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Steering Committee Meeting No. 2 Summary

Date: Thursday, January 12, 2012
Time: 10:00 am – 11:30 am
Location: Board Room
206 S. 17th Ave.
Phoenix, Arizona

ATTENDANCE

Bob Baldwin, Arizona State Parks
Bob Beane, Coalition of Arizona Bicyclists
Brian Fellows, ADOT Safe Routes to School
Larry Burns, Arizona Department of Public Safety
Ann Chanecka, Pima Association of Governments
Maureen DeCindis, Maricopa Association of Governments
Carlene Firman, ADOT Communication and Community Partnerships
Martin Ince, Flagstaff MPO (via teleconference)
Kristen Keener Busby, ADOT MPD Rail and Sustainability
Adam McGuire, Roadway PreDesign Section
James Meyer, MPD GIS
Richard Moeur, ADOT Traffic
Mike Normand, ADOT MPD Transit
Bill Pederson, ADOT Communication and Community Partnerships
Gregory Wisecaver, ADOT Tucson (via teleconference)
Michael Sanders, ADOT MPD

Consultant Staff in Attendance
Brent Crowther, Kimley-Horn & Associates, Inc.
Mike Colety, Kimley-Horn & Associates, Inc.

MEETING SUMMARY

Steering Committee Meeting No. 2 was held for the ADOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Update on January 12, 2012. The purpose of Steering Committee Meeting No. 2 was to review and discuss Draft Working Paper No. 1, which was previously distributed to the TAC, and preview Work-in-Progress Working Paper No. 2, which was distributed at the meeting.
The following summarizes key discussion items.

**Introductions**

Mike Sanders began the meeting by leading introductions.

Brent Crowther started the discussions with an overview of the agenda and project schedule.

**Draft Working Paper No. 1 Overview**

The following comments were made in regards to the Vision statement.

- B. Fellows asked, is there any mention of wayfinding?
- R. Moeur noted that his concerns are not with the vision, but the how. Potential for varying interpretation, so plan is important.
- Kristin Keener Busby stated that transit is missing in vision.
- B. Beane raised a concern with the last sentence – concern with phrase “their place”. The group decided that changing it to say “their accommodation” would be better.

Eight goals were proposed in Draft Working Paper No. 1 that will work towards accomplishing the statements made in the Vision. Associated with each goal are one or more objectives, which will outline how to accomplish the goals. Performance indicators were established which will be used to chart progress toward the goals and objectives.

The goals, objectives, and performance indicators were discussed:

**Goal 1: Increase bicycle and pedestrian trips**

- G. Wisecaver stated that 0.1% is clear, but 0.5% by 2017 is the goal, but should be per year. Make that clear.
- M. Ince asked where the 0.1% came from? What is the basis for the recommendation?
- L. Burns expressed concern in wording, increasing percentage of 0.1 percent
- M. Normand asked how it’s being measured and what the statistical margin of error is. How well can you measure your success if you are within margin of error? B. Crowther responded that it will be monitored using the American Community Surveys.
- B. Beane asked how the survey addresses multiple modes (e.g. from bike to transit). M. Sanders responded that the survey only captures the primary mode. Transition from bike to transit would show up as transit.
- B. Fellows raised a concern with the wording. Objective comes across as 0.1% per year, then 0.5% per year after 2017.

**Goal 2: Improve Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure on State Highways**

- L. Burns raised the concern that the goal does not have a percent increase goal, just “increase”. We should have a particular goal.
- A. Chanecka stated that it would be good to address pedestrian crossings also.
R. Moeur stated that crossings have been a problem. These crossing are critical for a network. The number of crossings is not readily available and may not lend itself to performance measurement.

A general discussion followed about reducing crashes and that will require an increase in safe crossings of state highways.

