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PLANNING FRAMEWORK
Connections to Metro Vision

Metro Vision includes important active transportation elements

**Theme 1:** An Efficient and Predictable Development Pattern

**Theme 2:** A Connected Multimodal Region

**Theme 3:** A Safe and Resilient Natural and Built Environment

**Theme 4:** Healthy, Inclusive, and Livable Communities

**Theme 5:** A Vibrant Regional Economy
Connections to Metro Vision

Metro Vision includes important active transportation elements

Examples of **Metro Vision Outcomes**:

- **Outcome 4**: The regional transportation system is *well-connected* and serves all modes of travel.
- **Outcome 5**: The transportation system is *safe*, *reliable*, and *well-maintained*.
- **Outcome 10**: The built and natural environment supports *healthy* and *active* choices.
Connections to Metro Vision

Metro Vision includes important active transportation elements

Examples of **Metro Vision Outcomes**:

- well-connected
- safe
- reliable
- well-maintained
- healthy
- active choices
Example ATP Elements in Metro Vision

- Safety
- Connectivity
- Livability
- Accessibility
- Usability
- Equity
- Reliability
- Public Health
- Economic Vitality
- Environmental Sustainability
Metro Vision Planning Framework

Strategic ‘altitude’

30,000 ft
Communities/
 Residents needs

25,000

15,000

Ground level

Mission

What is our purpose?

Vision

What is our ‘view’ of the future?

Strategic Perspectives

What performance lenses should we use to evaluate results?

Overarching Themes and Outcomes

What are our main focus areas? (Pillars of Excellence) What outcomes do we want for our communities & residents?

Objectives

What continuous improvement activities will support our outcomes?

Strategy Map

How do we create and improve value for our communities/residents?

Performance Measures and Targets

How will we know if we are achieving the results we want?

Strategic Initiatives

What projects/ actions will best contribute to our outcomes?
# Local Plan Summary Review

## County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Received</th>
<th>DRCOG Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broomfield</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Creek</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilpin</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weld</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Municipality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Received</th>
<th>DRCOG Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arvada</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Hawk</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bow Mar</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Pines</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Rock</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centennial</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Hills Village</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbine Valley</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce City</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dacono</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer Trail</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewater</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empire</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Englewood</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Heights</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firestone*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foxfield</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Municipality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Received</th>
<th>DRCOG Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frederick*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood Village</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Springs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkspur</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleton</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lochbuie*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone Tree</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longmont</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyons</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mead</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nederland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northglenn</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheridan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Plume</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornton</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat Ridge</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes plan inventoried after handout was printed
Initial Themes from ATSC

Prioritize Safety
- Apply a low-stress filter for biking and provide guidelines for all ages and abilities
- Consider injury severity and underreporting of incidents

Implementation
- Tie ATP into local plans
- Integrate with transit and bike share
- Policy and program recommendations

Forward-Thinking
- Understand and consider emerging trends: e-bikes, dockless bike share, autonomous vehicles
Focus on Equity

- ‘Long lines’ on a map are not realistic for vulnerable groups
- Use **equity** and **health** as guiding principles
- Non-traditional **outreach**
- Make sure we use simple materials and in multiple languages
- Include **smaller communities**
- **All ages & abilities**
STAKEHOLDER/LOCAL AGENCY SURVEY
Purpose
• What is currently **working well** and **not as well**?
• Identify most **useful project outcomes**
• Interest in **regional active transportation network** and criteria to consider
• Understand station-based and dockless **bike share implementation**
• Understand existing **bicycle count program(s)**

Survey to be distributed to broad range of staff and stakeholders across the region (i.e. local planners, etc.)

**COMING SOON!**

Response deadline in early March.
1. DRCOG’s *Metro Vision* includes the following *regional performance measures/targets for 2040*:

- Reduce **single occupant vehicle mode share** from 75% to 65% for **work trips**
- Reduce **daily vehicle miles traveled per capita** 10% (currently 25.4 miles per capita)
- Reduce **per capita transportation greenhouse gas emissions** 60% (currently 28.6 pounds per person)
- Reduce the number of **traffic fatalities** to fewer than 100 annually (currently over 250)

What are your community's most/least effective programs, techniques or investments for helping the region meet these targets?
2. Prioritize the aspects of the Plan listed below based on the value they will bring to your community:

