McDermott: Hello, I’m Katie McDermott with the Center for Transportation and the Environment. This is CTE’s National Teleconference Series. The purpose of this live forum is to engage transportation and environmental professionals in a dialogue about current policy issues, research applications and best practices in the field.

Today’s program is titled “Bicycle/Pedestrian Planning Strategies: From SAFETEA-LU to Safe Routes to School.” Our panel will discuss the new provisions of the Federal transportation legislation know as the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (or for short, SAFETEA-LU), as well as provisions of previous legislation that continue to support bicycle and pedestrian programming, planning and funding. A special topic of discussion today will focus on the Safe Routes to Schools initiative. This and other creative approaches underway throughout the country are showing how well-planned and well-designed bicycle and pedestrian initiatives can improve mobility, enhance safety and foster healthier and more livable communities.
We invite you to discuss today’s topic with our panel. You can use the numbers on your screen to phone or fax in your questions and comments at any time during the live broadcast or you can email us at CTE_email@ncsu.edu. Closed captioning for today’s program is provided by the North Carolina Agency for Public Telecommunications, and the phone bridge for audio transmission only is available at 919-733-2416.

After the broadcast we invite you to participate in CTE’s web-based after-the-program discussion forum where you can continue to talk about the issues raised during the live broadcast with our panel and other audience members. The discussion forum starts at 4:00 Eastern Daylight Time today right after our broadcast and will remain active for two weeks.

Just a few more details before we get started. First, I hope you have already downloaded the program handout and a copy of the panelist power point slides from CTE’s website. If not, I encourage you to do so using the URL address that will be appearing on your screen. From this site you can also replay this broadcast in its entirety or order a copy of the DVD or written transcript. We’d also like to get your feedback on today’s program and to do that if you are participating at one our satellite downlink sites, we encourage you to fill out the evaluation form and turn it into your site coordinator before you leave today or if you are participating via the web, please complete the online evaluation form located on CTE’s website. We thank you for your attention to this.

Well, at this time it is my pleasure to introduce today’s moderator, Ms. Mary Meletiou. Mary is the program manager for the Bicycle and Pedestrian Program located at the Institute for Transportation Research and Education at North Carolina State University. Prior to coming to ITRE in 2003, Mary worked for the North Carolina Department of Transportation with the Division of Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation. She has a long and active record of promoting the planning and development of bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly communities. Mary is also a close colleague and friend of the staff of CTE, and we are delighted to have her on the program with us today. Welcome, Mary.

Meletiou: Thank you, Katie. As Katie said, today’s broadcast will focus on the bicycling and walking provisions of SAFETEA-LU. This legislation was enacted in August of 2005 and created some new bicycle and pedestrian opportunities. During this broadcast we will also have presentations on programs and initiatives that are supported by this legislation and SAFETEA-LU’s predecessors: ISTEA enacted in 1991, and TEA-21 enacted in 1998.
These fields reflect a continuum of efforts to improve conditions for bicycling and walking. Many people point to the previous gasoline crisis in the mid-1970s as the catalyst for renewed interest in bicycling and walking. The federal government as well as many states and cities began to look at the issues and to develop solutions that would provide a more balanced transportation system. The ideas gained momentum, and a cadre of bicycle and pedestrian professionals evolved. Several of our presenters today have been involved since that time and can chronicle the positive changes that have taken place.

In the 1970s and ‘80s only a handful of states and cities had a bicycle or a pedestrian coordinator. The 1991 ISTEA legislation mandated that every DOT should appoint a coordinator. In 1999 the USDOT issued a policy statement and design guidance encouraging state DOTs and local transportation agencies to integrate bicycling and walking into their transportation infrastructure. This guidance signaled a significant change and approach. No longer would bicycle or pedestrian improvements require strong justification in order to be built. Rather, and this is a direct quote, “Bicycling and walking facilities will be incorporated into all transportation projects unless exceptional circumstances exist.” In other words, bicycling and walking would be mainstreamed into the transportation process.

Over the past 15 years increasing levels of funding have been made available from FHWA as well as from state and local governments for bicycle and pedestrian projects and programs spurred by local demand and supporting legislation spelled out by the three transportation acts.

