11

documentation

Appendix 11 - Table of Contents

A11.1 Plan Status & FHWA Concurrence Statement 305
A11.2 Reference list of sources and publications 306
A11.3 Meeting agendas, minutes, presentation slides..... 306
A11.3.1 Task Force Meeting #1..... 306
A11.3.2 Task Force Meeting #2..... 308
A11.3.3 Task Force Meeting #3..... 311
A11.4 Action Plan Checklist..... 314

A11.1 Plan Status & FHWA Concurrence Statement

The City of Bridgeport Safety Action Plan was developed under a Federal Fiscal Year (FY) 2024 Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) Planning Grant. The plan was completed in coordination with local stakeholders, partner agencies, and the public, and was reviewed by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). FHWA concurrence was issued on November 5, 2024, confirming that the plan meets the requirements of a qualifying Safety Action Plan under the SS4A program. This plan establishes a data-driven, Safe System–based framework for reducing fatal and serious injury crashes and is intended to support future SS4A Implementation Grant applications.

A11.2 Reference list of sources and publications

Several key plans, studies, surveys, and community records were referenced and used as a part of the broader planning and policy review for the development of the Bridgeport SS4A Safety Action Plan. These materials helped establish local context, identify transportation and safety priorities, and ensure consistency with adopted community goals and ongoing initiatives.

Referenced documents include:

- City of Bridgeport Comprehensive Plan 2000-2013
- Bridgeport Municipal Code 2025
- City of Bridgeport Traffic Safety Survey Winter 2024
- Activate Bridgeport, Meetings Records 2023-2025

Additional documents are included in the plan's referenced documents as they provide housing and demographic context, mobility and accessibility needs, and vulnerable population considerations.

- Regional Economic Development Strategic Plan 2014
- Economic and Demographic Trends February 2021
- Multi-county Regional Housing Study with Strategies for Affordable Housing August 2022

While not typically used as a primary transportation engineering document, their supporting context reinforces growth and housing trends, economic and demographic conditions, community development patterns, and equity/accessibility considerations relevant to transportation safety planning.

Together, these sources supported the plan's data-informed, community-driven approach to improving transportation safety.

A11.3 Meeting agendas, minutes, presentation slides

This section documents key meetings conducted as part of the Bridgeport SS4A planning process, including task force meetings, stakeholder discussions, and public engagement activities. Materials may include meeting agendas, presentation slides, summaries, and photographs that illustrate the planning process and community participation.

Meeting documentation is provided to support transparency, demonstrate meaningful stakeholder engagement, and preserve a record of how feedback and discussion informed plan development. These materials also serve as supporting documentation for SS4A eligibility and future grant applications.

A11.3.1 Task Force Meeting #1

September 18, 2025; 11:30 a.m. – 1:00 p.m., Prairie Winds Community Center

Task Force Members Present:

- Gail Beyer, Bridgeport Mayor
- George Schlothauer, Bridgeport Public Schools Superintendent
- Paul Sides, Bridgeport Street Department
- Milo Cardenas, Morrill County Sheriff
- Daniel Flores, Morrill County Sheriff Deputy
- Ron Doggett, Public Works Director
- Jennifer Ernest, Morrill County Community Hospital (MCCH) Quality Outcomes Coord.

Task Force Members Not Present:

- Michelle Coolidge, Bridgeport City Administrator
- Janelle Visser, PPHD Injury Prevention Coordinator
- Melissa Lally, NDOT District 5 ROW/Utilities/ Maintenance Environmental Liaison

Consultant Team: M.C. Schaff & Associates, Inc.

- David Schaff, P.E.
- Jeff Fuller, P.E.
- Bob Juve, P.E.
- Susan Myers, Project Manager
- Katherine Reisig, Engineer



Meeting Summary

The meeting began with a welcome and introductions, including participants' names, roles, and a reflective question about local traffic crashes. An overview of the SS4A (Safe Streets for All) program and Vision Zero was presented, highlighting the number of fatal and serious injury crashes in Scottsbluff over the past decade. The Safe System Approach was introduced, emphasizing six key principles: deaths and injuries are unacceptable, humans make mistakes, humans are vulnerable, responsibility is shared, safety is proactive, and redundancy is critical. Participants voted on safety focus areas using a poster board and weighted stickers.

