. The definition of distracted driving should be expanded to include hands free devices.
- Improve outreach and education about changes in distracted driving laws. Use blast texts to remind people to not text while driving and let them know about the changes in the law.
- Get kids to admonish their parents. Teach kids at a young age about the dangers of texting while driving so that they remind their parents to stop texting.
- Convert more intersections to roundabouts - The lowest incidents of distracted driving happened at roundabouts. When people are stopped at a red light, the phone is in their hand.
- Technology is making it easier to drive to the point that drivers get bored. As a result, drivers unconsciously look for distractions.

**Occupant Protection**

**Emphasis Area Champion: Phyllis Difiore**
**Leidos Liaison: Karen Sprattler**

**Key Discussion Items:**
- Improve outreach and education. Add a dollar amount to the “Click it or Ticket.” signs/slogan.
- Target seatbelt advertisement to males between 18-34 years old.
- Increase child passenger safety booster seat regulation to 8 years old.
- Use pediatric personnel to encourage seatbelt laws and reinforce them.
- Institute blanket legislation where everyone in the vehicle must wear a seatbelt.
- Target enforcement at towns that have lower compliance.

**Substance Abuse**

**Emphasis Area Champion: Joe Cristalli**
**Leidos Liaison: Karen Sprattler**

**Key Discussion Items:**
- Enable electronic warranting so that the hospital personal can get the approval to do a blood test and hand it to the police quicker.
- Prescription medication needs to define “heavy machinery” as an “automotive vehicle”.
- Increase funding for law enforcement and for drug recognition experts (DRE) and educate more officers to be DRE certified.
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- Expand general training for law enforcement. Some of the entry policemen are more informed than the older officers.
- Offer a “wet workshop” for policeman to observe potential drivers under the influence of drugs. This is currently done for alcohol but no other drugs.
- Institute legislative hard limits for drugs in the blood in order to increase ease of prosecution.
- Change CT’s open container law from allowing an open container of alcohol in the passenger area of the vehicle to prohibit open containers of alcohol in the passenger area of the vehicle.
- Change engineering stigma that crashes involving drugs or alcohol are not an engineering problem and that there is nothing an engineer can do to reduce crashes.
- Put up mile point signs on the interstate so that when people call in and report drunk driving, they can give their position and enforcement can respond faster and more accurately.

Speed

Emphasis Area Champion: Edmund Hedge
Leidos Liaison: Karen Sprattler

Key Discussion Items:
- Setup automated enforcement (e.g., speed trailers, speed feedback signs) in areas where police officers do not pull offenders over due to safety reasons (e.g., narrow shoulders):
- Collect speed data to help educate the public. Some people complain when there is no problem.
- Increase publicity of enforcement. Take pictures, put them on social media, and increase awareness.
- Look for funding sources other than FHWA.
- High price of tickets may be deterring officers from giving out tickets.
Young Drivers
Emphasis Area Champion: William Seymour
Leidos Liaison: Karen Sprattler

Key Discussion Items:

Education
- Encourage schools to teach drivers education as a yearlong course.
- Develop training material that combines education with kid’s interest.
- Online training and testing is not a good idea because teens will take the test together and cheat.
- Parents don’t know how to train their kid to drive. When the kid asks for keys, the parent should ask the kid where they are going, when they will return, what route they will use, and who they are going with/seeing. Incorporate this message of responsibility into the 2 hour mandatory parent training.
- Develop curriculum/pamphlet/information brochures that can be distributed to schools. Most schools are so busy that when contacted in regards to hosting a program they don’t have the time to listen to understand it nor solicit approval from the principal.

Legislative
- Reinstitute the second written test that teens must take before getting their license. The presence of this test encourages them to focus in class and reinforces what they learned over the permitting processes.
- Increase the mandatory number of hours teens must drive while holding a permit.
- Increase permitting time to 6 months or greater. New drivers need to experience driving in all weather conditions. Conversely, if the permitting timespan is too long, teens will get their hours in and then sit on their permit and not drive for the rest of the months.
- Increase the licensing age to 17.

Enforcement
- Try innovative penalties for teen moving violation offenders and their parents.
  o Revoke their high school parking pass.
  o Revoke license until additional mandatory education is completed.
- The DMV needs to print the graduation stage on the license because cops don’t like doing math. This could be a colored dot next to the DOB. At each stage of graduation, the teen hands in their license and gets a new one for free.

Outreach
- Registration could ask if there will be young drivers driving the car. If so, a piece of information can be sent with the registration to update the parents on the latest laws.
- The average parent does not know about teen brain development. That information is not very available.
- Encourage teenagers to take other modes of transportation.
- Taking advantage of the crash data repository. Create a fact sheet about what is happening in your town in the last 5 years. Create conversation starters with data.
- Engage teens to get input on how to develop messages and effective outreach campaigns.
Motorcycle Safety

Emphasis Area Champion: Nicholas Just
Leidos Liaison: Joe Jones

Key Discussion Items:

Legislation
- Universal helmet law. If universal helmet law is not obtainable, extend helmet requirements to higher-risk groups (e.g., riders cited for certain traffic violations and/or DUI).
- Instate left-turn restrictions
- Mandate insurer discount for ABS-equipped bikes
- DMV to suggest training when owners re-register older motorcycles that have not been ridden in a while.
- Provide incentives for use of head and break light modulators and xenon bulbs for better nighttime illumination.
- Lower Blood Alcohol Concentration limits for motorcyclists (as with CDL).

Enforcement
- Encourage/provide resources for law enforcement to identify and ticket unregistered scooters over 50 cc.
- Improve crash reporting level of detail in order to implement better countermeasures.

Design Changes
- Roundabouts would increase intersection safety for motorcyclists.
- Add netting and delineation to guardrails.
- Add pavement markings to supplement chevrons.
- Improve traffic signal video detection. Many motorcycles are not detected by traffic signal detectors.
- Explore lane sharing. This is legal in some places for speeds under 50 mph and at speed differentials of 15 mph. Some argue it could be safer for the motorcyclist because of shared visibility and shielding in stop-and-go conditions.
- Increase the use of rumble strips. Edge line rumble strips help motorcyclists from departing the roadway. Centerline rumble strips reduce the risk of drivers crossing over into oncoming motorcyclists.

Outreach Campaigns
- “Ride Bright” campaign similar to London’s. Involved advertisements on commercial radio, posters, leaflets and give-away items that encouraged motorcyclists to wear conspicuous clothing and switch headlights on during the daytime.
- “Road Guardian” program. Train riders to be first responders.
- Use VMS boards to display messages during motorcycle awareness month.
Traffic Incident Management

Emphasis Area Champion: Paul Krisavage
Leidos Liaison: Jennifer Atkinson

Key Discussion Items:
- DEMHS (State Police) to take lead role on Traffic Incident Management program
- Expand camera and fiber coverage
- Improve response time for first responders
- Improved traveler information to the general public, more real-time info to drivers
- Increase multidisciplinary training, tabletops, and exercises
- Need for more multidisciplinary training
- Need for understanding of specialty response for HAZMAT, consumer goods, etc.
- Additional work zone TIM plans and provisions
- More public service announcements/education

Networking Breaks

30 minute networking breaks were held both days in the morning and afternoon for attendees to converse and allow time for forging new and renewing existing professional contacts.
Connecticut SHSP Peer Exchange Observations, Evaluations, and Feedback

Evaluation of the means by which the peer exchange was planned and conducted is critical to understanding how to improve upon the next event and SHSP update. At the close of Day 1 and Day 2 peer exchange activities, the Planning Committee met to debrief and discuss “what worked?”, “what didn’t work?”, and provide suggestions for improvement. Additionally, the Committee collected attendee evaluation forms to understand suggestions for improvement from those who the exchange was designed to engage. The evaluation form template is found in Appendix E.

The following sections describe observations from the Planning Committee and results from the evaluations completed by attendees.

Observations by the Planning Committee

The Planning Committee believes that the two objectives of Peer Exchange were accomplished: 1) attendees began crafting Emphasis Area action plans, and 2) attendees were invited to assist in finalizing the Emphasis Area action plans. The Planning Committee received many positive comments, with several saying “I wasn’t going to come to this but I’m glad I did because it was Wow.” For the most part, meeting logistics went smoothly.

The peer exchange had a good cross-section of attendees, which allowed for varying opinions and inputs. Having senior management attendees from several safety partners (CTDOT, Governor’s Highway Safety Office, FHWA, NHTSA, and FMCSA) was helpful and important in showing each agency’s commitment and dedication to improving transportation safety in Connecticut.

The following sections aggregate observations and suggestions by peer exchange topic area.

Planning and Registration

Several modifications related to planning and registering for the peer exchange could help prepare attendees for the event and ensure that a wide array of safety stakeholders was aware of the event and its objectives. Invitees were directed to use an online registration tool to indicate their participation for each breakout session, dietary needs, and any other special requests.

Peer exchange registration website. The registration tool did not allow attendees to indicate if they planned to attend both days or partial days or sessions of the event, which is recommended in the future. This functionality could help aid in determining meal and refreshment quantities during networking breaks or lunch. It worked well to have registrants preselect the sessions they wanted to go to and as result, the size of each breakout room felt right. A number of attendees registered after the deadline, which is typical for this kind of event.

SHSP and peer exchange goals, objectives, and function. While the online registration tool was meant to capture the number of attendees and other planning criteria, in hindsight, the Planning Committee would have liked to use the registration process as a means to introduce prospective attendees to the purpose and function of the SHSP and the objectives of the peer exchange. Several participants mentioned they were not clear on the peer exchange goals.
**Potential invitees.** Despite developing a “4E” stakeholders list, the Planning Committee feels that key stakeholders may have been overlooked. For future events, the Committee plans to widen the canvas and engage other partners earlier, specifically legislators and the commercial vehicle industry. The Planning Committee communicated to potential attendees through email blasts and by relying on partner agencies to spread the word using their own communication channels.

**Participants**
Many of the invitees shared similar viewpoints which may not have allowed discussions to broaden. For example, the young driver breakout session may have benefited from a driving instructor’s perspective. There is an opportunity in future peer exchanges and SHSP activities to specifically target and invite stakeholders with differing viewpoints.

Additionally, having a representative from the Governor’s office attend and potentially speak may have helped communicate the importance of transportation safety in Connecticut and provided an opportunity for media coverage.

**Schedule and Logistics**
The layout of and access to the peer exchange facilities (e.g., building and parking) were not simple on site, but communication prior to the exchange was helpful to direct attendees to where they needed to be. On the first day, someone was stationed in the parking garage directing attendees to the building; however, those attending only the second day navigated to the peer exchange on their own. Once in the building, signing helped direct attendees to the registration floor and room.

**Breaks and networking.** The first day’s morning break was well-utilized and it was evident that participants took advantage of networking time. Shortening the final break on the final day to 15 minutes from 30 minutes helped encourage participants to stay for the final session. For future exchanges, adding a few minutes to change rooms between sessions would be helpful to reduce start-up time. Additionally, facilitators and moderators could be tasked to instruct attendees where the next sessions will be held and shepherd participants to keep the exchange on time.

**Plenary session.** In retrospect, the first day’s morning session was packed with back-to-back speakers, requiring attendees to listen but not participate for several hours. This time may have been better utilized by providing an opportunity for attendees to “perk up” and engage their minds through interactive means, perhaps by inserting a panel-type discussion or breakout session.

**Meals and snacks.** A full buffet style lunch was served on the first day and a boxed lunch was served on the second day. The quantity and variety of food was good. The buffet style lunch generated a long line (though it moved quickly), while the box style lunch moved people through much quicker. For the buffet style lunch, it might have been more efficient to stagger attendees’ meal times. On the other hand, some participants liked the opportunity of additional spontaneous networking created by the long line.
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Speakers, Moderators, and Facilitators

Peer exchange opening and emcee. Deputy Commissioner Barry was a good moderator and kept humor in play, which was a nice touch. She both opened and closed the exchange and was present for all sessions, which led to continuity and relevance of her remarks throughout. In hindsight, the Planning Committee should have asked her to instruct attendees to open the bags they received upon registering and discuss the materials inside.

The speakers giving the Federal perspective worked together a bit before the exchange so that there was some coordination between their speeches.

Keynote speaker. Many attendees felt that Tim Hollister gave an inspirational presentation. Many people at the event thought he was a moving speaker and really liked what he had to say.

Panel discussion with moderator. Craig Allred did a good job of tying the entire event together during the closing panel discussion. During this session, Craig solicited some interplay between the audience and panel and closed with a few unified safety challenges and actions but the panel was largely neglected in the discussion. The members gave an introduction at the beginning but were not given an opportunity during the session to contribute. Additionally, it was a somewhat awkward having the panel facing the audience the entire time. One idea for improvement is to keep a final breakout session, which ties together all of the peer exchange EAs and move the panel discussion to one of the lunches. The lunch period could serve as a time where participants can ask questions of the experts.

Craig stayed for the entire event, listened to the breakout sessions and integrated himself into the peer exchange. When he spoke, he incorporated his experiences at the peer exchange.

The room was set up in a tiered U-shape which helped encourage discussion rather than feeling like a listening-only session. Being the last session of the event, many people had left; the Planning Committee should consider moving up a session like this to be earlier in the schedule next time or separate a panel discussion into its own session rather than combining with the exchange closing.

Need to pre-screen presentations. Ted Minall’s presentation content did not strongly tie to the peer exchange topics; the title was misleading. The material and delivery pushed the limits of appropriateness for a government-sponsored event. Though the Planning Committee suggested topics prior to the exchange, it is a good future practice to pre-screen presentation materials or a speaking outline beforehand. That said, holding this presentation during lunch was the best time for it.

Introducing data and emphasis areas. It was helpful to introduce the data just prior to the breakout sessions, as participants could easily tie the data with Emphasis Area discussions.

Breakout Sessions

Room setup and logistics. Some sessions utilized a classroom-style set up with all the chairs facing the front which didn’t feel conducive to an exchange. Others used a U-shape where everyone faced each other; this felt like it facilitated a better dialogue. A double U-shape (successive rows) was also used and worked out well; people were close together while still facing most of the group. The Planning Committee made a decision to not use microphones in all the rooms; this was mostly successful though a few attendees cited the need for microphones in the larger breakouts.
Breakout kick-off, rules, introductions. Some attendees didn’t understand the overall goals of the breakout session. This could have been easily addressed by adding a short introduction stating how the discussion was to ultimately help kick start and fuel the Emphasis Area Teams, their Action Plans, and the overall SHSP development process in the next six to twelve months. The Roadway Departure background and introduction was well done.