This broadcast is the second in the FHWA series on the provisions of SAFETEA-LU. The first program broadcast last fall focused on the environmental provisions. It is archived and can be viewed on the website of the Center for Transportation and the Environment. The third in the series will be on planning and will be broadcast later this year. I want to thank FHWA for the opportunity to focus on bicycling and walking as a part of this broadcast series. By the way, May is Bike Month, so as we speak, a variety of activities and initiatives to promote bicycling are underway. Many of these have evolved as a direct result of the support provided by FHWA and the provisions of the ISTEA, TEA-21, and now SAFETEA-LU legislation.

There are many excellent initiatives underway throughout the country that we will not have time to discuss today. The program handout which Katie mentioned gives
you a lot of information about these programs and will guide you to links to those programs and information about them.

We have a lot to cover today. At the end of the broadcast we hope you will have a better understanding of the bike/ped provisions of SAFETEA-LU, will have gained some insights from the experiences of our presenters, and will know where to locate some helpful resources. So let’s get started.

Our first presenter is Cindy Burbank, the FHWA associate administrator for planning, environment, and realty. As you will see Cindy brings a strong message of support from FHWA, which is that bicycling and walking are an important part of the overall transportation system. And the needs of bicyclists and pedestrians should be routinely accommodated in all transportation projects. Now let’s watch Cindy’s pre-recorded opening comments.

Burbank: I am personally delighted to help kick off this videoconference because I spent 10 years of my life relying on biking and walking in Vermont, in Boston, in North Carolina, and Washington, DC. I delayed getting my driver’s license until I was 27. So I biked and I walked to school, to work, and for all kinds of errands on rural roads as well as urban streets. I recall those days very fondly – even biking to work in snowstorms in January in Boston. I was, and I still am, an enthusiastic advocate of biking and walking.

At FHWA we see improvements in bike/ped facilities as good transportation policy as well as good health policy and good economic policy. Our nation will be better served by a balanced, intermodal transportation system that provides individuals with safe, convenient, and attractive choices, including biking and walking choices as well as driving and transit options. We see bicyclists and pedestrians as important customers, and we are committed to meeting their needs. According to the 1991 National Household Travel Survey, 8% of all U.S. households do not have a motor vehicle. So biking and walking is essential for them. And the other 92% of households also make biking and walking trips.

FHWA believes all transportation projects should help meet the needs of bicyclists and pedestrians. Accommodating bicyclists and pedestrians should be regular practice and not the exception. SAFETEA-LU builds on ISTEA and TEA-21 by continuing and expanding Federal support for bike/ped initiatives. There are two important new programs, the Safe Routes to School Program and the Non-Motorized Transportation Pilot Program. They have continued funding for a national bicycle and
pedestrian clearinghouse. There is even a billion dollars for 750 bike/ped and trails earmarks.

More importantly, under SAFETEA-LU bike and ped projects continue to be proudly eligible for funding under all the Federal-aid highway programs. They compete for funding with transportation projects through the planning processes at the state and local levels of government and increasingly they are competing really well. In 1992 almost $23 million of Federal transportation funds were spent on bicycle and pedestrian projects. In 2005 that was up to $388 million in funding of bike/ped improvements.

FHWA will continue supporting non-motorized modes of travel because biking and walking are important. We will continue working with the bike/ped community with state and with local governments and MPOs to promote biking and walking, and to provide safe and effective transportation for bicyclists and pedestrians.

Meletiou: I’m sure you are all very encouraged by Cindy’s comments, and we appreciate her opening this broadcast for us. Few of us will ever have the time to read the full text of the SAFETEA-LU legislation. In this session, FHWA staffers John Fegan and Larry Anderson will help us understand some of the more important bicycle and pedestrian provisions and funding opportunities spelled out in this legislation. John will provide a general overview while Larry will focus on the planning provisions. The new Safe Routes to School legislation will be addressed in the next hour.

We will have time at the end of this hour to take your questions. Please send them in via email or fax any time during the broadcast or call in at the end of the session.

Our first presenter in this segment is John Fegan, bicycle and pedestrian program manager for FHWA. John brings a wealth of knowledge and many years of experience in the field. He was one of the first bike/ped professionals in the country and has been instrumental in developing many of the important FHWA bike/ped initiatives over the years. John has a lot to cover, so we’ll let him get started.