The scope of services was reviewed, with the goal of integrating data and community input into a plan that reduces killed or seriously injured (KSI) crashes in Scottsbluff. Attendees were asked to identify the most problematic roadway areas and potential hurdles to success, followed by a vote on policy and infrastructure priorities, again using weighted stickers. The role of the Task Force was clarified to include oversight of the plan's development and implementation, representing community voices, and reviewing possible project priorities. Future meetings were previewed to maintain momentum.

Data collection and analysis efforts were also discussed, including definitions of KSI and High Injury Network (HIN), total crash data, breakdowns by mode, and "when" graphics that illustrate crash trends by time of day, month, and year. Comparative data from peer cities was also shared to help inform local strategies.

Finally, the project Storymap website, public survey, and public commenting map were reviewed; and Task Force members each completed the public survey and began adding comments to the online crowd source map.

Working Session Notes

Summary of Key Discussion & Direction
Data & Analysis Scope

Task Force members discussed the geographic extent of crash analysis and recommended extending the analysis one mile beyond city limits within the ETJ to ensure key crashes are captured. Particular emphasis was placed on confirming inclusion of a fatal vehicle ejection crash if it occurred within the 2014–2023 analysis period.

Enforcement & Behavioral Safety Challenges

The Task Force discussed limitations related to distracted driving enforcement in Nebraska, noting that distracted driving is not a primary offense, which restricts enforcement effectiveness. Members acknowledged that Nebraska is among a small number of states with this limitation, reinforcing the need for education and outreach-based strategies in addition to enforcement.

The UNL Extension has expressed interest in supporting a

distracted driving education program, potentially creating an opportunity for a locally led, non-enforcement-based safety initiative.

Community Tradeoffs & Public Perception

A significant portion of discussion focused on the challenges of implementing safety improvements in areas where competing public concerns exist. Members noted that improvements to visibility, parking restrictions, and curb management often generate conflicting public feedback, particularly downtown where safety, access, and parking demand must be carefully balanced.

The need to explore off-street parking options was identified as a potential strategy to reduce conflicts between pedestrian safety and parking availability.

School Safety & Operations

School access and circulation were a major topic. The Task Force discussed school drop-off operations, including the potential benefit of shifting drop-off activity to 9th Street on the west side to reduce congestion and safety issues on 7th and 8th Streets. Traffic calming near schools was identified as a supporting strategy, particularly if paired with operational changes.

Public Engagement & Education

The Task Force supported continued engagement activities, including a Bike Safely to School Rally coordinated with local police. The event would include bicycle safety checks, safety education, and escorted rides to schools, reinforcing safe travel behaviors among students and families.

Task Force Composition

The City confirmed support for the current Task Force membership and indicated openness to adding additional City Council representation to strengthen coordination and decision-making.

Project-Specific Discussion Highlights

The Task Force reviewed and discussed several draft project concepts, providing local insight and direction: *Truck Route Management*: Interest in identifying options to reduce truck traffic impacts off Main Street.

Downtown Visibility & Parking: Strong support for safety-driven curb visibility improvements, with acknowledgment of parking tradeoffs. NDOT indicated support for visibility-related curb restrictions.

Head Start Pull-Out: Progress is underway and viewed positively.

US-26 School Route Crossing: A plan agreement has been signed for a school crossing improvement.

Traffic Calming Near Schools: Seen as more effective if combined with revised drop-off operations.

Downtown Crosswalk Enhancements: Prior RRFB installation was supported; potential funding opportunities may exist for additional enhancements.

5th Street & Main Street Intersection: NDOT signal warrant findings should be clearly documented to address public questions.

Recreation Road & 5th Street Pathway: Need to review NDOT plans for pedestrian and bicycle accommodations.

Speed Feedback Signs: Interest in pursuing potential funding partnerships.

Sidewalk Gaps & Conditions: Ongoing concerns identified in school areas and several neighborhood corridors.

Highway Shoulder Widening (US 385): Recommendation to review NDOT's "In Bridgeport" plans.

Downtown Pedestrian Lighting: General consensus that existing lighting is adequate.