- Convey the **benefits of active transportation**
- Identify **barriers** to bicycling and walking in the region
- Identify strategies to address **ADA compliance**
- Create a regional **bicycle network vision map**
- Identify **pedestrian priority areas**
- Provide facility **design guidance and best practices**
- Establish **standards/expectations** for regional bicycle facilities
- Improve **regional bicycle inventory** dataset and other data offerings
- Identify strategies for **improving safety** for bicyclists and pedestrians
- Establish **performance measures and targets**
- Identify strategies for DRCOG to **support active transportation** planning and programs in the region
- Provide guidance for **reaching those underrepresented** in bicycle and pedestrian planning efforts
3. One aspect of the Active Transportation Plan could be the creation of a regional **bicycle network map**. How do you envision a regional bicycle network could be of most value to your community and to the region as a whole? (Select all that apply)

- It will help our community **prioritize local investments**.
- It will help **communicate the value of investing in active transportation** to elected officials and the public.
- It will help our community **coordinate with adjacent communities** to create a cohesive network.
- It will help **identify potential projects** for funding.
- A regional bicycle network would not likely provide value to my community.
4. If developed, a regional bicycle network could take a variety of forms. What factors/criteria do you feel are most important in identifying regional routes?

- Identify long-distance routes/corridors that **cross jurisdictions**
- Identify locations with the best opportunity to **replace car trips with bicycle trips**
- Focus on connectivity of low-stress networks that support users of all ages, incomes, and abilities
- Focus on **access to transit** stations and stops
- Identify facilities providing safer **access to schools, libraries, parks, and other local destinations**
- Focus on the needs of **commuter and utility trip bicyclists**
5. What focus areas are most important in assisting local communities in promoting and implementing active transportation in the region? Please prioritize the list below:

- **Technical assistance** (data collection, mapping, analysis, etc.)
- **Planning and design assistance** for smaller communities
- Development and implementation of a **regional Vision Zero plan**
- Providing an ongoing forum for **coordination** among local governments and partners
- Providing guidance for local governments to coordinate **safe walking and biking routes to schools** with local school district(s)
- Developing **example policy guidance** related to active transportation (e.g., Complete Streets policy) for local governments’ use
6. Which areas of technical assistance would be of value to your community?

- **Data collection** (bicycle and pedestrian counts, crash data, etc.)
- **Mapping** of existing/planned bicycle and pedestrian facilities (for local government use)
- **Mapping** of existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities (for public use)
- Conducting **bicycle/pedestrian analysis** (safety, level of stress, etc.)
- Development of **policy guidance** related to active transportation (i.e. Complete Streets policy)
7. Does your community currently have or is it planning to have a **bike share program**? If so, who provides/will provide the service?

8. If your community does not currently have bike share or is considering adding another bikeshare service, is your community considering the **introduction of either station-based or dockless bike share**? If so, what is your timeline for starting a program? If not, why not?

9. Does your community currently have a **bicycle and/or pedestrian counting program**? If so, what technology/equipment do you use? What type of counts do you conduct (short duration and/or continuous)? What do you use the count data for?
RESIDENT SURVEY
Resident Survey

Survey Themes
• Understand broad types of barriers to bicycling and walking – unsafe roads, health barriers, workplace barriers, perceptions
• What is the potential for increasing active transportation? i.e., would people walk or bike more if barriers are addressed?
• Understand different needs across the region with respect to active transportation (market segmentation)

Survey Implementation
• 5,000 households will be surveyed from throughout the Denver region – expect 350-900 completed responses
• Online option for broader distribution to stakeholder groups

Results
• Inform plan recommendations
• Supplement other DRCOG and local plans and analyses
STATE OF THE PRACTICE PREVIEW
State of the Practice Outline

- Why Should MPOs Plan for and Encourage Active Transportation?
- How Can MPOs Improve Safety for People Who Walk or Bike?
- Incorporating Health into Transportation Planning
- Regional Approaches to Bike Network Planning
- Planning for Walking at the Regional Scale
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Modeling
- Pedestrian and Bicycle Volume Data
- Prioritizing Bicycling and Walking Projects in the Transportation Improvement Program
- Emerging Trends
How can MPOs Improve Safety for People who Walk or Bike?

- Set specific regional traffic safety **goals, performance measures**, and **targets**
- **Measure** and **report** out progress
- Identify the causes and **factors** in serious crashes
- Prioritize safety in all **funding decisions**
- Proactively share **resources** and provide **technical assistance**
- Recommend **countermeasures** and speed management strategies
- Publicize commitment to safety and **equity**
Atlanta Regional Council’s (ARC) 2017 TIP scoring process awards 33 percent of the safety score on the basis of safety countermeasures proposed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Nature of Metric</th>
<th>Percent of Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serious injury + fatality crashes</td>
<td>Numeric; GEARS database</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling crash risk</td>
<td>Numeric; from Walk. Bike. Thrive!</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety countermeasures proposed</td>
<td>Numeric; Crash Modification Factors</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MPOS usually align safety targets with State targets.

