Planning for Active Transportation

To better understand the current state of active transportation planning, a survey of state DOTs and regional planning organizations was distributed on behalf of SCOP, AMPO, and NARC. Thirty-one state DOTs and 99 MPOs responded – providing the insights and information shared here.

FROM INTEGRATION TO IMPLEMENTATION

How is pedestrian and bicycle planning currently incorporated into your planning efforts?

- 91% Incorporated fully within LRTP or as an element of an LRTP
- 34% Separate plan
- 6% As needed or on a project-by-project basis
- 5% Not currently well incorporated

How has your agency implemented pedestrian and bicycle recommendations or plans?

- 63% Adopted pedestrian and bicyclist policies (e.g., Complete Streets, design, or project selection)
- 47% Dedicated funds or created programs for pedestrian and bicyclist projects
- 40% Adopted pedestrian and bicyclist safety plans or programs
- 27% Mainstreamed into design, engineering, or maintenance programs

MPO AND DOT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES

- 57% Projects submitted for consideration in the STP tend to receive higher scores if they include bike/ped provisions.
- 47% Bike/ped needs included in preliminary planning of all construction projects.
- 45% Bike/ped coordinator reviews road safety audits and annual resurfacing lists, coordinating with communities where there is opportunity to add bike facilities...
- 68% Site plan reviews incorporate, at a minimum, pedestrian connectivity reviews and comments.
- 52% “Face-to-face meetings between maintenance crews and bike/ped users.”
- 28% Maintenance
- 11% Other
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MPO AND DOT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES

Priority pedestrian and bicycle networks designated?  
- States – Yes 54%  
- States – No 46%
- MPOs – Yes 45%  
- MPOs – No 55%

Pedestrian and bicycle performance measures developed?  
- States – Yes 20%  
- States – No 80%
- MPOs – Yes 35%  
- MPOs – No 65%

- 'We categorize the street network into 4 tiers ranging from short-term to long-term.'
- 'We identified the top 10 crash locations and are designing countermeasures.'
- 'Projects in local and/or regional plans score bonus points in applications...completing connections also scores bonus points.'

Example performance measures include:
- Cost effectiveness
- Connectivity
- Safety (fatalities and serious injuries)
- Congestion
- Transit access
- Bike/ped counts
- Mode share
- Facility miles

FINANCING PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Alternatives Program</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes to School and/or Nonmotorized Pilot Program</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Trails</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Funds</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARRA</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety (HSIP)</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...of agencies have established funding sources or employed innovative financing strategies.

- 'Attract private funds.'
- 'Bike/ped set-aside for discretionary STP funds.'
- 'Leverage grants and funds other state agencies, such as commerce, health and welfare, and others.'
- 'Use environmental fines as local match for Federal money.'
- 'TIGER 2 grant matched with private funds.'
- 'Early coordination with maintenance engineers.'
- 'Planning grant to integrate land use and active transportation.'
- '1/2 cent sales tax program includes funding for new bikeways and trails.'
- 'Bikeshare program partially funded through advertising revenues.'
- 'Bike/ped projects have access to pooled funds in the TIP to better reflects local priorities.'
BARRIERS AND CHALLENGES TO EFFECTIVE PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE PLANNING

'Venturing sidewalks and existing bicycle facilities.'
'Tying bike/ped improvements to future land use plans.'
'Right-of-way constraints.'
'Lack of consistent and reliable bike/ped counts.'
'State and Federal regulations make spending monies cumbersome and impractical.'
'Lack of staff resources in member agencies to advance priority projects.'
'It may not be primarily a data or a technical issue. It is a cultural issue. The political culture and traffic engineering culture is largely inimical to bike and pedestrian improvements. It's also a generational issue.'

WHAT SOURCES ARE USED FOR PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE DATA?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Sources Include</th>
<th>Bike/Ped Travel Counts</th>
<th>Bike/Ped Travel Model</th>
<th>User-Generated Data</th>
<th>Commercial Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑ U.S. Census/ACS ☑ Strava heat maps ☑ Miovision ☑ Volume Counters ☑ Custom surveys ☑ Wikimap ☑ Bicycle Level of Service tools ☑ Google Earth ☑ HPMS data ☑ Smartphone apps</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HOW HAS SOCIAL MEDIA ENHANCED PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE PLANNING?

Outreach and Communications: 72%
Identifying Needs and Projects: 45%
Data Collection and Visualization: 26%
Not Currently Using: 21%
Other: 3%

COMPLETE STREETS AND PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE PLANNING

Have Complete Streets policies been adopted?
- No policies in place: 46%
- Policies in practice but not adopted: 27%
- Policies formally adopted: 27%

What are the benefits of Complete Streets policies?
- Encouraged bike/ped activity: 94%
- Improved safety: 85%
- Increased property values or livability: 49%
- Increased transit ridership: 40%
- Resulted in more efficient traffic flows: 34%
- Boosted local business or tourism: 32%
- Provided project cost savings: 21%
EXAMPLES OF EFFECTIVE PLANNING INITIATIVES AND EFFORTS

- ‘Bike/ped committee maps a section of our planning area for every meeting and participants identify issues and potential solutions. Ultimately, these lines and dots are geocoded and used as a basis for our adopted plans.’
- ‘Bike-n-Brainstorm program – interactive advocacy meetings built into bike rides.’
- ‘Connecting bike/ped facilities to transit routes and stops.’
- ‘Trail counters...seeing how many people are using the trails makes it easier to justify bike/ped needs.’
- ‘Smartphone-based bike route choice survey.’
- ‘Complete Streets policy started dialogue between agencies, addressing bike/ped issues/fears/doubts.’
- ‘We adopted a policy that requires bicycle and pedestrian accommodation in everything we do.’
- ‘Bike/ped checklist that assesses needs for all projects in the planning, scoping, and design phases.’
- ‘Systems approach to Safe Routes to School planning: ranking elementary schools using objective data to maximize impact of limited funds.’
- ‘On-line interactive map, allowing users to draw and post comments.’
- ‘Individual outreach to bicycling community leadership.’
- ‘Recently developed State Multimodal Planning Guide addresses shared use of available right-of-way.’

GAUGING THE IMPACT OF BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PLANNING

Has your agency evaluated bike/ped improvements in terms of ROI, public health benefits, or economic development?

- Evaluation Examples
  - ‘Statewide bicycle economic impact study.’
  - ‘National figures or statistics for benefits.’
  - ‘Return on Investment metrics in TIGER II application.’
  - ‘Complete Streets Health Impact Assessment.’

Other Efforts to Better Incorporate Public Health

- ‘Health stakeholders on the MPO Bike-Ped Advisory Committee.’
- ‘We plan to get local healthcare agencies more involved to help develop a more connected bike/ped network.’
- ‘We work with health department officials, county wellness coordinator, parks, and the local hospital on various projects.’
- ‘The private sector in public health has been an excellent partner – helping to fund several facilities and programs.’

For more information about this NCHRP effort and to view additional snapshots please visit www.planningsnapshots.camsys.com.
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