Key Takeaways

Strong support exists for data-driven prioritization, including expanded crash analysis within the ETJ.

Education, operations, and policy strategies are critical where enforcement authority is limited.

Downtown and school areas present the most complex tradeoffs, requiring balanced, context-sensitive solutions.

Task Force input provided actionable guidance that directly informs project refinement and phasing.

A11.3.2 Task Force Meeting #2

December 23, 2025; 11:30 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.



Prairie Winds Community Center

Task Force Members Present:

- Gail Beyer, Bridgeport Mayor
- George Schlothauer, Bridgeport Public Schools Supt.
- Michelle Coolidge, Bridgeport City Administrator
- Ron Doggett, Bridgeport Public Works Dir.
- Andrew Leisy, Bridgeport Parks Department
- Janelle Visser, PPHD Injury Prevention Coordinator
- Jessica Rocha, PPHD Injury Prevention Educator
- Melissa Lally, NDOT District 5 ROW/Utilities/ Maintenance Environmental Liaison

Task Force Members Not Present:

- Cheree Fisher, Morrill County Community Hospital

Consultant Team: M.C. Schaff & Associates, Inc.

- David Schaff, P.E.
- Jeff Fuller, P.E.
- Bob Juve, P.E.
- Susan Myers, Project Manager
- Katherine Reisig, Engineer

Meeting Summary

Task Force Meeting #2 focused on reviewing data-driven safety findings and aligning those findings with public and Task Force priorities. Key components of the meeting included:

Presentation and review of the Preliminary High Injury Network (HIN), including priority corridors and intersections.

Review of crash analysis and crash trees, highlighting contributing factors such as speed, visibility, turning movements, and roadway geometry.

Side-by-side comparison of Task Force prioritization results from Meeting #1 and public prioritization results gathered through pop-up engagement and online tools.

Introduction and discussion of the Draft Implementation & Phasing Matrix, outlining short-, mid-, and long-term strategies across engineering, policy, education, and operations.

Facilitated discussion to confirm, refine, and adjust priorities based on local knowledge, feasibility, and safety impact.

This meeting confirmed strong alignment between community concerns, Task Force priorities, and the technical crash analysis, while also identifying specific locations and themes requiring deeper refinement.

Summary of Key Discussion & Direction

Countermeasures & Education Programs

The Task Force discussed non-infrastructure countermeasures, with UNL Extension expressing interest in supporting distracted driving education, potentially through exploratory or elective classes at Bridgeport High School (BHS) and Bridgeport Middle School (BMS). Additional education opportunities for older drivers were discussed, including potential collaboration with AARP. Members noted the value of short-term, locally delivered education programs in addressing behavioral safety issues.

Tiered Project Matrix Review

The Task Force reviewed the draft tiered project matrix and provided detailed feedback on individual projects, focusing on feasibility, visibility, and community impact.

Tier 1 Projects (Near-Term / High Priority)

Parking Setbacks on Main Street (J1): Reducing on-street parking remains a major concern. The Task Force emphasized the need to explore alternative or off-street parking options to balance visibility improvements with downtown access.

Head Start Pull-Out (J5): Strong support; ESU and adjacent property owners are on board. Locating the pull-out on O Street was identified as the preferred option.

Downtown Flashing Beacons – Existing (J6): Members emphasized the importance of these devices but noted that current placement limits visibility and effectiveness, indicating a need for relocation or upgrades.

Recreation Road Pathway to Bridgeport State Lakes (J7): Potential funding opportunities were discussed, including Nebraska State Parks Pathway Grants. Coordination with contractors working on the overpass was suggested to identify integration opportunities.

BPS Speed & Safety Updates (J8): Strong support for speed feedback signs, particularly near schools. Existing speed limit signage was noted along 7th and 9th Streets.

Crossing Guard Support (P1): Existing preschool crossing guard operations were acknowledged as a positive example.

A general note emphasized that crosswalks along 10th Street experience high pedestrian activity and should remain a focus. NDOT is reviewing planned changes in this area.

Tier 2 Projects (Mid-Term)

Residential Traffic Calming Near Schools (J10): Members recommended further coordination regarding school parking and circulation, including review of potential parking lot adjustments.