It worked well for session attendees to introduce themselves and state their agency to help frame the discussion; the EA Champions and Leidos Liaisons did not always do the same.

Facilitation. Each breakout session had very different atmospheres which came down to the facilitator; some focused on engaging the audience and creating a discussion style session while others chose to lecture and not elicit participants' involvement or feedback. All sessions were to employ a SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats) analysis. Some facilitators did a good job of describing the purpose of SWOT analysis. Others implemented it without much explanation. Still others did not cover it. Its purpose and usefulness should be emphasized to facilitators in the future.

Attendance and participation. On the first day, core representatives attended the sessions for which they were most familiar. On the second day, attendees branched out which contributed to a diverse perspective and more discussion. Good content came out of the breakout sessions with 20-40 ideas of how to improve safety within their Emphasis Area.

The Incident Management session could have been improved by having less or no opening presentation, having the DOT representative present, and giving attendees a chance to speak. The environment was identified by some participants as unwelcoming and unstructured.

Evaluations and Feedback from Attendees, Presenters, and Facilitators

Attendees were encouraged to share feedback verbally and by submitting a completed evaluation form, for which the template is found in Appendix E. A total of 41 peer exchange evaluations were received, with the following agencies and disciplines represented:
Of the 41 evaluations received, 30 attendees (73 percent) had heard of Connecticut’s SHSP prior to registering for the peer exchange.

Attendees were asked several questions related to their existing or future roles in supporting Connecticut’s SHSP, with 10 of 41 (25 percent) indicating they were already supporting at least one Emphasis Area Team and 20 (50 percent) new stakeholders committing to join an Emphasis Area Team.

The evaluation form instructed attendees to answer the following questions using a five-point scale, where 1 indicated a “low” response and 5 indicated a “high” response. The following table indicates average responses to those questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Average Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did the Peer Exchange meet your expectations?</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate the following elements of the Peer Exchange?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Event</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness of overall experience</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of the networking</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of the breakout sessions</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability of facilitators to stay on time/on target with content</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of event</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand how I will follow up after the Peer Exchange.</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of respondents thought the event was beneficial and enjoyed it.
Attendees were also asked to provide brief comments related to questions related to their expectations and takeaways from the event. These questions and responses are summarized below.

*Was the purpose of the Peer Exchange clearly articulated?*
34 of 41 responses indicated “Yes” with quite a few saying “several times”.

*What aspects of this Peer Exchange did you find to be the most beneficial?*
Networking and breakout sessions were the most frequent responses. Additionally, the following received several responses:

- Dialogues across departments, location, and agencies.
- Diversity of perspectives and disciplines.
- “Realization of other silos that we should be working with.”
- “Exposure to other partners and through their experiences and passion understanding a wider picture in trying to address problems.”
- The entire event!

*What aspects of this Peer Exchange did you find to be the least beneficial?*
Several participants indicated that the Federal Perspective session could have been shortened. With respect to the Emphasis Area breakout sessions, several comments related to the following:

- The breakout sessions were too short.
- The Driver Behavior sessions could have benefited from laying the groundwork for how behaviors fit into the 4Es.
- The Incident Management sessions were too focused on a presentation and less on soliciting group input.

*What related topics would you like to see presented/discussed at future Peer Exchanges?*
Top responses include:

- Work Zones and Work Zone Incidents
- Crash data: quality, availability, accessibility
- Sharing best practices with other DOTs and local agencies
- Involvement of Commercial Vehicles (Truck Association)
- Psychology of driver behavior

When asked how to improve upon the next SHSP Peer Exchange, one attendee said “This [was] my first time; I was simply AMAZED that this even happens. THANK YOU!!!”

*Can you identify one thing from the Peer Exchange that you feel you could use immediately to make a difference in your community or work? If so, briefly describe:*
Many responses indicated they plan to pursue or increase their efforts related to safe teen driving (personally and professionally). Other comments include:

- Using data to inform decision and direction.
- Made great contacts and caught up with previous partners to refresh ideas.
Did you have adequate opportunity to provide inputs on the topics that interest you?
34 of 41 responses indicated “yes”. There was no response from 4 and 3 indicated they did somewhat.

Please add any comments related to the content and structure that could help us in planning future
Peer Exchanges and topics:
1. Share the means to stay engaged in the SHSP update process, including the SHSP website, emails, and newsletters.
2. Break up the morning plenary session with a breakout session or group discussion.
3. Include more lay person attendees and local municipal leaders.
4. Limit breakout sessions to a single topic (e.g., substance abuse was paired with speed).
5. Use microphones in breakout sessions, especially when audience is speaking.
6. Use color-coded name tags for staff working the event for ease of locating, to help answer logistics questions (e.g., location of breakout rooms, etc.).
7. Re-evaluate findings of this exchange to develop more details of an action plan and organize another exchange to explore those details with other state DOTs.
8. Some attendees wanted a longer peer exchange while others wanted shorter.

Overall themes and attendees sentiments varied, based on the “write-in” comments given in the evaluation. Some attendees expressed their desire to have the peer exchange purpose more articulated, while others felt it was explained well. Seven participants expressed their desire for more time in breakout sessions, for networking, or both. Some respondents were curious about how to follow-up after the peer exchange and keep momentum going.

Breakout Session Feedback
Many attendees suggested improvements for the breakout sessions, including conducting the very first session during the morning of the first day amidst the series of speakers. Other general comments received regarding the breakout sessions included:

- Conduct breakout sessions with microphones
- Limit breakout sessions to a single topic
- Plan the breakout sessions with the Emphasis Area leads
- Better state the breakout session objectives. The objective during the first day’s sessions was not clear but Day 2 went better.
- SWOT analyses were good.
- Some sessions had too much speaker or facilitator participation – participant exchange was the best part.

Driver Behavior
A participant attending one or more of the Driver Behavior sessions wanted an explanation of why the behavioral breakouts were split as they were – the attendee expected speeding to be discussed when attending the Distracted/Unbelted session. This comment may explain another attendee’s comment about the breakout session “on Behavior [being the] least beneficial”. One attendee remarked they would like to have had more discussion on the psychology of driver behavior.
**Non-motorized Road Users**
One attendee desired discussion that addressed pedestrian-only issues, meaning those who have no vehicles (permanent pedestrians).

**Traffic Incident Management**
Two comments related to the TIM breakout sessions, in that these sessions had too much speaker contributions and not enough group discussion, and that speakers and/or facilitators lacked knowledge or understanding of how engineering could contribute to solutions.

**Follow-up Actions**
Several attendees desired a discussion related to how participants could follow up after the peer exchange and mentioned that attendees could be informed via the website or newsletter. Other comments centered on sharing ideas and findings of the peer exchange either immediately or soon after the exchange ended. One commenter didn’t understand that they had the ability to contribute to an Emphasis Area team and wrote, “How can a task force or study group be formed?”

One attendee supported the need for more frequent SHSP peer exchanges, while another wanted a recap of the peer exchange goal and next steps once strategies were identified.

**Recommendations for Future Peer Exchanges**
Reflecting on the planning process, peer exchange outcomes, and participant evaluations allowed the Planning Committee to determine several additional strategies or actions that could improve future peer exchanges.

**State peer exchange purpose.** Define and state the peer exchange purpose, objectives, and desired outcomes repeatedly throughout the event, breakout sessions, printed materials, and even during exchange registration via the online registration tool.

**Improve emphasis area dialogue.** Create a recommended script for facilitators to reference throughout the breakout session. The script can include introductory remarks, the purpose of the peer exchange and breakout sessions, and how the information and inputs will be used. The script will also outline a formalized introduction for a panel, if applicable.

**Keep participants engaged before, during, and after the peer exchange.** Create a public site to upload the exchange photos so that the participants can view and add to them. Reduce the number of lectures by either adding an additional breakout session on the first morning or concluding earlier on the second day. State repeatedly how participants can follow-up after the peer exchange by encouraging Emphasis Area Team participation.

Use social media to engage registered and potential attendees before, during, and after the peer exchange. Some attendees tagged the CT SHSP Peer Exchange using Twitter accounts, as shown below:
Improve logistics. Move the lunch presentation forward 15 minutes and end lunch earlier – adding a buffer before the next event - so people have time to get to the after-lunch breakout session. Break up the morning plenary session by introducing a breakout session midway. Move the final breakout session’s panel discussion to lunch time and host it like a question and answer session where the audience can pick the panel members’ minds.

Define roles and expectations. Hold a meeting on both mornings before the peer exchange begins in order to allow the Leidos Liaisons and the EA Champions to meet, introduce themselves, discuss logistics of the session, ask questions, and ensure a designated note taker. Obtain clear direction about facilitator roles for the breakout sessions and communicate this prior to the event.

Incorporate future peer exchange topics. Future topics suggested included:

- Work zone-related incidents
- Law enforcement and education
- Commercial vehicle related crashes and safety
- Education and outreach related to new laws and resources
- Technologies that improve safety

Identify potential future invitees. A few attendees commented on the need to involve other disciplines and partners in future discussions, including:

- Those with no transportation background who can share their “everyone” perspective
- Legislators, especially when discussing fines and citations
- Local government leadership, including mayors, first selectmen, etc.
- Local Technical Assistance Programs (LTAP)
- Commercial vehicle associations
- Other states

The Planning Committee can use the registration roster to help identify gaps in disciplines in order to invite or encourage wider attendance in the future.
Next Steps

Though consensus suggests the peer exchange met its objectives and brought awareness and support for future SHSP actions, there is much left to do as Connecticut shifts into SHSP development and implementation. Immediate next steps for the SHSP development team include the following steps.

Coordinate with Emphasis Area Champions and Liaisons by:

- Conducting meetings among EA Champions, co-chairs, and liaisons to debrief peer exchange breakout sessions.
- Sharing the SHSP Peer Exchange Summary Report and EA breakout session notes and solicit input.
- Defining next steps for EA Teams.

Build Emphasis Area teams by:

- Reconvening existing teams and adding peer exchange participants who expressed an interest in joining specific teams.
- Emailing all peer exchange attendees with follow-up information, including instructions on how they can join Emphasis Area teams.
- Developing EA Team rosters including contacts’ name, agency, physical and email addresses, phone number, and role on team.

Schedule first EA Team meeting by:

- Coordinating among EA Champion, co-chairs, and liaisons to identify date, location, and agenda for first meeting.
- Developing and distributing meeting invitation to those on EA Team rosters and sharing all relevant meeting materials, including agenda and strategies identified during peer exchange.

Begin Emphasis Area Action Plan development by:

- Combing through Emphasis Area breakout session notes to develop individual EA Action Plan frameworks, including strategies, partners, etc.

Begin SHSP update by:

- Developing SHSP annotated outline.
- Initiating SHSP marketing and outreach efforts, including development of an SHSP website.
Appendix A: List of Peer Exchange Attendees
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST NAME</th>
<th>LAST NAME</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd</td>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>AAA Northeast</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lalbert@aaanortheast.com">lalbert@aaanortheast.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Northeastern Connecticut Council of Governments</td>
<td><a href="mailto:samuel.alexander@neccog.org">samuel.alexander@neccog.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Atkinson</td>
<td>Leidos</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jennifer.e.atkinson@leidos.com">jennifer.e.atkinson@leidos.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marisa</td>
<td>Auguste</td>
<td>UConn</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marisa@engr.uconn.edu">marisa@engr.uconn.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Balskus</td>
<td>cdm smith</td>
<td><a href="mailto:balskusj@cdmsmith.com">balskusj@cdmsmith.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delois</td>
<td>Barnes</td>
<td>ConnDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Delois.barnes@ct.gov">Delois.barnes@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin</td>
<td>Baummer</td>
<td>CT DOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:colin.baummer@ct.gov">colin.baummer@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Benson</td>
<td>City of Stamford</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jbenson@stamfordct.gov">jbenson@stamfordct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Berry</td>
<td>ConnDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anna.barry@ct.gov">anna.barry@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Bockus</td>
<td>Town of East Hartford</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tbockus@easthartfordct.gov">tbockus@easthartfordct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Borrup</td>
<td>Injury Prevention Center / CCMC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kborrup@connecticutchildrens.org">kborrup@connecticutchildrens.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridget</td>
<td>Boucaud</td>
<td>VN Engineers, Inc.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bboucaud@vnengineers.com">bboucaud@vnengineers.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Bozak</td>
<td>InfoGroup, Inc.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bozakd@gmail.com">bozakd@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>CT DMV</td>
<td><a href="mailto:donald.bridge@ct.gov">donald.bridge@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Britnell</td>
<td>Connecticut Department of Transportation</td>
<td><a href="mailto:william.britnell@ct.gov">william.britnell@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Buerk</td>
<td>CONREP</td>
<td><a href="mailto:davidbuerk@aol.com">davidbuerk@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Burnham</td>
<td>UConn</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kevin.burnham@comcast.net">kevin.burnham@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Bushee</td>
<td>ConnDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:scott.bushee@ct.gov">scott.bushee@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbin</td>
<td>Cabelus</td>
<td>CT DOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:robbin.cabelus@ct.gov">robbin.cabelus@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale</td>
<td>Call</td>
<td>Westport Police Department</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dcall@westportct.gov">dcall@westportct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Carbone</td>
<td>Clinton Police Department</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jcarbone@clintonct.org">jcarbone@clintonct.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Carey</td>
<td>Fuss &amp; O’ Neill</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jcarey@fando.com">jcarey@fando.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Carlino</td>
<td>Town of Manchester</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mcarlino@manchesterct.gov">mcarlino@manchesterct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Carrier</td>
<td>CRCOG</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jcarriner@crccog.org">jcarriner@crccog.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Casner</td>
<td>Cheshire Fire Rescue</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jcasner@cheshirect.org">jcasner@cheshirect.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Chandler</td>
<td>Leidos</td>
<td><a href="mailto:chandlerbe@leidos.com">chandlerbe@leidos.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil</td>
<td>Chaudhary</td>
<td>PRG Inc.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:neil@preussergroup.com">neil@preussergroup.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>Connecticut Motorcycle Riders Association</td>
<td><a href="mailto:imnamericanwmn@hotmail.com">imnamericanwmn@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>Leidos</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jacquelyn.b.clark@leidos.com">jacquelyn.b.clark@leidos.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose</td>
<td>Claudio</td>
<td>Somers Police</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lt.claudio@somersct.gov">lt.claudio@somersct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td>ConnDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:philip.cohen@ct.gov">philip.cohen@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ned</td>
<td>Connell</td>
<td>Southeastern Connecticut Council of Governments</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nconnell@seccog.org">nconnell@seccog.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Connors</td>
<td>CTDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Michael.Connors@ct.gov">Michael.Connors@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Cristalli</td>
<td>Connecticut Department of Transportation</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Joseph.cristalli@ct.gov">Joseph.cristalli@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehul</td>
<td>Dalal</td>
<td>Connecticut Department of Public Health</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mehul.dalal@ct.gov">mehul.dalal@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mario</td>
<td>Damiata</td>
<td>UCONN</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mario.damiata@ct.gov">mario.damiata@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hal</td>
<td>Decker</td>
<td>Connecticut DOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:harold.decker@ct.gov">harold.decker@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Del Rio</td>
<td>RBA Group</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gdelrio@rbagroup.com">gdelrio@rbagroup.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>Hartford Police Department</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dianm001@hartford.gov">dianm001@hartford.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>DiBiasi</td>
<td>CTDOT - OSTA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:john.dibiasi@ct.gov">john.dibiasi@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis</td>
<td>DiFiore</td>
<td>CT Department of Transportation</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Phyllis.DiFiore@ct.gov">Phyllis.DiFiore@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST NAME</td>
<td>LAST NAME</td>
<td>AGENCY</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick</td>
<td>DiNardi</td>
<td>ConnDot</td>
<td><a href="mailto:frederick.dinardi@ct.gov">frederick.dinardi@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Farmington Valley Trails Council</td>
<td><a href="mailto:President@fvgreenway.org">President@fvgreenway.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Duncan</td>
<td>Stafford Police</td>
<td><a href="mailto:duncan@staffordct.org">duncan@staffordct.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn</td>
<td>Faraci</td>
<td>CT Dept. Of Transportation</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kathryn.faraci@ct.gov">kathryn.faraci@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natasha</td>
<td>Fatu</td>
<td>CT-DOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:natasha.fatu@ct.gov">natasha.fatu@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Fielder</td>
<td>ConnDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:susan.fiedler@ct.gov">susan.fiedler@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>Town of Durham</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lfrancis@townofdurhamct.org">lfrancis@townofdurhamct.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxane</td>
<td>Fromson</td>
<td>CTDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:roxane.fromson@ct.gov">roxane.fromson@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>Fry</td>
<td>Greater Hartford Transit District</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sfry@ghtd.org">sfry@ghtd.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. J.</td>
<td>Fusaro</td>
<td>Groton</td>
<td><a href="mailto:LFusaro@groton-ct.gov">LFusaro@groton-ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy</td>
<td>Gallagher</td>
<td>Stamford Police Department</td>
<td><a href="mailto:AGallagher@StamfordCT.gov">AGallagher@StamfordCT.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Gavallas</td>
<td>Watertown</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tgavallas@watertownctpd.org">tgavallas@watertownctpd.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Geraci</td>
<td>NHTSA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:michael.geraci@dot.gov">michael.geraci@dot.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Gomez</td>
<td>VN ENgineers, Inc.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rgomez@vnengineers.com">rgomez@vnengineers.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Grasso</td>
<td>UConn/CTSRC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:grasso@engr.uconn.edu">grasso@engr.uconn.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Harley</td>
<td>ConnDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Thomas.Harley@ct.gov">Thomas.Harley@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Harlow</td>
<td>CTDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:charles.harlow@ct.gov">charles.harlow@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>VHB</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dhead@vhb.com">dhead@vhb.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Hedge</td>
<td>CT DOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Edmund.hedge@ct.gov">Edmund.hedge@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Transportation - Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration</td>
<td><a href="mailto:christopher.henry@dot.gov">christopher.henry@dot.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Hill</td>
<td>CTDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:scott.hill@ct.gov">scott.hill@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Holden</td>
<td>Town of West Hartford</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kim.holden@westhartfordct.gov">kim.holden@westhartfordct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Hollister</td>
<td>Teen Safety Advocate</td>
<td><a href="mailto:123@gmail.com">123@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Holmes</td>
<td>CT DOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:paul.holmes@ct.gov">paul.holmes@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Hoyle</td>
<td>CT Cycling Advancement Program</td>
<td><a href="mailto:david@ctcyclingadvancement.com">david@ctcyclingadvancement.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene</td>
<td>Interlandi</td>
<td>Connecticut Department of Transportation</td>
<td><a href="mailto:e.gene.interlandi@ct.gov">e.gene.interlandi@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>UConn/CTSRT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:e.jackson@eng.uconn.edu">e.jackson@eng.uconn.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Jackson-Grove</td>
<td>Federal Highway Administration</td>
<td><a href="mailto:amy.jackson-grove@dot.gov">amy.jackson-grove@dot.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik</td>
<td>Jarboe</td>
<td>ConnDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:erik.jarboe@ct.gov">erik.jarboe@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Leidos</td>
<td><a href="mailto:joseph.g.jones@leidos.com">joseph.g.jones@leidos.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick</td>
<td>Just</td>
<td>CT DOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Nicholas.Just@ct.gov">Nicholas.Just@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veera</td>
<td>Karukonda</td>
<td>City of Stamford</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vkarukonda@stamfordct.gov">vkarukonda@stamfordct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>Bike Walk Connecticut</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kelly.kennedy@bikewalkct.org">kelly.kennedy@bikewalkct.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleen</td>
<td>Kissane</td>
<td>Connecticut Department of Transportation</td>
<td><a href="mailto:colleen.kissane@ct.gov">colleen.kissane@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karthik</td>
<td>Konduri</td>
<td>University of Connecticut</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kkonduri@engr.uconn.edu">kkonduri@engr.uconn.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johanna</td>
<td>Krebs</td>
<td>MADD CT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:johanna.krebs@madd.org">johanna.krebs@madd.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Krisavage</td>
<td>IBI Group/ConnDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:paul.k@snnet.net">paul.k@snnet.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>Kwentoh</td>
<td>CTDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ANTHONY.KWENTOH@CT.GOV">ANTHONY.KWENTOH@CT.GOV</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garry</td>
<td>Lapidus</td>
<td>Connecticut Children's Medical Ctr</td>
<td><a href="mailto:glapidu@connecticutchildrens.org">glapidu@connecticutchildrens.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brent</td>
<td>Leveille</td>
<td>AARP</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bbleveille@gmail.com">bbleveille@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST NAME</td>
<td>LAST NAME</td>
<td>AGENCY</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erika</td>
<td>Lindeberg</td>
<td>ConnDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:erika.lindeberg@ct.gov">erika.lindeberg@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliet</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Connecticut Department of Transportation</td>
<td><a href="mailto:juliet.little@ct.gov">juliet.little@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Livingston</td>
<td>CT Department of Transportation</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stephen.livingston@ct.gov">stephen.livingston@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mya</td>
<td>Lombardi</td>
<td>Connecticut Motorcycle Riders Association</td>
<td><a href="mailto:imnamericanwmn@hotmail.com">imnamericanwmn@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmine</td>
<td>Lombardi</td>
<td>Connecticut Motorcycle Riders Association</td>
<td><a href="mailto:imnamericanwmn@hotmail.com">imnamericanwmn@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Lorenzetti</td>
<td>University of Connecticut Technology Transfer Center</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lorenzetti@engr.uconn.edu">lorenzetti@engr.uconn.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica</td>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>Yale-New Haven Hospital</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Monica.Lucas@ynhh.org">Monica.Lucas@ynhh.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Lussier</td>
<td>ConnDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kenneth.lussier@ct.gov">kenneth.lussier@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>MacNamara</td>
<td>Fairfield Police Department</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gmacnamara@fairfieldct.org">gmacnamara@fairfieldct.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Makuch</td>
<td>CT DOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mark.makuch@ct.gov">mark.makuch@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sha</td>
<td>Mamun</td>
<td>University of Connecticut</td>
<td><a href="mailto:msm08014@engr.uconn.edu">msm08014@engr.uconn.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacey</td>
<td>Manware</td>
<td>Judicial Branch</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stacey.manware@jud.ct.gov">stacey.manware@jud.ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Margiotta</td>
<td>GM2 Associates</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tony.margiotta@gm2inc.com">tony.margiotta@gm2inc.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jillian</td>
<td>Massey</td>
<td>CRCOG</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jmassey@crco.org">jmassey@crco.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Maziarz</td>
<td>ConnDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Thomas.maziarz@ct.gov">Thomas.maziarz@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>McAllister</td>
<td>Naugatuck Police</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cmcallister@naugatuckpd.org">cmcallister@naugatuckpd.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>McCarthy</td>
<td>UCONN CT Technology Transfer Center</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mary@engr.uconn.edu">mary@engr.uconn.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gina</td>
<td>Medico</td>
<td>Connecticut Motorcycle Riders Association</td>
<td><a href="mailto:imnamericanwmn@hotmail.com">imnamericanwmn@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Meyer</td>
<td>Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cmeyer@nvcoct.gov">cmeyer@nvcoct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>Minall</td>
<td>Contracted to NHTSA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tedbb@aol.com">tedbb@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene</td>
<td>Nichols</td>
<td>State of CT Department of Public Health</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eugene.nichols@ct.gov">eugene.nichols@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Nielsen</td>
<td>Naugatuck Valley COG</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mnielsen@nvcoct.org">mnielsen@nvcoct.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alyssa</td>
<td>Norwood</td>
<td>Connecticut’s Legislative Commission on Aging</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alyssa.norwood@cga.ct.gov">alyssa.norwood@cga.ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>O’Brien</td>
<td>West Haven Fire Department</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jobrien@westhavenfiredept.com">jobrien@westhavenfiredept.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernie</td>
<td>Orgera</td>
<td>City of Stamford</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eorgera@stamfordct.gov">eorgera@stamfordct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Oshea</td>
<td>Precision Services</td>
<td><a href="mailto:barneybudd@yahoo.com">barneybudd@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Ouellette</td>
<td>CTDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:joseph.ouellette@ct.gov">joseph.ouellette@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil</td>
<td>Pade</td>
<td>Town of Canton</td>
<td><a href="mailto:NPade@townofcantonct.org">NPade@townofcantonct.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>Pang</td>
<td>Conn DOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:julia.pang@ct.gov">julia.pang@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Parmenter</td>
<td>AAA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aparmenter@aaa-alliedgroup.com">aparmenter@aaa-alliedgroup.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiah</td>
<td>Patten</td>
<td>Connecticut Department of Transportation</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kiah.patten@ct.gov">kiah.patten@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Peay</td>
<td>Conn-DOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:james.peay@ct.gov">james.peay@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Petzold</td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mary.petzold@ct.gov">mary.petzold@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Pichnarcik</td>
<td>Cheshire Police Department</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bpichnarcik@cheshirect.org">bpichnarcik@cheshirect.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>Pickering</td>
<td>Western Connecticut Council of Governments</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fpickering@westcoct.org">fpickering@westcoct.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>ConnDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jordan.pike@ct.gov">jordan.pike@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mani</td>
<td>Poola</td>
<td>City of Stamford</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mpoola@stamfordCT.gov">mpoola@stamfordCT.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Pothering</td>
<td>Connecticut Department of Transportation</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ryan.pothering@ct.gov">ryan.pothering@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Prosi</td>
<td>WestCOG</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sprosi@westcoct.org">sprosi@westcoct.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie</td>
<td>Raboin</td>
<td>Preusser Research Group, Inc.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kraboin@preussergroup.com">kraboin@preussergroup.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Registration List (Updated 9/28/2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST NAME</th>
<th>LAST NAME</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Ramirez</td>
<td>Federal Highway Administration</td>
<td><a href="mailto:robert.ramirez@dot.gov">robert.ramirez@dot.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Raposa</td>
<td>AAA Northeast</td>
<td><a href="mailto:draposa@aaanortheast.com">draposa@aaanortheast.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Redeker</td>
<td>ConnDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:james.redeker@ct.gov">james.redeker@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Retting</td>
<td>Sam Schwartz Engineering</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rretting@samschwartz.com">rretting@samschwartz.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Ricozzi</td>
<td>CT DOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:barbara.ricozzi@ct.gov">barbara.ricozzi@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy</td>
<td>Riedl</td>
<td>Highway Safety Corp</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rriedl@highwaysafety.net">rriedl@highwaysafety.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Rigdon</td>
<td>Leidos</td>
<td><a href="mailto:HEATHER.M.RIGDON@leidos.com">HEATHER.M.RIGDON@leidos.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Rio</td>
<td>CT DMV</td>
<td><a href="mailto:james.rio@ct.gov">james.rio@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andre</td>
<td>Rosedale</td>
<td>Norwich Police Department</td>
<td><a href="mailto:amv@norwichpolice.org">amv@norwichpolice.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerry</td>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>State of CT - DOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kerry.ross@ct.gov">kerry.ross@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Schilke</td>
<td>CT Main Street Center</td>
<td><a href="mailto:christine@ctmainstreet.org">christine@ctmainstreet.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tess</td>
<td>Schwartz</td>
<td>Town of East Hartford</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tmilkove@easthartfordct.gov">tmilkove@easthartfordct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>Schwartz</td>
<td>Division of Criminal Justice</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Robin.Schwartz@ct.gov">Robin.Schwartz@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc</td>
<td>Scrivener</td>
<td>Willimantic Fire Department</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mscrivener@windhamct.com">mscrivener@windhamct.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Shea</td>
<td>CT Technology Transfer Ctr</td>
<td><a href="mailto:shea@engr.uconn.edu">shea@engr.uconn.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Shooshan-Stoller</td>
<td>FHWA-CT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kenneth.shooshan-stoller@dot.gov">kenneth.shooshan-stoller@dot.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Shuck</td>
<td>Town of Stafford</td>
<td><a href="mailto:schuckr@staffordct.org">schuckr@staffordct.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Silva</td>
<td>Connecticut Department of Transportation</td>
<td><a href="mailto:thomas.silva@ct.gov">thomas.silva@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Slater</td>
<td>Uconn CTSRC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kslater@engr.uconn.edu">kslater@engr.uconn.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Sprattler</td>
<td>Leidos/Sprattler Group</td>
<td><a href="mailto:karen@sprattlergroup.com">karen@sprattlergroup.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Squires</td>
<td>Enfield Police</td>
<td><a href="mailto:msquires@enfield.org">msquires@enfield.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>Town of New Milford</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dstanton@newmilford.org">dstanton@newmilford.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitalij</td>
<td>Staroverov</td>
<td>ConnDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vitalij.staroverov@ct.gov">vitalij.staroverov@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron</td>
<td>Swanson</td>
<td>Connecticut Department of Transportation</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aaron.swanson@ct.gov">aaron.swanson@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Swenson</td>
<td>The RBA Group</td>
<td><a href="mailto:swenson_e@yahoo.com">swenson_e@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Tedesco</td>
<td>CT DOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kevin.tedesco@ct.gov">kevin.tedesco@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terri</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td>Retired Connecticut DOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:territ604@gmail.com">territ604@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>FHWA-CT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:robert.w.turner@dot.gov">robert.w.turner@dot.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyle</td>
<td>Turschman</td>
<td>Kleinfelder</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kturschman@kleinfelder.com">kturschman@kleinfelder.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Veronesi</td>
<td>ConnDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:daniel.veronesi@ct.gov">daniel.veronesi@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Vibert</td>
<td>Towing+Recovery Pro.of CT.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:timvibert@yahoo.com">timvibert@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pina</td>
<td>Violano</td>
<td>Yale-New Haven Hospital</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pina.violano@ynhh.org">pina.violano@ynhh.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Waiculonis</td>
<td>ConnDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:linda.waiculonis@ct.gov">linda.waiculonis@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marissa</td>
<td>Washburn</td>
<td>ConnDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marissa.washburn@ct.gov">marissa.washburn@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Welch</td>
<td>Leidos</td>
<td><a href="mailto:twelch1950@yahoo.com">twelch1950@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Whaley</td>
<td>CT DOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:michael.whaley@ct.gov">michael.whaley@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maribeth</td>
<td>Wojenski</td>
<td>CTDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:maribeth.wojenski@ct.gov">maribeth.wojenski@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>Yannes</td>
<td>Tighe &amp; Bond</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cdyannes@tighebond.com">cdyannes@tighebond.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Zapatka</td>
<td>CTDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Patrick.Zapatka@ct.gov">Patrick.Zapatka@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie</td>
<td>Zimyeski</td>
<td>CTDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Melanie.Zimyeski@ct.gov">Melanie.Zimyeski@ct.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Zulick</td>
<td>Town of Stafford</td>
<td><a href="mailto:publicworks@staffordct.org">publicworks@staffordct.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Peer Exchange Agenda
# AGENDA - DAY 1