Fegan: Thank you, Mary. What I would like to do is pick up from some of what Mary has said and also some of what Cindy Burbank has said already. What I would like to do is go over the major bicycle pedestrian provision in our new legislation and show you how that fits into the provisions of earlier bills that we talked about—the ISTEA legislation in 1991 and the TEA-21 legislation in 1998. One very consistent theme throughout our Federal transportation legislation is the concept of mainstreaming bicyclists and pedestrians into our nation’s transportation system. And by mainstreaming what we mean is that accommodating bicyclists and pedestrians should be a routine way of conducting
business. It should be part of a planning process. It should be part of the design process, part of the maintenance of facilities. Whenever a transportation decision is made in this country, we want to be sure that bicyclists and pedestrians are considered when that decision is made.

And some of these decisions are very tough decisions. But it is much easier to include bicycle and pedestrian accommodations when you are planning and designing a facility than having to go in after the fact and manage to fit it in at that point. So as you have heard, the SAFETEA-LU legislation continues what was in previous legislation but also has some new provisions. And one thing I want you to understand about our Federal legislation is that if there is a part of the law that was out it in previous legislation and is not commented upon in new legislation, it doesn’t mean that it has gone away. It simply means that there is no change in that particular provision of the law. So I want to talk about the continuing provisions and then some of the new provisions.

You heard previously, and it is still true under SAFETEA-LU, that all of the major Federal transportation funding programs have and can be used for bicycle and pedestrian projects and programs. When I talk about projects I am talking about infrastructure projects, and programs are the softer programs, the safety programs, the educational programs and encouragement programs. So you can use all of the major funding pots of money to fund bike/ped projects. Now when Cindy Burbank was talking a minute ago, she showed you the chart of Federal funding that is being spent on bike/ped projects and how it has gone from $22.9 million in 1992 up to $388 million in 2005. That is a dramatic increase. It’s all the more dramatic when you remember that no state or locality across the country has too much transportation money. The money that was spent on those bike/ped projects is money that would have been spent on other transportation needs in those communities. But the decision-makers at the state level, or at the metropolitan levels of government, decided that they wanted to spend their money on those particular bicycle and pedestrian projects. And I think that is a very significant change from what we have seen previous to that.

Another continuing provision of our legislation is that each state, as you heard, has a bicycle/pedestrian coordinator. And that is an excellent point of contact for you at the state level. Each state operates their program a little differently, but if you need to find out the information in your own state, go to your state department of transportation and contact the state bike/ped coordinator.
As you will hear when my co-worker, Larry, talks in a minute, the planning process is really very critical to funding bicycle and pedestrian projects and programs across the country. The funding process is a very complex one, but one of the initial, one of the key, steps is becoming involved in the planning part of that. And I would like to emphasize what I said a minute ago that the decisions on funding are made at the state level of government; they are made at the metropolitan or local levels of government. We don’t sit in Washington, DC, with a big checkbook. The money is given out by formula to the state departments of transportation, to the metropolitan planning organizations across the country, and that is where the decisions are made on which projects are funded.

So we really have very good continuing support in Federal legislation for bicycle and pedestrian projects and programs. Some of the new provisions that I want to mention to you are the Safe Routes to School Program, and Tim Arnade will be talking about that in the next hour of this program, but that is a brand new program that is just getting underway. Another brand new program is the non-motorized transportation pilot program. That program gave money to four communities – to Columbia, Missouri, to Marin County, California, to Sheboygan County, Wisconsin, and to Minneapolis/St Paul, Minnesota – to build an interconnected network of facilities for bicycling and walking, and this is a real opportunity to show that when you do build a network of facilities for bicycling and walking, what happens? Do people start to bicycle and walk more than they did previously? In essence, it is answering the question of if we build it, will they come? And so we are very excited about that new program. The four communities are four very diverse places, and each has a different slant, if you will, on how to build a network of facilities in their own community. And the four communities are also learning how to work together so that we have a unified program, so that when we come to the end of the legislation and we have to do a report to Congress on that program, we will be able to provide a unified report that really shows what has happened across the four communities.