**Goal 3: Improve Bicyclist and Pedestrian Safety on State Highways**
- B. Fellows stated that the 15 counties differ significantly in infrastructure. Is there any way to track this by county?
- M. Normand suggested making safety the top goal.
- L. Burns made the comment that the goals are dreamy but not specific.
- R. Moeur raised stated that the effectiveness of some countermeasures is not yet known. It is difficult to affix a specific goal to an issue when we don’t know how effective the countermeasures are.

**Goal 4: Improve Enforcement of Bicycle and Pedestrian Laws**
- K. Keener-Busby commented that it should say “to” police officers in Objective 2.
- A. Chaneecka stated that there needs to be enough bicycle and pedestrian information in driver’s manuals. This may fall under a strategy.
- L. Burns commented that some of these goals are potentially objectives of other goals.

**Goal 5: Improve Local Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities that Complement the SHS**
- M. Normand made some comments on incorporating into Grant process (i)
- M. Normand suggested to have the goal on plans come before the goal of increasing infrastructure (ii)
- K. Keener Busby commented that it sounds good to combine this goal with the other plans goal.

**Goal 6: Improve Funding for Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities**
- M. DeCindis commented that there’s a problem with goals – how can Michael achieve this?
- M. Normand asked whether the money that comes to the state and MAG is population based. M. DeCindis responded that CMAQ dollars are being allocated 17% to bike/ped in MAG. Small component of Transportation Enhancement and Safe Routes to School.
- M. Normand cautioned that before we say we need more money, we need to make sure we are spending the money we have allocated.
- B. Beane commented that a lot of the money that could have been used for bicyclists and pedestrians was rescinded. There is poor use of HSIP.
  - R. Moeur commented that with HSIP, it took a re-assignment of priority, and now they are spending the money. It can be tough when not set up to manage funds. FHWA likes system generated needs.

**Goal 7: Improve Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans, Policies, and Provisions**
- M. Normand asked for an explanation of provisions.
  » B. Crowther responded that a map is a good example or design guidelines
- A discussion followed on bike share.
  » M. DeCindis commented that Phoenix has been looking at bike share, but it
doesn’t pencil out.
  » B. Fellows suggested increasing the number of bike racks on a particular
transit vehicle also.
  » B. Baldwin commented that bike racks on LRT that are located in the
middle of the vehicle are hard to get to.
- A. Chanecka stated that a policy issue that needs to be addressed is the fact that bike
routes aren’t allowed on State Highways.
- A. Chanecka stated that SHSP doesn’t explicitly talk address pedestrians and bicycles. A
recommendation could be to allow the State Gas Tax to be used for bicycles. HURF
funding may be legislative.
  » M. Sanders commented that SHSP addresses bike/pedestrian
improvements under intersection safety.
  » A. Chanecka responded that she would like to see it more specific.
  » M. Sanders stated that ADOT has a bicycle policy, but the minimum
accommodation of cyclists is always a question.
  » R. Moeur asked how much will the bicycle pedestrian plan update control
and influence bicycle policy in ITD. There is clear unhappiness in the details
of the current policy. Will ITD make changes in their policy based on the
recommendations of this Plan?
  » M. Sanders responded that the BSAP plan already has recommended
changes to bike policy.
  » R. Moeur commented that ITD needs to go forward with parallel process to
review the bicycle policy.
  » A. Chanecka stated that the Plan needs to recognize the limitations of
recommendations from the State Plan.

Goal 8: Improve and Expand Bicycle and Pedestrian Encouragement and Education
- B. Fellows said that he would be happy to update everyone on the Safe Routes to School
training curriculum. Brian can provide updated data about Safe Routes participants.

General Discussion of Working Paper No. 1

The following comments were made concluding the discussion on the Draft Working Paper
No. 1:
- A. Chanecka commented that there needs to be a goal or objective regarding improving
evaluation, and counting of bicyclists and pedestrians.
  » B. Fellows stated that more women bicycling and walking is a key indicator of safer
and more comfortable facilities.
  » K. Keener Busby suggested that it all comes back to land use.
  » M. Normand commented that Flagstaff has good land use, university, transit.
  » R. Moeur commented that there’s a pedestrian hybrid beacon on Loop 101 Frontage
Road (there’s also a grade separation there also, which opened last year).
Work-In-Progress Working Paper No. 2 Overview

Working Paper No. 2 is a summary and analysis of current and future conditions for bicycling and walking. The document is organized around each of the eight goal categories.