## Wednesday, October 7, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Speaker(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 a.m. – 8:30 a.m.</td>
<td>Registration and Light Continental Breakfast</td>
<td>Deputy Commissioner Anna Barry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 a.m. – 8:45 a.m.</td>
<td>Welcome</td>
<td>Commissioner James Redeker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45 a.m. – 9:15 a.m.</td>
<td>Opening Remarks</td>
<td>Amy Jackson-Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Geraci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NHTSA New England Regional Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Federal Perspective on Safety</td>
<td>Christopher Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FMCSA Division Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.</td>
<td>Networking Break</td>
<td>Thomas Harley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bureau Chief, CTDOT Engineering &amp; Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.</td>
<td>State of Safety</td>
<td>Thomas Maziarz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Governor’s Highway Safety Representative; Bureau Chief, CTDOT Policy &amp; Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.</td>
<td>LUNCH Lunchtime Presentation</td>
<td>Brian Chandler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leidos Safety Program Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.</td>
<td>BREAKOUT SESSIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critical Roadway Locations Emphasis Area (Intersections and Roadway Departure)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-motorized Road Users Emphasis Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Networking Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.</td>
<td>BREAKOUT SESSIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Driver Behavior Emphasis Area (Distracted Driving and Occupant Protection)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motorcyclists Emphasis Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic Incident Management Emphasis Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 p.m. – 4:45 p.m.</td>
<td>Preview of Day 2</td>
<td>Deputy Commissioner Anna Barry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## AGENDA - DAY 2

### Thursday, October 8, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Speaker(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 a.m. – 8:30 a.m.</td>
<td>Registration and Light Continental Breakfast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8:30 a.m. – 8:45 a.m. | Welcome  
                    Day 1 Recap  
                    Overview of Day 2                          | Deputy Commissioner Anna Barry                                               |
| 8:45 a.m. – 9:30 a.m. | Keynote Speaker                                                                                  | Timothy Hollister  
                                                        Teen Safety Advocate          |
| 9:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m. | NETWORKING BREAK                                                                                     |                                                                              |
| 10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m. | BREAKOUT SESSIONS                                                                                       |  
                                                        Critical Roadway Locations Emphasis Area (Intersections and Roadway Departure)  
                                                        Young Drivers Emphasis Area                                                 
                                                        Motorcyclists Emphasis Area                                                 |
| 11:30 a.m. – 12:45 p.m. | LUNCH  
                    Lunchtime Presentation                                                        | Ted Minall  
                                                        Law Enforcement Liaison  
                                                        NHTSA Region 1                                                            |
| 12:45 p.m. – 2:15 p.m. | BREAKOUT SESSIONS                                                                                       |  
                                                        Non-motorized Road Users Emphasis Area                                      
                                                        Driver Behavior Emphasis Area (Speed and Substance Abuse)                   
                                                        Traffic Incident Management Emphasis Area                                  |
| 2:15 p.m. – 2:45 p.m. | NETWORKING BREAK                                                                                     |                                                                              |
| 2:45 p.m. – 4:15 p.m. | Creative Partnerships                                                                              | Moderator:  
                                                        Craig Allred  
                                                        FHWA Resource Center on Safety and Design  
                                                        Panelists:  
                                                        • Mark Carlino  
                                                        Town of Manchester  
                                                        • Dr. Pina Violano  
                                                        Yale-New Haven Hospital  
                                                        • Dr. Eric Jackson  
                                                        Connecticut Transportation Safety Research Center  
                                                        • Brent Leveille  
                                                        AARP Connecticut |
| 4:15 p.m. – 4:30 p.m. | Closing Comments and Adjourn                                                                        | Deputy Commissioner Anna Barry                                               |
Appendix C: Emphasis Area Fact Sheets
The dangers commonly associated with traffic incidents are obvious: emergency workers are placed in close proximity to live traffic, and highway users in the vicinity are exposed to conditions outside of their normal expectations. The latter often leads to secondary crashes in addition to the initial incident. There may also be indirect threats associated with traffic incidents. Among these are hazardous material spills and health threats posed by damaged cargo.

NATIONWIDE, there are several strategies in place to support safe and efficient traffic incident management (TIM):

- **PARTNERSHIPS**: Participation in State, regional, and local programs.
- **MULTIDISCIPLINARY TRAINING**: Thorough cross-training on scene roles and responsibilities.
- **PERFORMANCE**: Measurement of TIM performance at all levels.
- **TECHNOLOGY**: Promotion of affordable and useful TIM technologies.
- **DESIGN**: Incorporation of features to facilitate emergency vehicle and traffic movement.
- **EDUCATION**: Teaching motorists responsibility in negotiating incidents and preventing secondary crashes.
- **‘MOVE OVER’ LAWS**: Requirement for motorists to provide a buffer for emergency responders.
- **COMMUNICATIONS**: Use of prompt notifications, shared data networks, broadband communications, traveler information systems, and media partnerships.
- **INTERAGENCY COOPERATION**: Preparation before a crash, cooperation on the scene, and interagency debriefings after the event.
- **TRAINING**: Broad spectrum training of responders before they begin field work.

CONNECTICUT has identified a number of strategies in previous strategic highway safety plans:

- **INTERAGENCY COOPERATION**: Preparation before a crash, cooperation on the scene, and interagency debriefings after the event.
- **QUICK CLEARANCE**: Removal of crash victims and vehicles from the roadway as soon as practicable.

**By the numbers**

3,434

Secondary crashes in CT from 2005-12

18%

US fatal crashes that are secondary crashes

---

1 Crash Data 2005-2012, By Vehicle Maneuver, Connecticut Department of Transportation, Hartford, CT: 2012
As fatalities associated with motorcycles continue to mount, increasing attention is being focused on the problem both in the United States and worldwide. While there are inherent dangers associated with operating a vehicle of this type, there are a number of countermeasures that can or have been deployed to assuage that risk.

**NATIONWIDE:**

- "RIDE BRIGHT" – Encouragement of high-visibility apparel and equipment for riders.
- "LOOK TWICE" – National campaign to encourage greater driver perception of cyclists.
- HELMET LAWS – Legal requirement of helmet use.
- INFRASTRUCTURE – Forgiving pavements and roadside hardware, and road safety audits geared toward motorcycles.
- EDUCATION – Training and outreach for both riders and drivers.
- EQUIPMENT – Improvements in motorcycle performance and rider equipment.
- COMMUNICATION – Warning motorcyclists of potentially hazardous roadway conditions.

**CONNECTICUT:**

- RIDER TRAINING – Mandatory training before a rider can be licensed.
- MINORS HELMET LAW – Helmet use required for riders under age 18.
- OUTREACH – Supporting rider safety in cooperation with motorcycle dealerships.

**Motorcycles** represent only a small percentage of all registered vehicles in the United States and are responsible for an even smaller portion of vehicle miles traveled. In spite of that, they are involved in nearly one sixth of all fatal crashes. The situation is complicated by the fact that motorcycle ownership, rider age, and inattentive driving are all increasing, while rider experience decreases. If ignored, the overrepresentation of motorcycle fatalities may worsen.

**By the numbers**

- 44% 10-year increase in motorcycle fatalities compared to all vehicular fatalities
- $12B Annual economic burden in the US from motorcycle crash-related injuries and deaths
- 781 Additional motorcyclist lives that could be saved in the US if all riders wore helmets

---

Highway agencies have been shielding roadside obstacles and steep slopes since the 1930s and 40s. In the 1960s, the focus began to shift toward forgiving roadsides: free of fixed objects and steep slopes. Today, the tide is turning toward keeping drivers from leaving their lanes. There are a number of countermeasures that support these concepts.

**ROADWAY DEPARTURES.** If a driver is able to keep a vehicle within its lane of travel, the chances of a severe crash occurring decrease dramatically. In fact, roadway departures account for more than half of all fatal crashes in the United States. Much has been accomplished to decrease the risks of roadway departures over the past eight decades, and that work continues today with new technologies and methods being developed each year.

**NATIONWIDE:**

- **SHIELDING:** Barriers, guardrails, and guard cables that decrease the probability of striking a fixed object.
- **TERMINALS:** Devices that absorb energy or conduct vehicles harmlessly through a barrier end crash.
- **BREAKAWAY:** Intentionally weakening sign, light, and other support structures to lower impact severity.
- **CLEAR ZONES:** Building and maintaining adjacent areas that are free of fixed objects and steep slopes.
- **SURFACE TREATMENTS:** Hard, durable aggregates bonded to the roadway surface to increase tire friction and reduced sliding.
- **VISIBILITY:** Wider, brighter markings, edge delineators, and signs that clearly mark the edges of lanes and shoulders.
- **RUMBLE STRIPS:** Series of depressions milled into a lane edge that produce an audible and vibratory warning to errant drivers.
- **SAFETY EDGE:** Bevel formed into the edge of the pavement structure during construction allowing errant traffic to regain the roadway.
- **DURABLE MARKINGS:** High visibility markings installed in grooves for longer reflective life.
- **RUMBLE STRIPS:** Series of depressions milled into edge lines that produce audible and vibratory warnings to errant drivers on limited access highways. Centerline rumble strips may also be used to warn of imminent crossovers on certain roadways.
- **PRESERVATION:** Strategic program of diagnosis, treatment and observation of roadside hardware in place.
- **OUTREACH:** Partnering with local agencies to enhance pavement markings and curve delineation on their system.
- **CIRCUIT RIDER:** Safety expert available for on-site assistance to local agencies, as needed.

**CONNECTICUT:**

- **EDUCATION:**
- **ENFORCEMENT:**
- **ENGINEERING**

---

Intersections present inherently elevated crash risks as they are, by their very nature, points of planned conflict. It’s not surprising then, that intersections account for a relatively high percentage of all fatal and serious injury crashes. Besides direct safety risks, poorly planned and operated intersections can cause congestion during peak hours, which in turn can cause secondary safety issues upstream.

Intersections represent some of the most complex traffic environments that road users will ever negotiate. There are, however, a number of proven countermeasures—of varied complexity—that can be deployed to increase intersection safety.

**NATIONWIDE:**
- **OUTREACH:** Educating intersection users on the risks of red light running, excessive speeds, proper pedestrian operation, etc.
- **AUTOMATED ENFORCEMENT:** Constant electronic monitoring and documentation of traffic violations at intersections.
- **PEDESTRIAN ACCOMMODATIONS:** Revising intersection operation or layout to protect their most vulnerable users.
- **SIGHT DISTANCE:** Maximizing the opportunity for users to detect potential conflicts by maintaining clear sight lines.
- **ACCESS MANAGEMENT:** Optimizing safety and operations by managing the number and spacing of intersections along a roadway.
- **GEOMETRY:** Building or revising all or part of an intersection to increase its safety and efficiency.
- **ROUNDABOUT:** Significantly reducing conflict points by eliminating direct through movements and encouraging continuous flow.

**CONNECTICUT:**
- **STOP SIGNING AWARENESS:** Increased conspicuity of stop condition through oversized signing and post delineation.
- **SIGNAL PROGRAMMING:** Retiming all yellow, red, and pedestrian clearance intervals on state maintained signals.
- **VISIBILITY:** Increasing the awareness of intersection presence through use of retro-reflectorized signal backplates for newly constructed signals.
- **ROUNDABOUT:** Significantly reducing conflict points by eliminating direct through movements and encouraging continuous flow.
- **CIRCUIT RIDER:** Safety expert available for on-site assistance to local agencies, as needed.

**By the numbers**
- **55%** Fatal and serious injury crashes in CT occurring at intersections.¹
- **96%** Intersection crashes in the US where critical cause was due to driver²

Reducing pedestrian and bicyclist crashes is a main goal. Connecticut’s pedestrian and cyclist safety efforts can benefit from implementing a number of proven countermeasures.