**DRCOG set its own safety targets**
- Metro Vision Target: Reduce fatalities by 64 percent by 2040
- Also set targets for serious injuries

Vision Zero cities usually more aggressive.
- Denver: eliminate traffic fatalities and serious injuries in the City by 2030
Incorporating Health into Transportation Planning: HIAs

Over 350 HIAs have been completed across the country. At least 12 have been conducted at a regional scale.
In 2016, MetroPlan Orlando completed an HIA for the proposed State Route 50 Bus Rapid Transit project.

- Partnered with University of Central Florida
- HIA examined increased physical activity and reduced incidence of associated diseases, and pedestrian/bicyclist safety
- Project expected to offer a greater health benefit in low-income communities.
Nashville Area MPO used ITHIM results to understand health impacts of adding walking and/or bicycling elements into 77 percent of funded roadway projects.

- 82 minutes/wk
- 12 minutes/wk
- Decrease in cardiovascular disease by 4%
Bike/Ped Count Programs

- Several MPOs organize **annual count efforts**
- Some MPOs are conducting **automated counting** and **data warehousing**
TIP Project Prioritization

- Variety of TIP prioritization criteria
- Tied to **regional goals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SANDAG Active Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Possible Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serves Daily Trips</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Safety</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Connectivity</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency with Local Plans</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Bike/Pedestrian Stress Level</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse gas and Pollutant Emissions</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serves RCP Smart Growth Areas</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Activity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of Users/Skill Levels Served</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Cost-Effectiveness</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Emerging Trends

- **Shared Mobility**: role for MPOs is evolving
- **E-bikes**
- **Bike share** technology

*Dockless Bikeshare Systems in the U.S., 2017*
CAMPO (Austin, TX) Tiered Regional Network Map

- Areas with **high potential** for bicycling:
  - Demographic and socio-economic information
  - Vehicle ownership
  - Bicycle and pedestrian crashes
  - Transit and active transportation facilities
  - Points of interest (e.g., schools, universities, parks, and court houses)
- Connect **population** and **destinations** (gravity model)
- Sparse and focused on **long-distance routes**
- Priority networks: 10 years, 25 years, 25+ years
- Facility **design guidance**
Regional Bike Network Planning

CAMPO (Austin, TX) Tiered Regional Network Map

Tier I network

Tiers I & II networks

Tiers I and II, and Tier III Vision Connectors
Regional Bike Network Planning

**PSRC (Seattle, WA) Regional Bike Network**

- **Purpose:** identify a “future network of key bicycle connections between regional locations across the central Puget Sound region and to use this network as a planning tool for regional coordination and cross-jurisdictional cooperation”

- **Connections to Destinations:**
  - high employment zones,
  - higher education institutions and large high schools,
  - regional parks,
  - major trails in surrounding counties, and
  - military bases

- **Network criteria:**
  - Continuous and connected network
  - Cross-jurisdictional boundaries
  - Fill network gaps
  - First tier routes: shortest path between regional destinations

- **Alignments to be determined by local agencies** (routes indicate ½ mile alignment)

- **Regional bike facility typology/definitions**

- **Focused on all ages and abilities**
Regional Bike Network Planning

PSRC (Seattle, WA) Regional Bike Network
**Regional Bike Network Planning**

**WFRC (Salt Lake City, UT) Regional Bike Priority Network**

- Emphasis on **consistency and coordination with local plans** >> all regional network lines are on local plans
- ~**1 mile grid** of regional routes
- Regional routes **tied to centerlines** (not conceptual alignments)
- Initial routes difficult to create low-stress facilities >> rethinking approach
- RTP updates received from local jurisdictions
- WFRC encouraging consistent facility definitions and GIS schema
- Additional points for projects on regional routes, but some flexibility
- Map update challenges – some agencies working with outdated versions
- Recent WFRC effort to identify facility recommendations based on LTS principles >> locals use as starting point
Regional Bike Network Planning

WFRC (Salt Lake City, UT) Regional Priority Bike Network
Regional Bike Network Planning Common Themes

- Regional networks provide a **unifying vision**, but are usually **not tied to funding**
- **Existing and proposed facilities** from previous planning efforts provide the basis for a regional network
- Focus on **connecting regional destinations and major transit centers** and on providing **cross-jurisdictional links**
- Regional routes should be considered as **flexible**, with exact alignments and facility types to be identified through local planning processes. This is particularly appropriate in regions where many local plans have already been developed
- **Tiering** is a useful strategy for prioritizing investments
- Facility **design guidance** and **definitions** are helpful to promote consistency
- Facilities implemented on **regional routes should be comfortable for all ages and abilities**
**Bike Network**