A brief overview of some of the data presented in Working Paper No. 2 was discussed. Also distributed was a draft list of needs and deficiencies. The Steering Committee was asked to provide comment on the list and to provide general comment on the contents of Working Paper No.2, recognizing that the SC will have the opportunity to provide more detailed comment on WP2 following distribution of the draft.

Public Involvement

B. Pederson provided an update on the public involvement process. They will be following the template implemented for the Long Range Transportation Plan. News releases will be dispersed using ADOT Facebook, ADOT blog, Twitter, and outreach to local government and tribal representatives.

SC members were invited to visit the website for review and to submit any comments.

In regards to the survey, the survey questions still have to be determined. They are planning on using Survey Monkey as the survey platform.

- Brian voiced a concern on the sample question and whether the general public knows what roadways are “ADOT roadways” and which ones aren’t.

Next Steps

- Assessment of the needs and deficiencies, which will be prepared for the next SC meeting.
- Steering Committee Meeting No. 3.

Attachments

1. Agenda
2. PowerPoint Presentation
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STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING NO. 2

DATE: THURSDAY, JANUARY 12, 2012
TIME: 10:00 AM
LOCATION: BOARD ROOM
206 S.17TH AVE.
PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85007
TELECONFERENCE AVAILABLE*
CALL-IN# 1-866-726-6516
CODE: 227698437

*Please RSVP to msanders@azdot.gov if you intend to participate via teleconference. Meeting handouts will then be distributed to you in advance of the meeting.

AGENDA

1) Discussion of Working Paper No. 1

Draft Working Paper No. 1 was distributed to the Steering Committee on December 14. Steering Committee members are requested to submit comments on Working Paper No. 1 by January 12, 2012, using the comment form that was provided. Comments may be submitted to: msanders@azdot.gov.

   a) Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Update Vision
   b) Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Update Goals and Objectives
   c) Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Update Performance Measurement

2) Discussion of Working Paper No. 2

Working Paper No. 2 will include: 1) Summary of current conditions, and 2) Assessment of needs and deficiencies. Part 1 (current conditions) has been completed, and will be distributed at the Steering Committee Meeting. Part 2 (assessment of needs and deficiencies) is underway.

   a) Current conditions summary
   b) Assessment of needs and deficiencies

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:
MICHAEL SANDERS, ADOT PROJECT MANAGER, (602) 712-8141
3) Next Steps

   a) Final Working Paper No. 1, based on Steering Committee input.

   b) Draft Working Paper No. 2. Assessment of needs and deficiencies will be added to Working Paper No. 2. WP2 will be distributed for Steering Committee review.

   c) Public Involvement
Agenda

» Discussion of Working Paper No. 1
  » Vision
  » Goals and Objectives
  » Performance Measurement

» Discussion of Working Paper No. 2
  » Current Conditions
  » Needs and Deficiencies

» Next Steps
Vision Statement

Arizona will become a state where people of all ages and abilities can conveniently, comfortably, and safely walk or bicycle to destinations within a reasonable distance as part of their everyday life.

The quality of life and health of Arizona residents will be improved as more people choose to walk or bike.

A “complete system” of state highways and local streets will enhance the livability and economic vitality of cities and towns in rural and urban areas.

State highways will provide mobility and access for people to travel to work, school, shop, and recreate, especially where the state highway plays a critical role in the local transportation network and serves as “Main Street.” State highways will be designed to complement the local transportation system and collectively establish a “complete system” that encourages bicycling and walking.