Speed Management (P2): Speeding was identified as an ongoing issue. Speed bumps were discussed but raised concerns due to snow plowing and winter maintenance challenges.

Distracted Driving Programs (P3): Continued support for driver education targeting both youth and older drivers.

Paving & Sidewalk Program (P5): Identified as a significant community priority. Members noted this program could help justify and integrate buffer space and pedestrian safety improvements during reconstruction.

Snow & Ice Management (P6): School snow and ice management practices were viewed positively.

Lane Configuration Issues (P7): Concerns were raised about eastbound out-of-town access near signalized entries and gas station driveways, suggesting a need for operational review.



Tier 3 Projects (Longer-Term / Context-Driven)

Lighting – Citywide & Downtown (J14 / J15): Members suggested coordinating lighting improvements with downtown revitalization efforts. Pedestrian-scale lighting was noted to contribute more to streetscape character than significant illumination increases.

Truck Routes & Agricultural Equipment (O4): Agricultural equipment does not require permits, which can create conflicts. Members supported continued evaluation of truck and equipment routing strategies.

Additional Notes & Considerations

Future overpass completion is expected to result in no parking on both sides of 9th Street, which will affect circulation and safety planning.

Exploratory safety education classes were discussed as potential short-term programs, possibly coordinated with PPHD.

NDOT plans for shoulder widening south of Bridgeport were noted as relevant to ongoing safety improvements.



Key Takeaways

Strong support exists for near-term operational and low-cost safety improvements, especially speed feedback signs, crossing visibility, and school-area treatments.

Downtown safety improvements must carefully balance visibility, parking availability, and pedestrian activity.

Education and programmatic countermeasures are viewed as essential where enforcement tools are limited.

Task Force feedback provided actionable direction to refine project scope, phasing, and coordination with NDOT and other partners.

A11.3.3 Task Force Meeting #3

March 5, 2026; 11:30 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.
Prairie Winds Community Center

Task Force Members Present:

- Gail Beyer, Bridgeport Mayor
- George Schlothauer, Bridgeport Public Schools Supt.
- Michelle Coolidge, Bridgeport City Administrator
- Andrew Leisy, Bridgeport Parks Department
- Janelle Visser, PPHD Injury Prevention Coordinator
- Jessica Rocha, PPHD Injury Prevention Educator
- Melissa Lally, NDOT District 5 ROW/Utilities/ Maintenance Environmental Liaison

Task Force Members Not Present:

- Cheree Fisher, Morrill County Community Hospital

Consultant Team: M.C. Schaff & Associates, Inc.

- Bob Juve, P.E.
- Katherine Reisig, Engineer

Meeting Agenda

The meeting focused on walking through the plan framework, proposed projects, and key safety recommendations before the draft moves forward.

Meeting Purpose

Task Force Meeting #3 focused on reviewing the draft Bridgeport Safety Action Plan (SAP) and the draft **APPENDIX A8 - PROJECTS**. The meeting provided an opportunity for Task Force members to review the proposed safety strategies, confirm implementation priorities, and provide final feedback before the plan moves into public review.

Plan Overview and Draft Review

The meeting began with an overview of the structure of the Safety Action Plan and how the chapters work together to move from crash analysis and community input toward practical implementation strategies.

Following this introduction, the Task Force conducted a page-by-page review of the draft plan. While the entire document was discussed, the majority of discussion focused on Chapters 4 and 5, which describe the recommended safety strategies and the implementation framework.

Discussion topics included:

- The structure of the Capital Program (CP) bundles and how they group related safety improvements.
- The tiered prioritization system, which organizes projects based on readiness and expected implementation timing.
- The role of Chapter 5 as a practical implementation guide for the City.
- The inclusion of typical cost estimates for safety treatments as planning-level guidance.

- The flexible nature of the Capital Programs, allowing improvements to be implemented incrementally depending on funding and coordination opportunities.

Task Force members noted that the cost estimates presented in the draft plan represent planning-level estimates only. Because project designs are conceptual at this stage, final costs will depend on detailed engineering and construction conditions.