**NATIONWIDE:**
- **REFUGE ISLANDS:** Shown to reduce risk of pedestrian–vehicle crashes by roughly 50%.
- **EXCLUSIVE SIGNALS:** Risk of pedestrian crashes for intersections with exclusive timing was approximately half that of intersections with standard pedestrian signals.
- **INCREASED LIGHTING:** Increasing the intensity of street lighting has been shown to reduce nighttime pedestrian crashes by 50%.
- **ROUNDABOUTS:** Significantly reduce pedestrian and motor vehicle crashes.
- **SPEED CONTROL:** Reduce motor vehicle speeds in urban and suburban areas.
- **AUTOMATED ENFORCEMENT:** Constant monitoring and citation of red light running and speeding.
- **DEDICATED FACILITIES:** Installation of separated bike lanes, where feasible.
- **BICYCLE HELMETS:** Estimated to reduce the odds of head injury by 50%.
- **OUTREACH:** Promote *Share the Road* message to all road users.

**CONNECTICUT:**
- **DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES:** Improving the drivers’ manual to educate motorists on safe operation around bicyclists and pedestrians.
- **OUTREACH:** Promote *Share the Road* message to all road users.
- **EDUCATION:** Pedestrian/bicycle safety instruction for communities.

---

Strong enforcement of impaired driving laws, training of law enforcers, technology, and public education efforts are key. Consistent chemical testing of all drivers involved in fatal and serious injury crashes is critical to understanding the problem and developing targeted solutions.

NATIONWIDE:
- **HIGH VISIBILITY ENFORCEMENT:** Aggressive impaired driving enforcement to include sobriety checkpoints and primary seat belt laws.
- **LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING:** Standardized Field Sobriety Testing (SFST), Advanced Roadside Impaired Driving Enforcement (ARIDE), and the Drug Evaluation Classification Program / Drug Recognition Expert (DECP/DRE) prepare officers to recognize driver impairment.
- **IGNITION INTERLOCKS:** Technological solution that prevents driving after drinking –has proven effective in reducing DUI recidivism.
- **CHEMICAL TESTING:** Testing for the presence of alcohol and/or drugs in all drivers involved in fatal and serious injury crashes.
- **OUTREACH:** Informing motorists of the risks of impaired driving and supporting enforcement efforts.

CONNECTICUT1:
- **ENFORCEMENT:** Grant funding issued to communities based upon the evaluation of 5-year passenger vehicle injury crash data.
- **LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING:** Strong encouragement of grantee agencies to be trained in SFST. ARIDE and DRE are also supported.
- **STATUTES:** Mandatory all-offender Ignition Interlock law; in a 2014 survey, 3,314 interlocks were installed in vehicles of DUI offenders; primary seat belt law covers front seat occupants only.
- **OUTREACH:** Paid advertising including TV, radio, Internet, billboards and bus panels support national holiday mobilizations and other DUI high-risk dates like Super Bowl Sunday and St. Patrick’s Day.

Impaired driving continues to be one of the largest contributing factors to fatal and injury crashes across the country. Despite a national reduction in alcohol-impaired driving over the past few decades, current efforts to legalize marijuana in many states have increased the focus on the role of drugged driving on traffic safety.

**By the numbers**2
- 41% Fatal traffic crashes in CT estimated to involve an alcohol-impaired driver (BAC≥0.08)
- 37% Fewer fatally injured drivers tested for alcohol in CT than in the U.S. (45% vs. 71%)
- 45% CT’s fatally injured drinking drivers (BAC≥0.01) that were 21 to 34 year old (23% of licensed drivers)
- 77% CT’s fatally injured drinking drivers (BAC≥0.01) that were killed in single vehicle

---

Efforts to address speed can be challenging for safety advocates and policy makers. As a result, traditional enforcement and public awareness campaigns are the most common strategies used to combat speeding. Technology applications to automate speed enforcement are effective but have less public support.

**NATIONWIDE:**
- **ENFORCEMENT:** High visibility speed enforcement focusing on aggressive drivers and work zones can improve public support for speed enforcement. ¹
- **AUTOMATED ENFORCEMENT:** Electronic monitoring and citation of speeders underway in 138 local jurisdictions, 15 U.S. states and D.C.; 4 states allow speed cameras statewide in work zones. ²
- **INTERACTIVE SIGNING:** Reducing vehicle speeds by alerting drivers to their speed relative to the posted speed limit. These signs can be effective in reducing mean and 85th percentile speeds in a variety of situations. ³
- **OUTREACH:** Public awareness campaigns aimed at slowing down speeding drivers occur in 33 states. ⁴

**CONNECTICUT:**
- **ENFORCEMENT:** Comprehensive high visibility speed enforcement grants fund communities based upon problem identification and data.
- **EQUIPMENT:** Providing speed measuring devices for law enforcement agencies to use during speed enforcement activities.
- **DATA:** Funding a pilot program to collect real time speed data from state and local roadways to address speeding and aggressive driving.
- **TRAINING:** Education and incentives for law enforcement to address excessive speed.

---

Strong enforcement, coupled with supportive public messaging in the national “Click It or Ticket” campaign has been credited with significant increases in seat belt use in virtually every state in the U.S.\(^2\)

### NATIONWIDE:
- **ENFORCEMENT**: Aggressive, high visibility enforcement of seat belt and child safety seat laws.
- **PRIMARY SEAT BELT LAWS**: Seat belt use to be required in all occupant positions. Seat belt use increases when an unrestrained occupant can be cited for that reason alone.\(^3\)

### CONNECTICUT:
- **ENFORCEMENT**: Grant-funded day and nighttime checkpoints and roving/saturation patrols enforce seat belt use during the national “Click It or Ticket” mobilization.
- **DATA ANALYSIS**: Prioritization of grant-funded occupant protection enforcement projects using data on seat belt use, crashes, population and VMT.
- **STATUTES**: Primary seat belt law covers front seat occupants only.
- **OUTREACH**: Paid advertising including TV, radio, Internet, billboards and sports venue ads support national seat belt and child safety seat mobilizations and enforcement emphasis periods.

### By the numbers\(^4\)
- **85%**: Observed seat belt use in CT: lowest level in 10 years
- **35%**: Lower seat belt use by drinking drivers in serious crashes
- **89%**: CT children under age 4 that were restrained

---

   Newington, CT: Connecticut Department of Transportation, 2015.
Distracted driving is not a new highway safety issue. With the advent of technology, driver distraction by electronic devices of all kinds has renewed the concern of highway safety advocates.

Strong enforcement and public education serves to remind drivers to keep their focus on driving. Descriptive crash report form language helps stakeholders better understand the extent and nature of the distraction issue.

**NATIONWIDE¹:**
- **STATUTES:** Primary enforcement laws against distracted driving and texting while driving.
- **BANS:** Prohibition of hand-held mobile phone use—does not itself reduce distraction, but aids enforcement in detection.
- **ENFORCEMENT:** Aggressive enforcement of all laws related to distraction.

**Connecticut²:**
- **STATUTES:** Strong laws against distracted driving and texting while driving, and requiring any mobile phone use to be hands-free.
- **ENFORCEMENT:** Aggressive, grant-funded, high visibility distracted driving enforcement by municipal and state police on both interstate and local roads.

**OUTREACH:**
- Public education and media campaigns—address the dangers and consequences of distracted driving.
- **DATA:** State crash report forms capturing more details of distraction¹.

**By the numbers³**

**up to 60**
Law enforcement agencies that will participate in overtime enforcement of CT’s hand-held mobile phone ban in 2016

**30,000**
Connecticut high school students reached by the “Save A Life” Tour in the 2014-15 academic year

**By the Es**

---

Young (teenage) drivers have the highest crash risk per mile traveled, compared with almost all other drivers (the exception is drivers over 85 years of age).\(^1\) Their crash risk is also substantially higher, especially at low and moderate blood alcohol concentrations (BACs).\(^2\) Graduated driver licensing (GDL) laws reduce the risk for teens and others by making sure young drivers gradually build up driving experience under lower-risk conditions.

Graduated driver licensing (GDL) laws reduce the risk for teens and others by making sure young drivers gradually build up driving experience under lower-risk conditions as they mature and develop skills. GDL laws, in conjunction with driver education, parental involvement, and strong enforcement of key safety laws are important strategies for keeping teens safe.

### NATIONWIDE:
- **GRADUATED DRIVER LICENSING:** Strong laws limit nighttime driving, restrict teen passengers and require supervised driving practice.
- **DRIVER EDUCATION:** Helps teens learn driving skills and the rules of the road.
- **PARENTAL AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT:** Parents and communities are the most important enforcers of GDL laws.
- **ENFORCEMENT:** Aggressive enforcement of GDL, primary seat belt (in all seating positions), distraction and texting laws.
- **OUTREACH:** Public education and awareness for teens and their parents to understand teen driving risks and laws.

### CONNECTICUT\(^3,4\):
- **GRADUATED DRIVER LICENSING:** CT’s strong GDL law requires a safe-driving practices course that includes a two-hour joint parent-teen information class. Any GDL violation can result in a 48-hour suspension of driving privileges.
- **STATUTES:** CT has a primary seat belt law for front seat passengers, a hands-free cell phone law, and an all-age texting law.
- **OUTREACH:** Young driver media campaigns focus on underage drinking and driving and distracted driving.
- **PROGRAMMATIC STRATEGIES:** Parents, teens, school officials, state policymakers, corporate partners and safety advocates have created programs which include “Save a Life Tour”; “Power of Parents, It’s Your Influence” (MADD); the CT DMV-Travelers Teen Safe Driving Video Contest; and hospital injury prevention programs.
- **ENFORCEMENT:** State, federal and corporate grants focus on teen safe driving, underage drinking, and drinking and driving.

### By the numbers\(^5\)

- **50%** Novice teen drivers (15-17 years old) involved in fatal crashes who were violating GDL laws
- **1%** On average, the proportion of CT licensed drivers who were 16 or 17 years old. These drivers were involved in\(1.8\)% of CT's fatal crashes.
- **2.4%** On average, the proportion of CT licensed drivers who were 18 or 19 years old. These drivers were involved in\(4.8\)% of CT's fatal crashes.

### By the Es

- **EDUCATION**
- **ENFORCEMENT**

---


Appendix D: Breakout Session Minutes and SWOT Analysis
Critical Roadway Locations Emphasis Area
(Intersections and Roadway Departure)

Meeting Minutes

Day 1

Charles Harlow – This group/Emphasis Area is more than just infrastructure and engineers (hence the name) and we are working to bring in all stakeholders.

Jack Carey – Gave history of Safety. Traditionally did SLOSSS location projects (reactive). AASHTO led the charge in 1990’s to look at Roadway departure. In 2006, first SHSP summit was held, Road Departure was a EA.

Ryan Pothering – Overview of RD and Int. data trends.

Barbara Ricozzi – Overview of the session and SWOT analysis.

- Looking to provide more outreach to Local Towns, more projects on Local Roads. How has been the outreach by DOT so far?
- Mark Carlino (Manchester) – so far the school sign project has been great, Towns appreciate it.
- Question came up about Motorcycle detection at signal lights – often motorcycles are not detected and they have to run a red light from the side street.
  - Video Detection can help solve this issue.
- Glenn Schilling (3m) – What sort of evaluations have been done for these “Systemic” projects
- There was a thorough study done on Shoulder rumble strips on limited access highways a while back, which helped conclude that they should be installed on all limited access highways.
- A lot of the current projects haven’t had enough time for data to be available for a proper study, but the goal is to do B/A’s eventually.
  - Nationwide studies have shown positive results from these types of projects.
- Ken Lussier (CTDOT) – Pavement markings are often lacking on Local Roads – opportunity for a future project?
- New York State Thruway is using wet reflective pavement markings
- Tony Lorenzetti – Other issues include Guiderail and Fixed Objects
- Weakness – Misinformation. For ex. A complaint about CLRS
- Can Curbs help contain vehicles on the road?
  - For most part curbs are drainage related and will have little impact on vehicles at higher speeds.
- Europe currently using a “Netting” on curves to help a motorcyclists that is in a run-off-road collision. Expensive but effective.
- Object Markers on Utility Poles, the utility companies have expressed interest in doing this themselves.
- Reflectors installed in the Guiderail are very effective at helping delineate curves.
- Can an incentive be provided for vehicles that have Lane Departure Warning Systems?
• What else can be done by the State to help this sort of new technology (also automatic braking)?
• Brent Leveille (AARP) – Older Drivers – education helps, for ex. How to handle left-turns
  o Signs that are easily in eye view are the most effective. Brighter is better
  o Insurance discounts are available for training/re-training of older drivers
• Roundabouts – clear safety benefits
  o Public doesn’t see the benefits as a reason to install.
  o Fighting the “Rotary” reputation
  o Put info into the Driver Education Manual/Media Blitz to show the benefits
  o Can a “simulator” be used to help teach young drivers how to “drive” a roundabout?
• Middle School has training “Safety Town” with electric cars
• Mani Poola (Stamford) – HFST on curves and ramps
• An inventory of all signs on Local Roads could provide major benefits
• Joe Balskus - Sweeden is using illuminated pavement markings
• Clearance Interval increases for left-turn phases will help trucks
• Flashing Yellow Arrow, is CT considering? Currently being investigated.
• Infrastructure for Connected Vehicles? What can we do to position ourselves for the future?
• Is there an inventory of the different High Friction surface locations?
• Work with CT Transit on the location of bus stops
• Use enforcement data in Systemic Analysis
• Should spiral curve transitions be used more
  o Require more ROW.
• The new CT Highway Design Manual is emphasizing less of the traditional “tangent, curve, tangent” type of design.

Day 2
• Heads up to some of the project initiatives
• Program solicitation through regions as well
  o Add the MPOs/RPOs
• Sign database prototype share with MPOs/RPOs
• Everyone using the same template not necessarily the same database
• Threat - public opinion on aesthetics vs. what should be done
• Additional edge lines on pavement
• Superelevation w/ milling & paving over time it goes away. Incorporate small subtle differences and participation/partnership with maintenance
• Opposition to traffic safety devices guiderails – national reviews
• Context sensitive solution designs
• Education – promoting reductions in crashes
• Transverse rumble strips in advance of difficult geometric features
• CMF clearinghouse
• Not wholesale marking 12’ lanes – actually designing for the speed
• Education – Videos: How to drive roundabout, Why choose roundabout
• Invite/partner with those who hated the idea, but now love it
• Involve communications – getting snappy titles and using YouTube.