New and enhanced bicycle and pedestrian facilities will make the trip safer, more pleasant, more convenient, more accessible, and with minimal barriers. Bicycling and walking will be incorporated into state highway design to meet the needs of a bicyclists and pedestrians of all abilities at interchanges, intersections, and traffic signals. Nonmotorized travelers’ facilities such as underpasses/overpasses, bicycle lanes, sidewalks and paths will clearly indicate the right of way or their place on shared roadways.
Vision

Goal No. 1: Increase bicycle and pedestrian trips

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Reporting Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Increase the percentage of trips to work by walking and bicycling statewide by 0.1% per year, and 0.5% by the year 2017, as compared to baseline data available for 2010.</td>
<td>Percentage of trips to work by walking and bicycling statewide</td>
<td>American Community Survey (ACS), which is conducted annually. The most recent ACS data was collected in 2010.</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goal No. 2: Improve Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure on State Highways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Reporting Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Increase the number of miles of ADOT state highways (non-access controlled) with sidewalks or shared-use paths.</td>
<td>Number of miles of state highways with adjacent/parallel sidewalks or shared-use paths in urban areas/small urban areas.</td>
<td>ADOT Highway Performance Monitoring System, which is updated annually by ADOT.</td>
<td>Bi-annual or greater basis, not to exceed every five years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Increase the number of miles of state highways with wide paved shoulders that meet ADOT design guidelines.</td>
<td>Number of miles of state highways with a shoulder width of 4 feet or greater.</td>
<td>ADOT Highway Performance Monitoring System, which is updated annually by ADOT.</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vision

Goal No. 3: Improve Bicyclist and Pedestrian Safety on State Highways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Reporting Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Reduce the rate per one million population of bicycle fatalities and injuries on State highways.</td>
<td>Number of bicyclist injuries and fatalities statewide.</td>
<td>ADOT Crash Facts</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rate per one million population of bicycle fatalities and injuries statewide.</td>
<td>ADOT Crash Facts</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of bicyclist injuries and fatalities on ADOT State Highways.</td>
<td>Safety Data Mart</td>
<td>Bi-annual or greater basis, not to exceed every five years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reduce the rate per one million population of pedestrian fatalities and injuries on State highways.</td>
<td>Number of pedestrian injuries and fatalities statewide.</td>
<td>ADOT Crash Facts</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rate per one million population of pedestrian fatalities and injuries on State Highways.</td>
<td>ADOT Crash Facts</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of pedestrian injuries and fatalities on ADOT State Highways</td>
<td>Safety Data Mart</td>
<td>Bi-annual or greater basis, not to exceed every five years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vision

» Goal No. 4: Improve Enforcement of Bicycle and Pedestrian Laws

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Reporting Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Increase safety by including bicycle, pedestrian, and motorist enforcement as part of Police Officer Standards and Training (POST).</td>
<td>Inclusion of bicycle, pedestrian, and motorist education in POST.</td>
<td>Police Officer Standards and Training</td>
<td>Concurrent with updates to ADOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Provide continuing education of police officers about bicycle, pedestrian, and motorist safety.</td>
<td>Number of public safety agencies (police, sheriff, etc.) that provide continuing education for bicycle, pedestrian, and motorist enforcement</td>
<td>Stakeholder survey</td>
<td>Concurrent with updates to ADOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vision

» Goal No. 5: Improve Local Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities that Complement the SHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Reporting Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Increase the number of designated bicycle and pedestrian facilities (bicycle lanes, bicycle boulevards, shared use paths) in local jurisdictions within ½ mile of the SHS.</td>
<td>No measurement identified.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Increase connectivity of local streets that supplement the SHS. Low-volume local streets can serve as an alternative to the SHS for bicyclists and pedestrians.</td>
<td>No measurement identified.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Vision**

» **Goal No. 6: Improve Funding for Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase the percentage of federal transportation funds obligated to bicycle and pedestrian projects in Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the funds committed to bicycle and pedestrian projects in the ADOT Five Year Facilities Construction Program and the Arizona State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of transportation funding allocated to bicycle and pedestrian projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds committed to bicycle and pedestrian projects in the ADOT Five Year Facilities Construction Program and the Arizona State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Funding for Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities and Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADOT Five Year Facilities Construction Program Transportation Improvement Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concurrent with updates to ADOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vision**