- What does a regional bike network vision mean for our region?
- How would/do local agencies use the regional vision?
- How should a regional network address short- vs. long-distance trips?
- Would a regional vision assist with interjurisdictional coordination and collaboration?
- Should a regional vision be specific to individual streets or more conceptual alignments?
- How should a regional vision account for proposed/planned facilities from local plans?
- Should a regional network be tiered?
- How should a regional network address comfort?
PSRC (Seattle, WA)

- Transit Supportive Planning Toolkit
  - Facilities that improve connections to transit, such as pedestrian crossings, wayfinding signs, and continuous sidewalks.
  - Complete Streets policies.
  - Encourage clear, formalized, and interconnected streets and small blocks to make destinations visible and easier to access.
  - Expand the sidewalk network in areas where it is incomplete or non-existent and can provide a linkage to a transit corridor.
  - Prioritize multi-modal improvement projects and include them in the six-year Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP).
- Guidance on pedestrian counts, analysis, and policy
- No specific network planning
CAMPO (Austin, TX)

- Pedestrian Zones where walking is more likely
- Three networks
  - **Unconstrained network**: All projects identified by local officials and CAMPO staff during the planning process and routes provided by the public through an online interactive map.
  - **Local networks**: Areas where population density, street grid density, and other factors support short bicycling and walking trips and access to transit. The specific projects for local networks come from local governments.
  - **Regional priority network**: Organized into three tiers and identifies key longer-distance routes that connect communities to one another.
- Pedestrian facility design guidance
Memphis MPO (Memphis, TN)

- Detailed segment evaluation
- Candidate projects from previous efforts
- Scoring process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>The higher the score, the more crashes that occur in that area (applied by Census Tract per person).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td>The higher the score, the higher the block lengths are in that area (applied by Census Tract).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The higher the score, the fewer links there are to nodes in that area (applied by Census Tract).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The higher the score, the less that location supports bicycle/pedestrian travel in its current condition (applied by network segment).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>The higher the score, the more that location is used, or, alternatively, in demand (applied by network segment).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode Shift</td>
<td>The higher the score, the greater potential that location offers to shift trips to bicycle or pedestrian travel (applied by census Tract).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Pedestrian Planning

Memphis MPO (Memphis, TN)
Pedestrian Planning

• What do you think would help local agencies improve conditions and plan better for pedestrians?

• How important is it that the regional pedestrian planning focus on transit access and first/final mile connectivity?

• Is pedestrian facility design and operations guidance needed? E.g., best practices for crossings, signals, sidewalks, maintenance.
Bike and Pedestrian Facility Inventory and Analysis

Bike Facility Data Source

Local Agency Facility Inventories
- Various facility designations
- Some agencies provide proposed facilities

DRCOG Staff
- Apply consistent definitions
- Update network as new data received

Active Transportation Plan Development
- Existing facilities
- No comprehensive proposed facilities
- Process and facility definition recommendation
Over 2,000 miles of total bike facilities
14 miles of bike facilities for every 100 miles of road
1.5 miles of pedestrian facilities (sidewalks, trails, paved paths) for every mile of road

Source: DRCOG Bicycle Facility Inventory (01/2018)
Bike and Pedestrian Facility Inventory and Analysis – Counties

Bike facility miles by county

- **Adams**
- **Arapahoe**
- **Boulder**
- **Broomfield**
- **Clear Creek**
- **Denver**
- **Douglas**
- **Jefferson**
- **Weld**

- **Significant trail**
- **Neighborhood paved path**
- **Bike lane (including protected)**
- **Signed route (no facility)**

Source: DRCOG Bicycle Facility Inventory (01/2018)
Bike and Pedestrian Facility Inventory and Analysis – Geographic Focus Areas

Distribution of bike facility miles in geographic focus areas

- **Region**
  - Significant trail: 49%
  - Neighborhood paved path: 9%
  - Bike lane (including protected): 24%
  - Signed route (no facility): 18%

- **Urban Center**
  - Significant trail: 35%
  - Neighborhood paved path: 11%
  - Bike lane (including protected): 37%
  - Signed route (no facility): 17%

- **No vehicle**
  - Significant trail: 32%
  - Neighborhood paved path: 6%
  - Bike lane (including protected): 26%
  - Signed route (no facility): 37%

- **Environmental Justice**
  - Significant trail: 46%
  - Neighborhood paved path: 6%
  - Bike lane (including protected): 21%
  - Signed route (no facility): 26%

Sources: DRCOG Bicycle Facility Inventory (01/2018), DRCOG Environmental Justice Analysis Zones (02/2018), US Census Block Groups (12/2017), DRCOG Boundary (11/2017), DRCOG Urban Centers (11/2017)
NEXT MEETING:
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 14, 2018 AT 2PM