

PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE

This review will be more easily understood as annotated comments on problem areas in the 2030 RTP.* The 2030 RTP was considered from the point of view of public comment during 2001 and 2002, particularly the comment found in *Changing Direction: Transportation Choices for 2030*.**

Thematic issues that impact this section include:

* Available at <http://www.sp2030.com/CommentSite/index.html>.

**Available at <http://www.cnt.org/tsp/trans/ctaqc/cc/theplan.htm>

The chart below offers specific page references and quotes from the Regional Transportation Plan and commentary on why each quote is relevant or problematic

Page	Quote	Comment
38	<i>Most transportation facilities are constructed to last 20-50 years.</i>	There is no discussion of differing maintenance and reconstruction schedules for various types of facilities. The average life of a sidewalk is different than the average life of a highway.
85	<i>Community Interfaces: Major highway reconstruction provides an opportunity to improve the appearance and character as well as mitigate any negative externalities of a facility from the perspective of the community through which it passes.</i>	The damage done to walkability, bikeability near expressway ramps should be systemically remedied, rather than occasionally, in the course of major reconstruction.
88	<i>With regard to highway vehicle safety, most operational improvements to major highways and arterials are intended to increase the ability to operate a vehicle safely. The improved flow of traffic and the removal of possible conflict points, common in many projects, are principally intended to reduce the possibility of crashes.</i>	The safety section has been diluted from the first draft, where there was a primary emphasis on vulnerable travelers. Now vehicular safety has precedence; dollars are allocated on the basis of priorities set by the plan. Pedestrian/cyclist safety has to be a primary objective. The plan is unrealistic in expecting investment in free-flowing auto travel to “trickle down” as a safety benefit to vulnerable travelers.
89	<i>Safety issues are also considered at a local level. In most cases, these local solutions focus on specific problems and are typically not indicative of any system-wide or long-term safety deficiency.</i>	Wider, faster arterials, with fewer traffic signals are promoted as a systemic regional goal. Responsibility to reduce traffic deaths and injuries can not be delegated to local officials.

The Center for Neighborhood Technology

www.cnt.org

August 2003

PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE

89	<i>Many projects intended to increase capacity, reduce congestion or provide alternative travel choices have safety benefits that cannot easily be isolated from the total project cost and benefit.</i>	Agencies spending public funds need to be transparent and accountable about how and where the funds are spent. The public can not be expected to accept on faith that investments to facilitate more free-flowing auto travel will increase pedestrian safety.
90	<i>Safety for seniors and persons with disabilities</i>	The 2020 RTP spoke of "Universal Design" which implies that many or most of us will benefit at one time or another from safety and infrastructure design that accommodates wheelchairs, strollers, children on bikes, people using crutches or shopping carts. Marginalizing smaller populations of "seniors and persons with disabilities" implies a reduced urgency to invest in the necessary alteration of sidewalks, crossings, etc.
90	<i>The RTP recognizes that these types of management and operations approaches are most effective when combined with enforcement, encouragement and education, and dedicated funding.</i>	We are in agreement, but wonder why the RTP fails to dedicate funding to protect the most vulnerable travelers.
92	<i>Roadway improvement funds should be devoted to improving pedestrian safety where necessary. In addition, discretionary transportation funds should be directed toward providing a variety of safe and convenient pedestrian options.</i>	The general statement is admirable, but without dedicated funds, pedestrians will continue to be shortchanged by the emphasis on more and wider roads and faster speeds.
99	<i>Shared Path 2030 avoided making modal distinctions up to a point in consideration of a unified multi-modal approach. The RTP's major capital project recommendations, while mode-specific, include specific strategy discussions intended to provide implementation guidance to promote choice between and among travel modes.</i>	The refusal to prioritize or adequately address walkability and bikeability heightens concern that continued heavy roadway investment is the intention.
101	<i>Even at compact urban land densities, attention to accommodating all modes in a facility's design can meet this expectation.</i>	Accommodation of all modes is easiest, most likely and most appropriate in more dense communities.

PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE

101	<i>Limit introduction of new traffic signals.</i>	This bullet point in a section on arterial improvements is in opposition to safe, multi-modal use of all local roads.
101	<i>Limit introduction of new traffic signals.</i>	Restatement of this principle encourages the perception that speedy, rather than safe, travel is the highest priority.
106	<i>These (SRA) studies provided valuable guidance for improving the individual facilities themselves, but also created a large local literature of arterial concepts that can now be transferred to other appropriate arterial settings.</i>	The studies should be reviewed for their applicability to today's standards. They were done before Context Sensitive Design, shared use and multi-modal became the standard for road construction.
110	<i>Pedestrian and Bicycle</i>	This section heading was originally "Strategic Pedestrian and Bicycle System."
111	<i>The RTP recommends that project implementers should consider a facility's potential use by bicycle and pedestrian travelers and make appropriate design accommodations. While motor vehicle-oriented design guidelines at times conflict with the needs of pedestrians and bicyclists, traditional design standards do not always indicate the required practice. Rather, they serve as a guide to solving traffic problems unique to the case at hand.</i>	This statement is confusing, weak, or both.
216	<i>Footnote 140: This would most often take the form of a "shared-use" arterial proposal that incorporated strategies for each system. It was estimated that designing a four lane full "shared-use" arterial might cost as much as \$8.5 Million per centerline mile (pcm) to develop. This includes \$1.8M pcm for fixed pavement elements such as r.o.w. preparation, excavation, substrate, pavement, curb and gutter, etc., \$500K for signals, \$141K pcm for additional truck-bearing construction, \$761K for urban drainage, \$2.5M pcm for transit elements such as BRT stations,</i>	This estimate requires a great deal more analysis. The baseline of \$1.8 million per mile for roadway pavement and \$1.6 million per mile for pedestrian and bicycle elements is immediate cause for skepticism. The estimates included amenities typically associated with most roadways (street lighting, trees and sodded parkways) as exclusively pedestrian and bicycle expenses. All elements to protect pedestrians from auto traffic were considered "pedestrian treatments." They could as easily be considered safety treatments in the roadway section, since it is the autos, not the pedestrians that create the hazards. The actual cost per mile cited in

PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE

<p><i>\$1.6M pcm for bicycle and pedestrian accommodations such as bike lanes, sidewalks, refuges and signals, \$1.2M pcm for arterial ITS such as signal interconnects and “smart corridor” elements. A six-lane arterial designed to the same level is estimated at approximately \$9.4M pcm. Providing additional bus service was estimated to cost approximately \$300K per bus. Cost economies can be achieved by combining some or of these modal improvements into a single shared-use design. All accommodations may not be appropriate in all cases and the necessity of providing grade separations for any mode (including bicycle and pedestrian) dramatically increases the cost. Overall, it was estimated that \$5B would cover upgrading approximately 250 centerline miles of arterials to a full shared use design and implement significant portions of CTA neighborhood express and Pace Vision 2020 bus service proposals.</i></p>	<p>documentation for this footnote for bicycle lanes (two directions) is \$161,000 and for sidewalks (two directions), \$290,400.</p>
---	---