» **Goal No. 7: Improve Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans, Policies, and Provisions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase the number of cities, towns, tribal communities, counties, metropolitan planning organizations, and associations of government with an adopted “complete streets” policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the number of bicycle and pedestrian master plans adopted by local cities, towns, tribal communities, counties, metropolitan planning organizations, and associations of government.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of jurisdictions with a formal Complete Streets Policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number jurisdictions with a bicycle and/or pedestrian master plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concurrent with updates to ADOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concurrent with updates to ADOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vision

» Goal No. 7: Improve Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans, Policies, and Provisions (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Reporting Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Increase the number of cities, towns, tribal communities, counties, metropolitan planning organizations, and associations of government with publicly available bicycle maps.</td>
<td>Number of jurisdictions with a publicly available bicycle map.</td>
<td>Stakeholder survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>Increase the number of cities, towns, tribal communities, counties, metropolitan planning organizations, and associations of government with formal Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committees.</td>
<td>Number of jurisdictions with a formal Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee.</td>
<td>Stakeholder survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>Increase the number of cities, towns, tribal communities, and counties with bicycle parking requirements.</td>
<td>Number of jurisdictions with bicycle parking requirements.</td>
<td>Stakeholder survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi.</td>
<td>Increase the number of transit agencies with bike-transit integration (bike racks on buses, bicycle parking at transit stops, etc.)</td>
<td>Number of transit agencies with bicycle amenities (bikes on bus/bike racks, bicycle parking at transit stops)</td>
<td>Stakeholder survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Goal No. 7: Improve Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans, Policies, and Provisions (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Reporting Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vii. Identify actions to develop and implement an ADOT Americans with Disabilities (ADA) Transition Plan.</td>
<td>Number of agencies with formal ADA Transition Plans.</td>
<td>Stakeholder survey</td>
<td>Concurrent with updates to ADOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Goal No. 8: Improve and Expand Bicycle and Pedestrian Encouragement and Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Reporting Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Increase the number of schools that participate in education and encouragement events such as the International Walk to School Day.</td>
<td>Number of schools that participated in International Walk to School Day.</td>
<td>Stakeholder survey</td>
<td>Concurrent with updates to ADOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Increase the number of cities, towns, tribal communities, counties, metropolitan planning organizations, and associations of government that participate in Bike to Work Day.</td>
<td>Number of jurisdictions/agencies that participated in Bike to Work Day</td>
<td>Stakeholder survey</td>
<td>Concurrent with updates to ADOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Goal No. 8: Improve and Expand Bicycle and Pedestrian Encouragement and Education (con’t)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Reporting Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Develop and distribute a standard Safe Routes to School bicycle skills training curriculum available for all programs throughout the state in the next two years</td>
<td>Number of schools that implement the statewide Safe Routes to School bicycle skills curriculum.</td>
<td>Concurrent with updates to ADOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>Promote bicyclist training programs for adults such as those provided by the League of American Bicyclists; cosponsor safety and training programs with Coalition of Arizona Bicyclists and/or other agencies</td>
<td>Number of training courses and participants in of bicyclists training programs for adults</td>
<td>League of American Bicyclists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>Produce and distribute bicycle and pedestrian safety education materials.</td>
<td>Number of bicycle and pedestrian safety education materials distributed.</td>
<td>ADOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bicycle and Pedestrian “Dashboard”

- **Bicycling Demand**
  - Percentage of trips to work by walking and bicycling statewide

- **Infrastructure**
  - Number of miles of state highways with a shoulder width of 4 feet or greater

- **Safety**
  - Number of bicyclist injuries and fatalities statewide
  - Rate per one million population of bicycle fatalities and injuries statewide
  - Number of pedestrian injuries and fatalities statewide
  - Rate per one million population of pedestrian fatalities and injuries on State Highways.