SWOT Analysis

Strengths
• Systemic applications such as the LPA signing program are a great way to distribute funds out to the local roads
• Rumble strips
• Curve Delineation
• Better and quicker crash data through electronic crash reporting
• Database of signs on the state system
• Yellow and red clearance intervals for all signals statewide being retimed by consultant
• LTAP Safety circuit rider
• Circuit rider provides tech support to LPAs when grant opportunities come around
• Comment form on website and quick response therein
• Good interaction with and inclusion of Locals

Weaknesses
• No detection for light vehicles at actuated signals
• Existing data gathering is still clumsy and slow
• Rural roads don't treat fixed objects well
• Poor signing at intersections, e.g. bad placement, dead sheeting
• No replacement plan for replacing HFST
• Poor communication of programmatic solutions for LPAs; many in the room hadn't heard about them and had missed out
• Poor outreach to the impaired; this should be the lowest hanging fruit of all

Opportunities
• Increased rumble striping, e.g. Missouri and Michigan
• Durable pavement markings on local roads
• Wet reflective markings
• Curbing roadways to retain cars on road (RDG says this won't work)
• Additional shielding of critical areas to make roads “foolproof” for impaired drivers.
• European style nets in advance of guardrails to retain motorcyclists
• Utility pole delineation
• Guardrail delineation
• Incentivize automated lane-departure warnings in cars, e.g. reduced registration fees
• Incentivize defensive driving courses for existing drivers, e.g. reduced licensing fees
• Systemic roundabout program
• Use a simulator, smart phone app, or live layout to train roundabout operation
Use social media to promote roundabouts (Boil down 30-minute FHWA video to 30 seconds)
Build statewide assets management database to help identify problems
Illuminated pavement markings
Explore V2V and get the state infrastructure ready for it
Enhanced lighting where needed
Work with transit to place bus stops away from conflict with intersection operation or signing
Use enforcement data to try to discern patterns of concern
Better design of curves by using spirals and avoiding long tangents connected by sharp curves.
More systemic programs for the locals, e.g. Sign assistance, etc.
In addition to the letters to town selectmen, publicize systemic LPA grants through various local councils of governments (COGs)
Share the format for the assets management database (specifically sign logs) with the LPAs.
Encourage state DOT and LPAs to use same format for their assets management database so data can be shared universally
Add a systemic program to help LPAs edge-stripe their roads
Add a systemic program to help LPAs upgrade guardrail
Check existing superelevations as a matter of course for paving jobs; add material for wedging as needed
Use context for improvements, e.g. Don’t make the street in a residential neighborhood function like the interstate
Countermeasures such as rumble stripes should be built irrespective of public opposition
Expand use of transverse rumble strips to warn of hazards
Use the CMF clearinghouse to explore additional countermeasures and their associated crash reductions
Consider lane-narrowing as traffic-calming measure
Empathize with people’s anxieties, e.g. "Look, we know you hate roundabouts, we did too at first, but..."
Reach out to fire and EMS about safely navigating roundabouts
Have regular meeting with LPAs to discuss new concepts, e.g. roundabouts etc.
Consider protective intersections to isolate bicycle and pedestrian traffic from motorized traffic
Treat intersections and RwD differently when building the SHSP; they are different entities and RwD tends to overshadow intersections
Take advantage of the COGs as outreach opportunities
Put complete streets, road diet, and traffic calming more into the mainstream of traffic operations
Give regions advance notice of vendor in place (VIP) paving to allow safety issues to be included and addressed

Threats
- Public outcry against rumblestrips (although this is thought to be going down because of strategic placement away from homes and the public getting used to it)
• Misinformation: data exists that certain treatments make roads better but public ignorance can derail it
• Utility companies might be resistant to allowing pole reflectors and if they do, there is often yellow/white confusion
• Interactions with property owners: some don't like things in their "back yard" others want things (guardrails) that may not be warranted
• Avoid making "too many" improvements on local roads because they will drive speeds up
• Outreach to teach the public safe driving has the not been well-received and has not worked well
• Roundabout signing for suburban roundabouts is huge and simply will not fit
Meeting Minutes

- Research says there is some type of addictive quality about receiving a text and some kind of release of chemicals in the brain. Knowing there is a message waiting for you becomes irresistible.
- Only State to get 405 E Distracted Driving.

Stiffer Penalties

- CT has a tiered fine system. The first offense is $150, second $300, and third $500. Third offense also comes with a point on the driver’s license and information sent to the insurance company.
- If you offend and you have a child in the car, you automatically get $500.
- If increase fines too much, cops won’t give it out because it is too devastating.
- While to some, $150 is not a lot, to others it is a lot.
- The fine should be lowered slightly so it still hurts a little but doesn’t discourage ticketing.
- The first tier fine should be lowered and the third and fourth tier fines should be increased.
- The penalty should be changed so that you go to a two hour violator class. It is held twice a month.
- A tier penalty is useless because the police officer has to search his database while the car is pulled over. So the second and third tiered tickets are not issued often.
  - Tiered structure is required under federal funding.

Is hands-free still a distraction?

- Research says distraction is in your head. It doesn’t have to do with you dexterity.
- The definition of distracted driving should be expanded to include hands free devices. The problem is with enforcement because police can’t tell if your hands free phone is on.

Do crashes increase at traffic lights when people get right off the highway because they are catching up on their messages?

- The lowest incidents of distracted driving happened at roundabouts. When people are stopped at a red light, the phone is in their hand.
- CT has changed their law so that it is illegal to have a phone in their hand while operating a motor vehicle which includes stopped at a red light.
- Officers use an elevated location to target texters (e.g., SUV).

How does the community know that a law changes? Today you can text at a stoplight, tomorrow you can’t.

- Sound out a flyer or news that talks about traffic updates in the last 5 years.
- The law changed to be 405 E compliant.
- We try to cover these things in our PSA and public education.
- Moving forward, this is something we could highlight. How to get the word out?
• Leverage the Stakeholders
  • Children’s hospital, Yale new haven.
  • Use variable message signs about new laws.
    o Signs have regulations about how they are supposed to be used.

Technology is making it easier to drive, so drivers are more likely to pull out a phone and entertain themselves.
• Antilock brake
• Automatic transmission
• Blind spot warning
• Automatic cruise control
• Vast majority of fleet does not have these technologies in the car.

SWOT Analysis

Strengths
• Hands free law - CT has changed their law so that it is illegal to have a phone in their hand while operating a motor vehicle which includes stopped at a red light.
• Strong enforcement (20,000 tags in 6 weeks) - Officers use an elevated location to target texters (e.g., SUV).
• Strong advertising
• Funding

Weaknesses
• Data
  o Crash reports do not capture distracted driving information.
  o System is electronic so can make tweaks to it in the future.
  o In the new report, the cause of crash can be Distracted Driving.
• Culture
  o Everyone expects an immediate response (kids, boss, parents, etc.) so there is a culture pressure that encourages people to text and drive.

Opportunities to Improve
• Force violators of no-texting-while-driving to go to a class.
• Use blast texts to allow people remind people to not text while driving and let them know about the changes in the law.
• Use signs to advertise “no texting”. States will advertise that a safe area to text is coming up.
• Switch from “Rest Area” to “Text Area”.
• Get kids to admonish their parents. Teach kids at a young age about the dangers of texting while driving so that they remind their parents to stop texting.
• Approaching automotive and technology companies to make something that will force you to turn off your phone or stow it away.
  o Require texting offenders to use an app to put their phone in “drive mode”, cutting off text messages, and allowing your car to turn on.
• Need to make the consequence an inconvenience instead of a fine. Change the distracted driving fine to a penalty that suspends a driver’s licenses until they attend a two hour violator class. It is held twice a month.
• The distracted driving fine should be altered slightly so it still hurts a little but doesn’t discourage ticketing. The first tier fine should be lowered and the third and fourth tier fines should be increased. (A law enforcement recommendation.)
• Gather input from everyday younger drivers who most frequently use new technology.
• Research says distraction is in your head. It doesn’t have to do with you dexterity. The definition of distracted driving should be expanded to include hands free devices.
• Convert more intersections to roundabouts - The lowest incidents of distracted driving happened at roundabouts. When people are stopped at a red light, the phone is in their hand.
• Advertise to the community that the distracted driving law has changed.

**Threats/Barriers**

• Culture – respond right away
• Money – never enough
• Technology
• Motor vehicle industry
• Maintaining balance between protecting the public and not infringing on public liberties
• Perception that hands-free is safe
• Legislation
• People don’t want to be responsible for their behavior. “We’re all human.” “It’s not my kid.”
Meeting Minutes

- We are targeting 15% of population that does not wear their seatbelt.
- The largest demographic group that does not wear seatbelts is males from between 18 – 34 years old.
- 28 States where it is an offense for all seating positions.
- 17 States where it is a primary offense for all seating positions.
- When seatbelt fines increase, citations decrease. Cost went from $37 to $92.

How can we more effectively communicate the Seatbelts Save Lives message?

- Add a dollar amount to the “Click it or Ticket.” signs/slogan.
- Washington has 98% compliant. They put the Click it or Ticket message on billboards along with the price of the fine. They also use education. In 2002, CT did their click or ticket it campaign. Compliance jumped from 68% to 85%. It is still 85%. Started a Vermont highway safety alliance. Unrestrained fatality rate stayed at 30% while the restrained dropped by 25%. There were more unbelted crashes then DUI crashes in 2014 in Vermont.
- Putting up marketing where these 18-34 male are going (e.g., bars, sports events).
- Gather a target group of males age 18-34 ask them why they do not use seatbelts and how we can encourage them to use seatbelts.
  - We did this with males within that age range. Many of them said that they use seatbelts on long trips, but if it is a short trip, they do not use it.
- Create advertising that shows how seatbelts can save lives even on short trips within neighborhoods.
- Maybe need to change slogan “click it or ticket” to target the male age group.
- Need to speak in native language and talk to their cultural differences. Use a native to communicate the message.
- Advertise that Connecticut is below average in seatbelt usage. Have a popular person come and say “Come on CT, do better”. This will speak to young men’s competitive nature.

SWOT Analysis

Strengths
- The seatbelt law is a primary law.

Weaknesses
- No law that encourages passengers in the rear-seating to use a seatbelt. They only have to wear it up to age 7.
• Culture – law enforcement don’t want to give a large fines to mothers with kids in the back, but these are the people who need the most encouragement.
• Data – the federal government requires the click it and ticket data collection.
  o We need better performance data that isn’t subject to geometry and other factors.

Opportunities
• Add a dollar amount to the “Click it or Ticket.” signs/slogan.
• Increase CPS booster seat regulation to 8 years old.
• Connecticut highway safety alliance – partner with department of education.
• Target seatbelt advertisement to males between 18-34.
  o Hire someone famous to be a seatbelt champion and increase advertising, targeted at males 18-34.
  o Place marketing where 18-34 year old males are going (e.g., bars, sports events).
  o Create advertising that shows how seatbelts can save lives even on short trips within neighborhoods.
• Use pediatric personnel to encourage laws and reinforce them.
  o Pediatricians don’t know what the car seat laws are.
  o Need training for pediatricians about the laws.
• Seatbelt summit in March that includes 9 States (NY, NJ, PN, Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico).
• Institute blanket legislation where everyone in the vehicle must wear a seatbelt.
• Unify seatbelt laws across the county. No matter who you are, where you sit, or where you drive, you get the same message.
• Targeted enforcement – look at towns that have lower compliance.

Threats
• Culture
• Vehicle automation
• Perception
• Lack of standardization across the nation. People don’t know what the laws are.
• Inconsistency of vehicles.
Driver Behavior Emphasis Area
Substance Abuse

Meeting Minutes

- Columbia’s illegal BAC level is 0.02, a $900 driver fine, and a license suspension
  - This serves as a deterrent but may not be realistic.
- We are seeing more frequently the mixing of substances (e.g., alcohol and marijuana) that impairs a driver and poly-drug use that does not show up on a breath test.
- There is a rise in prescription drug use in cases where there is no alcohol.
- Many young people are using drugs and are very ignorant about what they are consuming. They are taking a drug that has other chemicals mixed in.
- CT has no drugged driving DMV per se laws.
- Need to be able to identify those people that are below the 0.08 but are under the influence of drugs.
- Currently, a wet lab is offered as part of the Standardized Field Sobriety Test training for law enforcement officers where volunteers drink alcohol under a controlled environment so that police officers can better identify impairment.
- 7 predominate drug categories. Police officers are offered training in Advanced Roadside Impaired Driving Enforcement (ARIDE) which assists given 2 additional tests to test for drugs. There are on-line ARIDE courses available as well, that educate officers on how to identify intoxicated drivers.
- A Drug Recognition Expert (DRE) is called upon in post arrest and in a controlled environment to evaluate a drugged impaired driver
- The more officers educated through thorough training, the better the reports, and the more concrete the arrests.
- DRE reports are so specific and detailed that it is very hard for a defense attorney to argue against it.
- DREs are strategically located in regions around the State so that they can assist in a timely fashion. Education of what a DRE is and the training it entails is on-going.
- More issues are arising with people on prescription medication consuming a small amount of alcohol, leading to driver impairment.
- Need testing immunity for the medical professionals. They cannot release report lab results to a law enforcement official without a warrant.
- The medical field should reduce the amount of opiates they give out to patients. Patients can become addicted, which may lead to other types of drug use such as heroin since, it is less expensive.

How do you verify that drivers are under the influence of drugs?

- Drivers first take the standardize field sobriety tests, then a breath test, then an evaluation, then a urine or blood test. A DRE will conduct an evaluation post arrest to identify the source of impairment.
- There are ways to hide alcohol. Teenagers are becoming more creative with the use of Vodka soaked tampons, eye shots and other means of ingesting alcohol.
- CT does not currently have an open container law for alcohol in a motor vehicle. Non-compliance funding is provided to address this issue.
SWOT Analysis

Strengths
- Toxicology response and relationship is improving.
- Hospitals are tracking greater detailed information.
- The CT Highway Safety Officer currently funds 2 Per Se Hearing attorney positions vs. one as in previous years at the Department of Motor Vehicles.
- The statewide Impaired Driving task force has increased in participants.
- Drug Evaluation and Classification (DEC) program
- Data – new MMUCC (Model Minimum Uniform Crash Criteria) report
- New Ignition Interlock (IID) law
- Increase in Law Enforcement training
- Law enforcement
- The MMUCC Standard police crash report requires detailed officer input and they become in-depth investigators.