Implementation Updates and Coordination

During the review of the draft plan, several updates related to upcoming infrastructure improvements were discussed.

Melissa Lally (NDOT) confirmed that the pedestrian mid-block crossing at the Prairie Winds Community Center (Project J3) is expected to move forward in 2026.

In addition, downtown ADA improvements may occur in the near term as part of ongoing accessibility upgrades.

Task Force members also discussed the NDOT viaduct project, which is expected to include sidewalks extending from 21st Century Equipment toward the Bridgeport State Lakes Recreation Area. These improvements may complement the pedestrian connectivity improvements identified in the Safety Action Plan.

Plan Feedback Questions

After reviewing the draft plan, Task Force members were asked to provide feedback on several key questions:

- Does the plan language feel balanced and appropriate for the community?
- Are the highest-risk corridors and locations correctly prioritized?
- Are any major safety issues missing from the plan?
- Are there any political sensitivities, omissions, or issues that need additional attention?

No significant concerns were raised regarding the overall tone or structure of the plan. Task Force members generally agreed that the safety priorities and recommended strategies reflect Bridgeport's safety needs.

Transparency and Documentation

The Task Force discussed the level of documentation included in the plan and appendices. Members noted that the appendices include detailed crash data, scoring methodology, and engagement documentation.

At the time of the meeting, the project team indicated that detailed cost tables and final map refinements were still being completed.

Task Force members confirmed that the level of documentation appears appropriate and transparent.

Administrative Updates

Several administrative updates were noted during the meeting, including two official additions to the Task Force:

- Andrew Leisy, the new Street Superintendent
- Jessica Rocha, PPHD

Review of Projects, Programs, and Policies

The Task Force reviewed the 26 projects, programs, and policy actions listed in **APPENDIX A8 - PROJECTS**.

During this discussion, Task Force members reviewed project descriptions and implementation tiers, and were asked whether any changes to project priorities were recommended. No tier changes were formally requested.

Key discussion points included:

- Confirmation that **Project J3** (PWCC mid-block crossing) is expected to be constructed in 2026.
- Discussion of speeding concerns along Main Street, including questions about whether the speed limit could be reduced to 25 mph in the future. Task Force members noted that enforcement data and citations are often necessary to support NDOT speed limit adjustments on state highways.
- Clarification regarding speed feedback sign standards (**Program P2**). It was noted that alternating red and blue flashing displays are no longer permitted, and that approved signs must use yellow backgrounds.

- Intersections at 5th & Main and 10th & Main were identified as high-priority locations for safety improvements. Advancing **Project J11** to **Tier 1** may be considered during final plan refinement.

General Plan Discussion

Task Force members were asked whether any sections of the plan raised concerns or required additional clarification. No major issues were identified.

One member noted that while safety plans often contain strong recommendations, the key challenge for many communities is ensuring that the plan is actively implemented rather than forgotten once completed.

Public Review Strategy

The Task Force discussed options for conducting the public review period for the draft Safety Action Plan.

The project team proposed posting the draft plan on the City website and opening a public comment period.

Task Force members recommended:

- Extending the review period to three to four weeks.
- Providing reminders during the review period (for example, “One week remaining to comment”).
- Clearly identifying a contact person for questions about the plan.
- Referencing the City website in outreach materials.
- Conducting targeted outreach to the school.
- Distributing flyers through utility bills and around town.
- Publishing notices in the local newspaper, which remains an important information source for many residents.

Task Force members also suggested providing guidance for reviewing the plan, since the full document may be overwhelming for residents seeing it for the first time.

Additional Discussion Topics

The Task Force briefly discussed a “phantom right-turn lane” issue at one downtown intersection and the need for further evaluation of traffic operations before determining whether changes are appropriate. It was suggested that reviewing traffic conditions during peak periods may help inform potential improvements.

Additional discussion occurred regarding potential downtown lighting enhancements, with members noting that some lighting improvements may have both safety and aesthetic benefits.

Task Force Confirmation

At the conclusion of the meeting, Task Force members were asked to confirm whether they were comfortable releasing the draft Safety Action Plan for public review following final edits, cost refinements, and map updates.

Task Force members indicated general agreement with moving forward to public review.