- **Funding**
  - Percentage of transportation funding allocated to bicycle and pedestrian projects.

- **Education**
  - Number of training courses and participants in bicyclists training programs for adults
  - Number of bicycle and pedestrian safety education materials distributed

---

Working Paper No. 1

- **Comments on Vision, Goals, Objectives and Performance Indicators?**
Working Paper No. 2 – Current and Future Conditions

» Current conditions summary

» Assessment of needs and deficiencies

WP No. 2 – Current Conditions Summary

» Organized around each of the “Goal Categories”

  » No. 1: Increase Bicycle and Pedestrian Trips
  » No. 2: Improve Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure on State Highways
  » No. 3: Improve Bicyclist and Pedestrian Safety on State Highways
  » No. 4: Improve Enforcement of Bicycle and Pedestrian Laws (for motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians)
  » No. 5: Improve Local Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities that Complement the SHS
  » No. 6: Improve Funding for Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities
  » No. 8: Improve and Expand Bicycle and Pedestrian Encouragement and Education Programs
Bicycle and Pedestrian Trips (Goal 1)

» American Community Survey

- Means of Transportation to Work

Other Bicycle and Pedestrian Data (Goal 1)

» ADOT BSAP/PSAP

- Work: 14.30%, School: 2.40%, Errands: 35.70%, Social: 26.20%, Recreation/Exercise: 71.40%, Other: 31.00%
Other Bicycle and Pedestrian Data (Goal 1)

» ADOT BSAP/PSAP

![Bar chart showing percentage of riders for different categories]

Categories: Work, School, Errands, Social, Recreation/Exercise, Other

- Work: 14.30%
- School: 2.40%
- Errands: 35.70%
- Social: 26.20%
- Recreation/Exercise: 71.40%
- Other: 31.00%

Table 2 - Bicycling Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Cyclists</td>
<td>9,796</td>
<td>20,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Riding</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Riding</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 18 and 65</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riding in AM Peak</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riding in PM Peak</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helmet Usage</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riding Wrong Way</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Riding</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Other Bicycle and Pedestrian Data (Goal 1)

- **ADOT Permanent Bicycle Count Station on SR 179**

![Bar Chart](image)

#### Permanent Count Station on SR 179

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Number of Bicyclists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>2,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>1,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>1,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>1,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>1,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>1,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>1,564</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure (Goal 2)

- **Paved Shoulders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>State Highway Configuration</th>
<th>Miles</th>
<th>% of SHS with effective shoulder width of 4 feet or greater</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Highways without Rumble Strips</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder Width of 4 feet or Greater</td>
<td>848.98</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder Width Less than 4 feet</td>
<td>2,267.81</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SHS without rumble strips</td>
<td>3,116.79</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Highways with Rumble Strips</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder Width of 4 feet or Greater</td>
<td>2,003.67</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder Width Less than 4 feet</td>
<td>704.73</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SHS with Rumble Strips</td>
<td>2,708.40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5,825.38</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure (Goal 2)

» Paved Shoulders

Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure (Goal 2)

» Bicycle Lanes
  » US 60, near Wickenburg from MP 107.3 to MP 108.6.
Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure (Goal 2)

» Sidewalks and Shared Use Paths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/Town</th>
<th>State Highway, Limits of Sidewalk/Shared Use Path</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>SR 77, I-10 to River Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR 86, La Cholla Blvd to 16th Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tangerine Rd, Mandarin Ln to SR 77 (Shared use path)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR 77, Hawser St to Lamb Dr (Shared use path)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valencia Rd at I-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-10 WB off ramp at 6th Ave</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Sidewalk Length on State Highways: 319.2 miles
Total Shared use Path Length on State Highways: 19.6 miles

Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure (Goal 2)

» Pedestrian Grade Separations
   » 47 on state highways

» Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons
   » SR 86 (Ajo) (Existing)
   » US 95 Bullhead City (Planned)
   » US 60 Globe (Planned)
Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure (Goal 2)