Weaknesses
- Funding
- There are no per se penalties for a positive drug test.
  - It takes the tox lab time to process a urine test.
  - Washington, Oregon, and Colorado have laws that give an illegal dosage level which Connecticut currently does not.
- Not enough manpower for checkpoints which leads to many being cancelled.
- No legislative hard limits for drugs in the blood. Creating a standard would support prosecution.
- When engineers see that there is a crash report with a drug or alcohol cause, they disregard it. (Said by an engineer.) Need to change the its-the-drivers-fault, nothing-I-can-do mentality.

Opportunities
- The MMUCC police crash report will give ConnDOT the opportunity to use its data as direction for future initiatives.
- Electronic warranting so that the hospital personal can get the approval to do a blood test and hand it to the police quicker.
- Pharmacy can remind patients that a vehicle is “heavy machinery”. Need to re-label “heavy machinery” to read “automotive vehicle”.
- Increase funding for LE and for DREs and educate more officers to be DRE certified.
- Expand general law enforcement training initiatives. Some of the entry-level officers are more informed than the older officers.
- Try to incorporate engineering solutions.
- Insurance companies – some insurance companies do not reimburse hospitals for drug tests.
- Offer “wet lab training” for officers to observe potential drivers under the influence of drugs. This is currently done for alcohol as part of the High Visibility Enforcement training held at the Police Officer Standards Training Council (Police Academy).

Threats
- Funding
- Personal
- Legalization of Marijuana
• Social norms and lack of education around prescription drugs: I’m going to be okay because my doctor gave it to me.
• Police officers get filmed at checkpoints
• Social media
• Legal drugs/ Prescription drugs

**Strategies**
- Public education (TV) – Initiate an advertising campaign that makes the public aware about illegal drugs.
- Legalize other forms of roadside testing.
- Focus on education and parental involvement that is targeted toward youth.
- Learn from other States.
- Funding for additional enforcement.
- Increase communications between all the Stakeholders (Peer-to-Peer).
- Allow officers to obtain a warrant faster.
- Processes for improved testing.
- Identify new partners
  - Liquor control
  - Department of education
  - Department of public health
- Put up mile point signs on the interstate so that when people call in and report drunk driving, they can give their position and enforcement can respond faster and more accurately.
Driver Behavior Emphasis Area

Speeding

Meeting Minutes

- Most fatal crashes are on roadways that are 40mph and less.
- As speed limits drop, fatalities go up.
- Grant applications are data and performance based.

SWOT Analysis

Strength

- Speed enforcement was a big success. 12000 infraction/citations issued on rural roads, over 30 days. 90,000 total were speeding.
- Grant funding through High Risk Rural Roads (HRRR).
- Speed detection technology is state-of-the-art (laser detection).
- Speed training is improving.
- Connection between law enforcement and insurance. Speeding ticket makes insurance go up. It is an effective penalty.
- High fines (can also be a weakness)
- Citation data – will help identify location strategies
- Design standards – We do the same thing every time. It is consistent.
- Education – They are educating kids about excessive speed. This improves social norms.

Weaknesses

- Funding
- Tickets being nullied (thrown out by the judge)
- Public norms
- High-fine amounts
- Lack of signage – A 25mph residential road but drivers want to go 40. Need to improve speed management on roadways.
- Speed differential is the most dangerous measure. It is defined as the speed difference between the fastest and the slowest vehicle on the road
- Many roadways are not conducive to law enforcement. There is no safe spot on the road for the police officer to pull the over the offending driver.
- Lack of staffing.

Opportunities

- Setup automated enforcement in areas that police officers have trouble enforcing:
  - Speed trailers
  - Speed feedback signs – They are tough to maintain. You need someone to reset them and change the batteries. Could use solar. Rural towns can’t afford them.
- Community buy-in.
- Collect speed data to help educate the public. Some people complain when there isn’t a problem.
- Increase publicity of enforcement. Take pictures, put them on social media, and increase awareness.
• Include location on the citation.
• Look for other funding sources than FHWA.

Threats
• How data is used to drive enforcement.
• People trying to enforce speed on their own.
• Tolerance – At what speed do you stop the car? 5, 10, 15 mph over?
• Price of tickets is too high, might deter officers from giving out tickets.
  o Use this opportunity to build a relationship with the community. Sometimes giving the ticket isn’t always the answer.

Strategies
• Education
• Funding
• Equipment
Motorcyclists Emphasis Area

SWOT Analysis

Strengths
- Rider training required to obtain motorcycle endorsement; responsible riding (including helmet use) is taught in the mandatory training
- Helmet requirement for minors and those operating with learner’s permit
- New endorsement added for 3-wheeled bikes
- Centerline rumble strips
- Encouragement of self-assessment for riders
- Enhanced curve signing and delineation
- Three-wheel operation endorsement allows licensing for three-wheeled vehicles only, not downward compatible for two-wheel
- Mandatory training as stipulation of licensure
- Helmet law for minors
- Responsible riding (including helmet use) is taught in the mandatory training
- Seventy percent of Connecticut riders wear helmets

Weaknesses
- Traffic signal detection devices do not always detect motorcycles
- Motorcycle endorsement not required to register motorcycle
- One endorsement for motorcycles of all sizes; no need to demonstrate ability to safely operate large cc motorcycle
- Scooters (under 50 cc) may be used by drivers that lose licenses
- Lack of traffic sign maintenance
- Centerline rumble strips may be harmful to motorcyclists
- Cable barriers may be harmful to motorcyclists
- Generally poor roadway conditions
- The "driver lost control" crash code is too broad. Slick pavements, snow and ice, and impairments can all cause drivers to lose control.
- No detection for light vehicles at actuated signals

Opportunities
- Universal helmet law
- If universal helmet law is not obtainable, extend helmet requirements to higher-risk groups (e.g., riders cited for certain traffic violations and/or DUI)
- “Ride Bright” campaign
- Left-turn restrictions
- Roundabouts
- Netting for guardrails
- Mandate insurer discount for ABS-equipped bikes
- Pavement markings to supplement chevrons
- Coordinate with military bases
- Red light cameras
- “Road Guardian” program – train riders to be first responders
• DMV to suggest training when owners re-register older motorcycles that have not been ridden in some time
• Explore what other New England states are doing to improve motorcycle safety
• Requiring a motorcycle endorsement for cycle registration would force licensing (and therefore training) on owners
• Encourage/provide resources for law enforcement to identify and ticket unregistered scooters over 50 cc.
• Explore lane sharing. This is legal in some places for speeds under 50 mph and at speed differentials of 15 mph. Some argue it could be safer for the motorcyclist because of shared visibility and shielding in stop-and-go conditions
• Rumble strips save lives, including motorcyclists. CL rumble strips reduce the risk of drivers crossing over into oncoming motorcyclists
• Wider use of head and break light modulators
• Wider use of xenon bulbs for better nighttime illumination
• Delve into the issue of military personnel being the wild riders. Can base commanders require off base use of all the protective gear?
• Dilemma zone detection at intersections
• Red light cameras: red-light runners really put motorcyclists at risk.
• Roundabouts would increase intersection safety for motorcyclists.
• Better crash reporting can lead to better countermeasures

Threats
• Lack of training for EMTs regarding unhelmeted rider injuries?
• States that have repealed universal helmet laws have seen fatal crashes increase
• Helmet laws are generally dead on arrival at the legislature
• The number of people riding unendorsed, impaired, suspended, or on unregulated vehicles (scooters) is unknown
• No endorsement is necessary to register a motorcycle
• Some people perceive helmets as mobility and vision-restricted although there is really no evidence of this
• Scooters (motorcycles under 50 cc) require only a driver's license to operate; they do not have to be registered at the DMV
• Aging population and their limited vision and depth perception are not a good mix for motorcycle safety
• EMT and first-responders are not trained or equipped to treat helmeted vs. non-helmeted riders
• States that have lifted the helmet law have seen fatal crashes decrease
• EMT and first-responders are not trained or equipped to treat helmeted vs. non-helmeted riders

Strategies
• Use VMS boards to display messages during motorcycle awareness month
• Lower BAC limits for motorcyclists (as with CDL)
• Vary endorsements based on size of motorcycle
Meeting Minutes

- Ms. Melanie Zimyeski, Transportation Supervising Planner of Intermodal Planning at CTDOT, introduced herself as the Non-Motorized Emphasis Area Chair.
- The SHSP was defined as follows: “A comprehensive plan to substantially reduce the vehicle related fatalities and serious injuries on Connecticut’s roadways.”
- The goal of the session was presented to the group: “To gather ideas, opinions, comments and suggestions that will serve as input to ultimately help compile strategies to be identified as part of the “2016” SHSP.
- The four “E”s, in regard to the Strategic plan were highlighted as follows: Engineering, Enforcement, Education, and Emergency Services.
- Attendees participated in a “SWOT” analysis to identify Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats, results of which are summarized below:

SWOT Analysis

Strengths

- Changes made to the CT Driver’s manual regarding bike/pedestrian laws and safety
- The success of programs such as: ShareTheRoadCT.org and Safe Routes to School
- The implementation of the Street Smarts brochure
- Use of Rumble strips
- Partnership between UCONN and the CTDOT
- Change in culture at CTDOT regarding ped/bike accommodations
- Adoption of a CTDOT Complete Streets policy
- Shared lane markings (Sharrows): useful for heightening driver awareness of bicyclists
- LTAP technical support
- Change in CTDOT policy to allow sidewalk-only projects and fund 100% of sidewalk construction
- Multi-use paths as alternative to State routes
- CT installing accessible ped signals, countdown displays
- Good examples of best practices of ped/bike accommodations on university campuses

Weaknesses

- Inaccuracy of data reporting (ex. Bike/pedestrian use - leisure vs. necessity, etc.)
- Inability to track "near" collisions
- Difficulty in enforcing bike laws (ex. 3 ft. separation when overtaking and passing cyclists)
- Ability to measure success of existing programs
- No statewide consistency, or guidelines for cities and towns to reference
- Sidewalks to nowhere and non-continuous sidewalks; bike trails that cannot be used for commuting purposes
- Reaching bicyclists that may never have driven, resulting in no access to the driving training manual (as it pertains to bike safety)
- State of Connecticut’s inability to necessitate repair, maintenance, and snow removal on
sidewalks in cities and towns; lack of municipal support for sidewalk maintenance

- Lack of awareness of traffic laws that pertain to cyclists
- Lack of information regarding program effectiveness
- Limited funding to support implementation of ped/bike accommodations
- No clearinghouse for ped/bike exposure data
- Need Sidewalk maintenance/snow removal inventories

Opportunities

- The use of data as a key component in receiving Federal funding (Vermont’s Bike/Ped Safety Plan was used as an example)
- Incorporate bike/pedestrian info into the driver refresher course given through AAA and AARP
- Utilize Complete streets policy
- Use social media, posting surveys, or pop quizzes that incorporate bike/pedestrian safety
- Provide technical assistance through the CTDOT to towns and municipalities
- Offer cities and towns help with sidewalk repair
- Study University bicycle/pedestrian safety plans (UCONN was used as an example)
- Change culture/perception with regard to cyclists and pedestrians (ex. "roads are for cars", "children aren't safe walking or biking to school")
- Enforce snow removal on sidewalks, thus eliminating the need for pedestrians and school children to walk in the street
- Encourage adoption of municipal master plans for sidewalks
- Initiate media campaigns geared to both motorists and bicyclists
- Install or replace traffic signals with audible and signal-timed traffic signals
- Insure that bike/pedestrian safety is part of the Physical Education Curriculum in schools (South Windsor, Simsbury already incorporate this into their PE classes)
- Enlist volunteers and Police bike patrols to educate the public through community based programs
- Continue to educate crossing guards (refresher classes) on the proper way to cross the street (no diagonal crossing)
- Use the presence of law enforcement officers as a threat to deter speeding (a major contributor to bike/pedestrian accidents and fatalities)
- Encourage the use of bike patrol officers
- Use cellular phone App.’s as a monitoring tool for bike/pedestrian traffic
- Tap into existing CTDOT monitoring devices to track bike traffic
- Use local Boards’ of Education as an educational tool to highlight the benefits and safety of walking and biking to school
- Create a "Hotline" for motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians as a quick reference to changes in laws and overall safety tips
- Offer EMT classes to organized Cycling groups and clubs
- Pursue opportunities for Road Diets; apply for FHWA technical assistance for implementing road diets
- Use SHSP EA Committee to leverage information and action
- Work with nonprofits on outreach opportunities (e.g., Center for Latino Progress; Head Start)
• FHWA link to ped/bike videos developed for specific age groups
  http://www.pedbikeinfo.org/
• Can private developers fund offsite improvements (e.g., rather than fund sidewalk construction in a small cul-de-sac, use the same funds for sidewalk construction on connecting streets)?