The meeting concluded with appreciation for the Task Force members’ continued participation and their commitment to improving transportation safety in Bridgeport.

S|S
4|A

Safe Streets and Roads for All

Self-Certification Eligibility Worksheet

All applicants should follow the instructions in the NOFO to correctly apply for a grant. See the SS4A website for more information.

Table 1 of the SS4A NOFO describes seven components of an Action Plan, which correspond to the questions in this worksheet. Applicants should use this worksheet to determine whether their existing plan(s) contains the required components to be considered an eligible Action Plan for SS4A.

This worksheet is required for all SS4A **Implementation Grant** applications and any **Planning and Demonstration Grant applications to conduct Supplemental Planning/Demonstration Activities only**. Please complete the form in its entirety, do not adjust the formatting or headings of the worksheet, and upload the completed PDF with your application.

Eligibility

An Action Plan is considered eligible for an SS4A application for an Implementation Grant or a Planning and Demonstration Grant to conduct Supplemental Planning/Demonstration Activities if the following two conditions are met:

- You can answer "YES" to Questions **3, 6,** and **8** in this worksheet; *and*
- You can answer "YES" to **at least three of the five remaining** Questions, **1, 2, 4, 5,** and **7.**

If both conditions are not met, an applicant is still eligible to apply for a Planning and Demonstration Grant to fund the creation of a new Action Plan or updates to an existing Action Plan to meet SS4A requirements.

Applicant Information

Lead Applicant: City of Bridgeport, Nebraska **UEI:** FMKLGZ8DP319

Action Plan Documents

In the table below, list the relevant Action Plan and any additional plans or documents that you reference in this form. **Up to three plans or documents may be included**. Please provide a hyperlink to any documents available online or indicate that the Action Plan or other documents will be uploaded in Valid Eval as part of your application. Note that, to be considered an eligible Action Plan for SS4A, the plan(s) coverage must be broader than just a corridor, neighborhood, or specific location.

Document Title	Link	Date of Most Recent Update
Bridgeport Vision Zero	bit.ly/BPSS4A (links from website)	Approved 5/14/26
Bridgeport Vision Zero Appendices	bit.ly/BPSS4A (links from website)	Approved 5/14/26

U.S. Department of Transportation

Action Plan Components

For each question below, answer "YES" or "NO." If "YES," list the relevant plan(s) or supporting documentation that address the condition and the specific page number(s) in each document that corroborates your response. This form provides space to reference multiple plans, but please list only the most relevant document(s).

1. Leadership Commitment and Goal Setting

Are **BOTH** of the following true?

- A high-ranking official and/or governing body in the jurisdiction publicly committed to an eventual goal of zero roadway fatalities and serious injuries; and
- The commitment includes either setting a target date to reach zero OR setting one or more targets to achieve a reduction in roadway fatalities and serious injuries by a specific date.

☑ **YES**

☐ **NO**

Note: This may include a resolution, policy, ordinance, executive order, or other official announcement from a high-ranking official and the official adoption of a plan that includes the commitment by a legislative body.

If "YES," please list the relevant document(s) and page number(s) that corroborate your response.

Document Title	Page Number(s)
Bridgeport Vision Zero	iv, v, 5, 100
Bridgeport Vision Zero Appendices (A10 - Support)	288-289

2. Planning Structure

To develop the Action Plan, was a committee, task force, implementation group, or similar body established and charged with the plan's development, implementation, and monitoring?

☑ **YES**

☐ **NO**

Note: This should include a description of the membership of the group and what role they play in the development, implementation, and monitoring of the Action Plan.

If "YES," please list the relevant document(s) and page number(s) that corroborate your response.

Document Title	Page Number(s)
Bridgeport Vision Zero	ii, xxii, 17, 23
Bridgeport Vision Zero Appendices (A11 - Documentation)	306-313

3. Safety Analysis

Does the Action Plan include **ALL** of the following?

- Analysis of existing conditions and historical trends to provide a baseline level of crashes involving fatalities and serious injuries across a jurisdiction, locality, Tribe, or region;
- Analysis of the location(s) of crashes, the severity, contributing factors, and crash types;
- Analysis of systemic and specific safety needs, as needed (e.g., high-risk road features, specific safety needs of relevant road users, or post-crash care and emergency response); and,
- A geospatial identification (geographic or locational data using maps) of higher risk locations.