» BSAP and PSAP Surveys

Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety (Goal 3)

» Statewide Fatalities (1994-2010)
Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety (Goal 3)

» Statewide fatalities as % of all crashes (2001-2010)

Bicycle and Pedestrian Law Enforcement (Goal 4)

» Limited training of law enforcement for bicycle and pedestrian safety
  » MAG is contracting with CAB
  » PAG
    » 4 officers who are LCIs
    » Training videos
  » Flagstaff
    » Police Dept actively engaged in updating bicycle codes
    » Periodically issues training bulletins
    » Police Dept participates in BAC, PAC and Transportation Commission Meetings
Local Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities (Goal 5)

» Proposed infrastructure within ADOT R/W
  » Underpasses
    » 101/202 along Rio Salado SUP
    » Bike/Ped bridges on I-10, Loop 101, SR 143
  » Crossings of interstates (e.g. I-10 in Tucson, I-40 in Flagstaff)
  » Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons (SR 86 in Sells)
  » Bicycle Lanes
  » Sidewalks

» Noted that some facilities are in need of bicycle infrastructure, but has not been addressed in local plans

Funding for Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities and Programs (Goal 6)

» Federal Aid Program Funding for Arizona for Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities
Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans and Policies (Goal 7)

» ADOT
  » BSAP/PSAP
  » Statewide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan

» MAG
  » Design Guidelines
  » 2000 Regional Pedestrian Plan
  » 2040 RTP includes bicycle and pedestrian elements

» Flagstaff
  » Pedestrian and Bicycle Design Guide
  » Flagstaff Urban Trails System Master Plan

» Others: Scottsdale, Surprise, Prescott, Oro Valley among others (24 total)

Plans in Progress

» U of A Area Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan
» Inclusion of bicycle and pedestrian in comprehensive/general/multimodal transportation plans
» Several PARAs (ADOT Planning Assistance for Rural Areas) addressed bicycle and pedestrian issues

Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Maps

» 15 jurisdictions publish maps
» ADOT, MAG, Santa Cruz Valley, Flagstaff, Glendale, Kingman, Mesa, Peoria, Phoenix, Scottsdale, Sierra Vista, Tempe, Tucson, Yuma, Prescott
Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans and Policies (Goal 7)

» Formal Bicycle Advisory Committees
  » MAG
  » PAG/Tucson/Pima County
  » Maricopa County
  » Flagstaff
  » Glendale
  » Scottsdale
  » Tempe

» Complete Streets Policies
  » Several jurisdictions have draft policies
  » Only 2 policies/documents recognized on Complete Streets.org
    » MAG (Guidebook)
    » Scottsdale (Transportation Master Plan)

» Bicycle Parking Requirements
  » Flagstaff
  » Peoria
  » Scottsdale
  » Tucson
  » 9 communities
Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans and Policies (Goal 7)

» Sidewalk Requirements
  » 17 jurisdictions (who responded)

» Bicycle-Transit Facilities
  » MAG (100% of Fleet)
  » Bicycle Lockers
    » Chandler –at Park and Ride
    » Tucson – at 8 locations
  » Bicycle Racks at Transit Stops
    » Flagstaff
    » Scottsdale
    » Peoria
    » Tempe

» ADA Transition Plans
  » Very few identified
  » Additional follow-up required to determine nature of identified ADA transition plans

» Encouragement and Education (per survey)
  » International Walk to School Day (8 cities/towns)
  » Bike to Work Day (8 cities/towns)

» Safe Routes to School
  » 13 cities/towns

» Bike/Ped education programs
Needs and Deficiencies

» Discussion of Needs and Deficiencies
  » Preliminary list drafted for each Goal area
  » Refer to Handout

Next Steps

» Working Paper No. 2 – Current and Future Conditions, “Part B”
  » Assessment of Needs and Deficiencies

» Steering Committee Meeting No. 3
  » Late February/early March