Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plans
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Why Plan?

• Vision → Results

• Planning less expensive than correcting

• Coordination of infrastructure
Types of Pedestrians

• “Everyone is a pedestrian”

• Diverse group

• Slower travel speed
# Types of Bicyclists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong &amp; Fearless, 1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested but Concerned, 60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Way, No How, 33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthused &amp; Confident, 7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Steps in Creating Master Plan

1. Before the Plan
   – Stakeholder engagement and vision
   – Consensus around goals & objectives
   – Data collection

2. Developing Master Plan
   – Dialogue & education with community
   – Preparing draft plan & setting priorities

3. Implementing the Plan
   – Adopt plan
   – Annual work plan & continued outreach

Adapted from “Producing & Implementing the Bicycle Master Plan” (2009)
Elements of Master Plan

1. Vision for the future
2. Existing Condition Analysis
3. Input from Community and Stakeholders
4. Policies
5. System Facilities and Design
6. Final Plan Recommendations
7. Implementation & Funding Strategies
8. Appendices
1. Vision

Sets the direction, motivates action and helps guide future decisions

- Easily communicated
- Strategic, future-oriented
- Source of inspiration for leaders and community
1. Vision

CITY WITH A VISION

BIKE 2015 PLAN
CITY OF CHICAGO

The Bike 2015 Plan is the City of Chicago’s vision to make bicycling an integral part of daily life in Chicago. The plan recommends projects, programs and policies for the next ten years to encourage use of this practical, non-polluting and affordable mode of transportation.
2. Existing Conditions

Evaluates existing facilities & deficiencies

- Miles of bikeways
- Collision data
- Commute rate
- Existing programs
- Mapped facilities
- Current rates of walking & cycling
- Identify underserved areas
2. Existing Conditions

Bellevue, Washington

Staff Assessment
- Field Assessments
- Crash data
- Traffic Volume
- Land Uses
- Existing Facilities

Community Engagement
- Flickr stream
- Interactive maps
- Workshops
- Photo visualization
3. Community Engagement

Helps understand user’s needs, builds stakeholder buy in, and gets local knowledge.

- “Early & Often”
- Diverse groups
- Problem solving
- User knowledge
- Identify equity issues
3. Community Engagement

- Steering Committee
- Bike Rides/Walks
- Interactive Open Houses
- Neighborhood Visits
- Workshops
- Public Comment on Draft
- Social Media
- Interactive Websites
4. Policies

Understand context of existing plans & policies

Policies

• Strategies to reach vision
• Complement other efforts
• Identify opportunities to implement and integrate
• Recommendations for policy

Other Plans

• Comprehensive Plan
• Transportation Master Plan
• Engineering Policies
• Municipal law
• Neighborhood and Business Associations
4. Policies

Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Existing policies not being upheld

1. Assess gaps
2. Prioritize actions to meet policy standards
3. Recommend additional policies to fill gaps in current system
5. System Facilities Design

Design Principles:
- Safety
- Comfort
- Attractiveness
- Direct routes
- Connected system

Facility Types:
- Car Free Areas
- Shared Roadway
- Separated-in-Roadway
5. System Facilities Design

Portland, Oregon
6. Final Plan Recommendations

Provide recommendations based on research, and analysis

- Connects to vision to goals and actions
- Complements policy
6. Final Plan Recommendations

Oakland, California

Goal: *Create a street environment that strives to ensure pedestrian safety.*

Policy 1.1. Crossing Safety:

Improve pedestrian crossings in areas of high pedestrian activity where safety is an issue.

Action 1.1.1.

Consider the full range of design elements – including bulb outs and refuge islands – to improve pedestrian safety.
7. Implementation & Funding

How and when the plan will be executed

• Next steps
• Short and long term goals
• Timeline & prioritization
• Identification of funding sources

Appendix D. Project Evaluation Matrix

A system of “○”, “△”, and “□” was used to rate each project. A “○” indicates the project fully meets the criterion under focus, a “△” indicates mixed or neutral conditions, while a “□” indicates that the project minimally fulfills or does not fulfill the criterion. These ratings were considered together to prioritize projects. Projects fulfilling the greatest number of evaluation criteria received higher scores, correspondingly leading to higher rankings within the overall list.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection Improvements</th>
<th>Overcomes Barriers</th>
<th>System Connectivity</th>
<th>Community Support</th>
<th>User Generator</th>
<th>Land Uses</th>
<th>Safety/Comfort</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Regional Benefit</th>
<th>Ease of Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constitution Trail (north/south segment) roadway crossings</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Parkway at Fort Jesse Road</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Parkway at Juniper Drive</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage Avenue at Hovey Avenue</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Parkway at Vernon Avenue</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Parkway at Parkway Plaza Dr</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Parkway at Shepard Road</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsley Street at Hovey Avenue</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkside Road at Hovey Avenue</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Implementation & Funding

**Denver, Colorado**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Small to medium improvements to existing or construction of new pedestrian infrastructure | · Expanding 3’ to 5’ sidewalks  
· Striping and signing an intersection  
· Installation of sidewalks where they are missing  
· New bulb outs and pedestrian refuges at an intersection  
· Block long pedestrian route improvements | · Redeveloping property owner  
· Districts  
· CIP  
· Sidewalk Fee  
· Adjacent property owners (PW Mgr authority) |
| Construction of new large infrastructure | · New pedestrian bridges  
· Corridor long pedestrian route improvements | · CIP  
· Bonds  
· Districts |

*Funding sources in italics are proposed or not currently used.*
8. Appendices

Support and implement plan

- Maps of planned and current facilities
- In depth data & resources
- Summary of community engagement and input
- Design guidelines
Combined or Separate Plans

• Different needs & populations

• Streamlining resources

• Scale of Plan

• Community Vision
Equity Planning

Equity GAP ANALYSIS:

Legend
- High geo mean/low service (low stress)*
- Block Groups
- GMean
- 0% - 9.97%
- 9.98% - 13.17%
- 13.18% - 17.15%
- 17.16% - 30.64%

Service gaps compared to indicators of disadvantage for existing bikeway network. (Darker areas are higher disadvantaged population; outlined boxes are low service areas with high disadvantaged population).
Questions & Discussion