Threats
• Persistent fear from parents concerning the safety of their children walking or biking to school
• Lighting along scenic routes and crosswalks
• Lack of cooperation and general opposition from the general public regarding instillation, repair, and maintenance on town and city sidewalks
• Developers avoid installing sidewalks based on economic grounds
• The mindset of motorists and how it relates to non-motorized vehicles
• Motor vehicle speed
• Continued lack of education and an inability to reach the public with the message of bicycle/pedestrian safety
• Pedestrians and cyclists not taking personal responsibility
• Rumble strips

Strategies
• Road Diets
• Speed Management
• Share the road educational campaign
  Sidewalk requirements
• Sidewalk network plans
• Dedicated funding source for ped/bike improvements
• Improved ped/bike data (exposure, crashes)
• Context-sensitive solutions (similar to deviation from standard designs for scenic routes)
• CT DOT outreach on ped/bike safety issues to boards of education
• Emergency call-boxes on trails
• Training to make cyclists “first responders”
• Install/maintain more bus stops and shelters
• Educate kids about safety at graduation ceremonies (bring in a speaker)
• Establish a scholarship program and at the awards ceremony, have educators speak out to the public about bike/ped safety laws and proper practices
• Posters/educational material distributed at State Agencies to inform State Workers about bike/ped safety – they can relay these messages to all the people they reach (friends, family, contacts) statewide. Have the State workers help spread the word and model good behavior on the roads
• The website http://www.pedbikeinfo.org/planning/facilities_designresourceindex.cfm provides design guidance for on-road bike facilities, pedestrian facilities, and trails with corresponding manuals and page/section numbers. This was presented by FHWA at 2015 Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals conference held in St Louis,
Closing thoughts: When attempting to develop strategies for the SHSP, one of the greatest challenges continues to be data accuracy. The group also agreed that focus has to be on how to change the general public’s mindset as it pertains to the pedestrian and cyclist’s interaction with the motorized community; the consensus was through education, and the groups outlined multiple strategies that could help effectively accomplish this goal. It was noted that programs like ShareTheRoad CT, and Connecticut Safe Routes to School were examples of highly successful programs initiated by the CTDOT. The Non-Motorized Emphasis Area team will hold quarterly meetings and the SHSP is expected to be drafted during 2016. Further comments, concerns, ideas, and participation from the attendees (including interest in volunteering as a co-chair) were encouraged to be submitted to Ms. Melanie Zimyeski within 30 days.
Meeting Minutes
Paul Krisavage and Carmine Centrella provided an introduction to TIM and emphasized:

- The need for multidisciplinary approach to Traffic Incident Management.
- Understanding the different roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders at an incident scene.
- Provided trends in overall traffic patterns – increasing congestion, lost productivity, need for significant reinvestment in infrastructure.
- 4-hour TIM training course that is available.

SWOT Analysis

Strengths
- Promotes safety
- Coordinated, collaborative, unified, multi-discipline approach
- SHRP 2 training is developed, and online course is available
- Cameras for detection
- Existing fiber optic network
- Statewide cell phone coverage for detection/reporting
- Ability to convey information/media info
- Quick response,
- Co-location of Bridgeport and CSP
- Diversion plans already exist for many key corridors
- “Move Over” laws
- Good design standards for appropriate design of roadways to allow for response (adequate shoulders, etc.)
- There are existing training programs, and training materials
- Integrated planning for TIM during construction projects
- Traffic camera detection on major roadways
- Diversion plans exist
- Move Over laws

Weaknesses
- TIM Training does not have a home. DOT has helped with identify training, but TIM training is not the responsibility of DOT.
- No county government, so regional planning done at the RPA level. 5 regional emergency management organizations.
- Need for more buy in
- Money
- Resources
- Wide range of experience level across the state with respect to TIM
• Lack of ICS training for DOT
• Need for DESPP/DEMHS to push forward ICS, NIMS training throughout the state
• Lack of coverage of cameras on certain roads
• Some technology approaching end of useful life, need to maintain State of Good Repair
• Getting through congestion to reach incidents
• More communication for how diversion plans are implemented

**Opportunities:**
• DEMHS to take lead role on TIM program
• Expand camera and fiber coverage
• Improve response time for first responders
• Improved traveler information to the general public, more real-time info to drivers
• Increase multidisciplinary training, table tops, and exercises
• Need for more multidisciplinary training
• Need for understanding of specialty response for HAZMAT, consumer goods, etc.
• Additional work zone TIM plans and provisions
• More public service announcements/education

**Threats:**
• TIM continues to not have a home
• Limited options for TIM response
• Negative economic impact due to lack of TIM coordination
• Lack of funding for ongoing operations and maintenance
• Loss of lives, secondary incidents
• Competition with other training mandates
• Overcoming “silos” of training, to have more multidisciplinary training, exercises
• Life safety, economic, environmental issues from continued lack of program roll-out
• Need for ongoing resources and funding for TIM efforts
Young Drivers Emphasis Area

Meeting Minutes

• In New York, new drivers are identified on the vehicle with a decal.
• From an engineer’s standpoint while designing roadway, we can’t treat the 16 year olds any differently from the 60 years old. Recently registration has been changed for roadway design to meet the needs of the older drivers but there isn’t roadway design legislation for young drivers.
• Most parents found the 2 hour class valuable.
  o Confirmed worries about kid getting their driver’s licenses.
  o Felt powerless that as a parent, they didn’t have a say about their kid getting their license.
• Parents like the curfew and the GTL law about not driving with other kids in the car.

How would you change the teen driving laws. What are things the State could be doing?

• Driver’s education should last a year.
• Reinstitute testing before giving them their license. Testing is another hurdle to pass. Bring back second written test. When the second written test was removed it removed stress on the teens. Previously, the second test forced them to focus in class and reinforces what they learned.
• Need more education before they get their license. Once they get their license, they stop listening.
• Until young drivers get scared (e.g., get into an accident) they won’t listen/improve their driving.
• Change consequences:
  o Pull the high school parking pass.
• Teens need to get experience driving in different weather conditions.
• Parents want their kids to take more education until it becomes inconvenient for them.
• CT is one of the few States that has mandatory training for the parents.

Moving to online education

• Currently kids have to come to the State Department to take the test.
• AAA is going to take a position.
• Kids will take tests together and cheat.
• Book knowledge is good but experience is important. Teens must learn that other drivers will do what you do illogical, unexpected things.
• Improve education. In schools. Mandatory number of hours with DMV or private driver.

Should the learners permit be increased beyond the 4-6 for the 17 and 18 year olds?

• Currently, CT law is that teens only need to hold a permit for 4 months if they enrolled in a driving school or 6 months if they do not enrolled in the driving school.
• How many of these kids are cited for having a passenger in the vehicle?
  o The number of citations has decreased since the law has been passed.
  o Officer can’t stop someone unless a violation or crash has occurred.
• Any moving violation should have their driver’s license revoked until after additional mandatory education is completed.
• There should be penalties to parent.
• Many kids are waiting until after 20 to get their license. These kids are not required to complete any training or practice.
• Some states report that 18 and 19 year old crashes increase after GTL laws are put in.
• Extending the permit cannot hurt. Drivers should know how to drive in every condition. A 4 month permit only covers one or two seasons.
  o Could increase it to a year so that all climates are driven.
• Institute 18 to 19 year old GTL rules.
• Many parents would want to increase permit time. Parents like the curfew law.
• Need something beyond a 2 hour class to enforce messages to parents.
  o Maybe send messages through media?
• Extend the permit processes for a year and require that parents have a 2 hour class with their child every quarter.
• Driver’s education was offered in the high school. Now it is all private. Providing driver’s education in high school, kids will get licenses sooner and that means more crashes.
• Don’t have a right to impose restrictions on 18 year olds. CT already has. You can’t drag the parent into the equation but you can make legislative changes.
• Delay in licensure occurs the most with people with less funding, less affluent communities.
• Young crashes are often occurring in affluent communities.
• There are also kids that aren’t licensed, driving.
• The DMV needs to print the graduation stage on the license because cops don’t like doing math. This could be a colored dot next to the DOB. At each stage of graduation, the child can hand in their license and get a new one for free.

**Activate parents to get involved. What should they do with their teen driver?**
• Parents don’t know how to train their kid to drive.
• A license is not a statement of confidence. It is the minimum bar to get behind the wheel alone.
• When the kid asks for keys, the parent should ask the kid where they are going, when they will return, what route they will use, and who they are going with/seeing.
• Parents should be able to deny their kids a license.
• Need a private public partnership. Towns are cutting back on programs. Tragedies happen in every level of economic income neighborhoods.
• Registration could ask if there will be young drivers driving the car. If so, a piece of information can be sent with the legislation to update the parents on the latest laws.

**How can we collaborate to improve the teen driving laws in CT?**
• Get all the Es together in order to get input from all areas. Joint discussions make a better product.
• Parents look at it as an inconvenience. Parents are tired of driving their kids. They don’t think about their safety. Parents don’t like picking up their kids and driving them around. Freedom from their kid.
• The average parent does not know about teen brain development. That information is not very available.

Why don’t parents grasp the teen driving statistics and brain development?
• Parents don’t think it will be their child that will crash.
• Parents do not understand why other teens have crashes. They don’t know them so they can’t relate. They assume that the kid did something wrong and was crazy. They know their kid and think the kid is a good kid so therefore they can’t get into accidents like other kids they don’t actually know.
• Kids see their parents texting while driving. Since the parent can do it, the kid believes he/she can do it.
• Parents choose their battles. Teenagers battle for every inch of freedom they can get. Driving is lower on the list than other battles. It isn’t their main focus. It is also a conveniences for them.
• Societal influence. Other teenagers are getting it. Parents got their license when they were young. It is almost like both parents and teenagers believe teenagers have a right to have a license at a certain age. It has become a benchmark.
  o Starting to see a shift. Less kids are getting their licenses at 16.

Should we increase the permitting time for 16 and 17 year olds?
• How long is too long? Does 2 years give you the same benefit as 6 months? What factors help?
  o If it is too long. They get their hours in and then they sit on their permit and don’t drive for the rest of the months.
  o New Jersey has lower crash rates for 18 and 19 year olds. Extending the permit will delay getting the license.
  o Need to fix the license processes, not just move the age.

Should any restrictions be extended to 18 and 19 year olds.
• Parents need to have accountability.
• Kids leave at 18. Giving them their license when they can leave the house means they will not learn or practice from their parents.

Are 18 year olds competent drivers?
• Legislatively, they are seen as an adult by the law.
• There is legislation about not drinking until 21.

How many licenses for 16 and 17 year olds get suspensions?
• There is a steady decrease by law enforcement to issues the 48 hour suspension. Interviews with law enforcement show that it is a hard law to enforce and it is up to officer’s discretion.
• Law enforcement says that parent are supportive of the 48 hour enforcement. They are disappointed in the kid not the police officer. It could be a training issue. It is a recent change.
• It is an immediate penalty.
• The law is too complex and this causes it to happen less often. The officer has to wait with the kid at the side of the road. There needs to be more communication between DMV and law enforcement about what is not working.

SWOT Analysis

Strengths
• Current young driver restrictions with GDL
• Mandatory 2 hour parent class
• 48 hour pull and penalties
• Strong private sector participation
• Education and outreach
• Excellent grassroots actives
• Research and Data

Weaknesses/Challenges
• Consistent enforcement of GDL laws
• Communication of the law changes to both law enforcement and parents
• Evaluation of 2 hour class and young driver program
• No grant money because we are not eligible for Fed money b/c our GDL does not match their criteria
• Communication with LE
• Culture
• Parental responsibility
• No home for team driving issue
• Missing partners – public health needs to take a greater roll, judicial and State’s attorney office needs to be supportive of law enforcement.
• The older 18 and 19 year old drivers are not addressed in current GDL legislation
• Statewide programs
• DOE...

Opportunities
• Schools/health classes
• Consistency in education
  o Schools need a toolbox so they have the freedom to develop their own lesson plans.
• Combine education with kid’s interest
• Messaging opportunities at kids school events, maybe on the large TV above the basketball courts.
• Involve medical providers and use them to get the message out about teenage brain development.
• Look at all partners and identify where each partner’s rolls and responsibilities start and stop.
• Encourage teenagers to take other modes of transportation.
• Work with supportive driver training schools.
• Taking advantage of the crash data repository. Create a fact sheet about what is happening in your town in the last 5 years. Create conversation starters with data.
• Emphasize the Community Mobilization Project
  o Need a different funding model that is low cost, highly efficient, and sustainable.
• Engage teens to get input on how to develop messages and how to do outreach effectively.
  o ID and develop champions at all levels, team leadership.
• Toolkits for enforcement, toolkit for communities, etc.

**Threats**
- Parents
- New population of teens and parents every year
- Funding
- Changes in technology
- Human resistance to change
- Community buy-in

**What do we want to tell ConnDOT to focus on? Strategies...**
• Perform an evaluation of the program and look at results.
  o Come up with performance measures to evaluate our programs.
• Increase GDL status for all new drivers effective for 2 hours after getting driver’s license.
• Expand education and explain issues (maybe at a PSA meeting).
• Educate parents about GDL laws through the campaign “Not my kid”.
• Send messaging through social media (Facebook, Twitter). Make it cool.
• Evidence based programs.
• Expand GDL to meet federal guidelines so that we are eligible to grant money.
• Increase emphasis on outreach.
• Look internationally for ideas.
• Get messages into the health curriculum.
• Create a traffic records data repository that includes all types of data related to traffic (healthy, operations, vehicle, etc.).
• If we don’t continue to spread and expand the young driver message, the politicians will roll back restrictions.
Appendix E: SHSP
Peer Exchange
Evaluation Form
Template
Evaluation Form

*Your feedback and thoughts are valuable to us.*

**Name:**

______________________________

**Agency:**

______________________________

**Discipline:**

- [ ] Engineering / Infrastructure
- [ ] Law Enforcement
- [ ] Education
- [ ] Emergency Medical Services
- [ ] Other ____________________________

**Contact Info:**

Phone ___________________________ Email ____________________________

What is your role in Connecticut’s Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP)?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________


Have you heard of Connecticut’s SHSP before the Peer Exchange?  

- [ ] YES  
- [ ] NO

If so, how have you heard about it?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

I am currently a member of the following SHSP Emphasis Area Team(s):

- [ ] Critical Roadway Locations
- [ ] Non-motorized Users
- [ ] Driver Behavior
- [ ] Young Drivers
- [ ] Motorcyclists
- [ ] Incident Management

I am NOT currently a member of an SHSP Emphasis Area Team but would like to be added to the following team(s):

- [ ] Critical Roadway Locations
- [ ] Non-motorized Users
- [ ] Driver Behavior
- [ ] Young Drivers
- [ ] Motorcyclists
- [ ] Incident Management

PLEASE COMPLETE QUESTIONS ON BACK.
1. Did the Peer Exchange meet your expectations?......................................................... 1 2 3 4 5

2. How would you rate the following elements of the Peer Exchange?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location of event</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness of overall experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of the networking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of the breakout sessions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability of facilitators to stay on time/on target</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of event</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Was the purpose of the Peer Exchange clearly articulated?

4. What aspects of this Peer Exchange did you find to be the most beneficial?

5. What aspects of this Peer Exchange did you find to be the least beneficial?

6. What related topics would you like to see presented/discussed at future Peer Exchanges?

7. Can you identify one thing from the Peer Exchange that you feel you could use immediately to make a difference in your community or work? If so, briefly describe:

8. Did you have adequate opportunity to provide inputs on the topics that interest you?

9. Please add any comments that could help us in planning future Peer Exchanges and topics.

THANK YOU!