☑ **YES**
☐ **NO**

Note: Availability and level of detail of safety data may vary greatly by location. The Fatality and Injury Reporting System Tool (FIRST) provides county- and city-level data. When available, local data should be used to supplement nationally available data sets.

If "YES," please list the relevant document(s) and page number(s) that corroborate your response.

Document Title	Page Number(s)
Bridgeport Vision Zero	2, 7-10, 27-48
Bridgeport Vision Zero Appendices (A2 - Collisions and A3 - Crash Maps)	29-45; 47-69

4. Engagement and Collaboration

Did development of the Action Plan include **ALL** of the following activities?

- Engagement with the public and relevant stakeholders, including the private sector and community groups;
- Incorporation of information received from the engagement and collaboration into the plan; and
- Coordination that included inter- and intra-governmental cooperation and collaboration, as appropriate.

☑ **YES**
☐ **NO**

Note: This should include a description of public meetings, participation in public and private events, and proactive meetings with stakeholders.

If "YES," please list the relevant document(s) and page number(s) that corroborate your response.

Document Title	Page Number(s)
Bridgeport Vision Zero	13-26
Bridgeport Vision Zero Appendices (A1 - Engagement and A10 - Support)	5-27, 291-302

5. Policy and Process Changes

Are **BOTH** of the following true?

- The plan development included an assessment of current policies, plans, guidelines, and/or standards to identify opportunities to improve how processes prioritize safety; and
- The plan discusses implementation through the adoption of revised or new policies, guidelines, and/or standards.

☑ **YES**
☐ **NO**

Note: This may include existing and/or recommended Complete Streets policy, guidelines for community engagement and collaboration, policy for prioritizing areas of greatest need, local laws (e.g., speed limit), design guidelines, and other policies and processes that prioritize safety.

If "YES," please list the relevant document(s) and page number(s) that corroborate your response.

Document Title	Page Number(s)
Bridgeport Vision Zero	xiv, xviii, 25-26, 61-62, 73, 80, 84
Bridgeport Vision Zero Appendices (A6 - Findings and A8 - Projects)	102-105; 138, 148–165, 188-189, 200-203, 217

6. Strategy and Project Selections

Does the plan identify a comprehensive set of projects and strategies to address the safety problems in the Action Plan, with information about time ranges when projects and strategies will be deployed, and an explanation of project prioritization criteria?

☑ **YES**
☐ **NO**

Note: This should include one or more lists of community-wide multi-modal and multi-disciplinary projects that respond to safety problems and reflect community input, indication of expected time ranges to complete each project, and a description of how your community will prioritize projects in the future.

If "YES," please list the relevant document(s) and page number(s) that corroborate your response.

Document Title	Page Number(s)
Bridgeport Vision Zero	49-84
Bridgeport Vision Zero Appendices (A8 - Projects and A9 - Countermeasures)	129-217; 219-275

7. Progress and Transparency

Does the plan include **BOTH** of the following?

- A description of how progress will be measured over time that includes, at a minimum, outcome data.
- The plan is posted publicly online.

☑ **YES**
☐ **NO**

Note: This should include a progress reporting structure and list of proposed metrics.

If "YES," please list the relevant document(s) and page number(s) that corroborate your response.

Document Title	Page Number(s)
Bridgeport Vision Zero	96
Bridgeport Vision Zero Appendices	3
bit.ly/BPSS4A	link

8. Action Plan Date

Was at least one of your plans finalized and/or last updated between 2021 and May 26, 2026?

☑ **YES**
☐ **NO**

Note: Updates may include major revisions, updates to the data used for analysis, status updates, or the addition of supplemental planning documents, including but not limited to an ADA Transition Plan, one or more Road Safety Audits conducted in high-crash locations, or a Vulnerable Road User Plan.

If "YES," please list your most recent document, date of finalization, and page number(s) that corroborate your response.

Document Title	Date of Most Recent Update	Page Number(s)
Bridgeport Vision Zero (adopted by City Council)	5/14/26	xiv, 5, 100