Another new provision we have, which is actually a modification of an existing one, is we have had the pedestrian and bicycle information center. We call it the PBIC. It is a national clearinghouse that has been in operation for the past five years, and that effort is coming to a close. But in the new legislation, the SAFETEA-LU legislation, there is a provision for a new national ped/bike clearinghouse. And what we will be doing over the next few months is transitioning from the old operation to the new operation so
that those of you who have had a chance to go to the pedestrian/bike information center will be smoothly transitioned into the new operation, and I would really encourage you to look at the list of websites as part of the handout material for this. And if you haven’t visit the pedestrian/bicycle information center, they really have a family of websites that has a great deal of technical and administrative information on there.

Cindy mentioned that in the SAFETEA-LU legislation there are 750 high priority projects across the country. These are our particular projects that the U.S. Congress feels are very important, and we are working with the states and the metropolitan levels of government to implement those projects.

I wanted to spend a few minutes talking to you about the role of the Federal Highway Administration. As I mentioned, our role is not to sit in Washington, DC, with a large checkbook. We don’t decide which projects get funded, which projects don’t get funded. We have what we call a division office in each state that deals very closely with the state department of transportation in that particular state. And the division offices are the ones that work with the state and other local sponsors on individual projects. But our role in the headquarters office is really to interpret the Federal legislation, to help implement the legislation, and so in doing that we write regulations and guidance to help explain the legislative language.

We also set policy. Mary mentioned our design guidance language that we issued back in 1999 and 2000. That language says that we strongly encourage that when all transportation decisions are made, that bicycles and pedestrians be routinely accommodated in those decisions, that it really should be the rule rather than the exception that bicycles and pedestrians are accommodated.

Another role of our agency and the Federal Highway Administration is to provide technical assistance. As you can probably tell from the amount of Federal funding that has gone up from the early ‘90s to 2005, the increase from about $23 million up to $388 million, there are a lot more projects being funded across the country, and, quite frankly, there is an increasing need for technical assistance across the country. Quite frankly, the questions we are being asked are getting much harder. The advocates are more engaged than they had been in the past. The pedestrian advocates are catching up with the bicycle advocates, and the complexity and the numbers of questions that are being posed to us, and it’s really, quite frankly, challenging in a good sense in that we can see the community growing, the communities learning how to work within the transportation system, to really help us get a transportation system that is more responsive to the needs
of all users out there. Cindy mentioned that 8% of households don’t have access to a motor vehicle. In addition, a large number of other people across the country choose to use a bicycle for all or for part of their trips. And those are our customers. We have an obligation to provide facilities and programs for those people.

So our role at the federal level is to interpret legislation; it is to set national policy. It’s to provide technical assistance. It’s really to provide leadership, and when Cindy was talking about our commitment to bicycling and walking, I want you to understand that that is not just lip service. Cindy and the rest of us at Federal Highway Administration are serious about that commitment to bicycling and walking. As Mary mentioned earlier, some of the earlier energy crises back in the 1970s really gave an impetus to the bicycle and pedestrian programs at that time. Well, as we’re doing this program now we are having dramatic increases in the cost of gasoline, and it’s making people re-think how they want to make individual trips. And so what we really at the federal level want to be working towards is a more balanced transportation system, a system where people don’t have to take their motor vehicle for every trip they make. We’re not telling people that they can’t use their motor vehicle, that motor vehicle use is bad. But what we want to tell them is that sometimes the motor vehicle is the appropriate mode of travel; other times, your bicycle may be; other times, walking may be; other times, transit may be. We want a more flexible, more balanced transportation system so that when someone is setting off on a trip they can decide which option or which mode of travel is the best one for them to use, and in order for them to do that, they have to have the facilities to do that.

And that is where you all come in, really. The implementation of the Federal legislation doesn’t happen at the federal level. The implementation happens at the state level of government, the metropolitan level of government, and at the local level of government. So we are all in this together. At the federal level we can provide technical assistance, supportive policy, some training efforts, some leadership, but the real implementation is happening with you at the state level, at the metropolitan level, and local levels of government. So we can do our part, and we stand committed to doing our part, but we can’t do it without you. So thank you.

Meletiou: Thank you, John. That was a great overview – a lot of good information and a lot of encouraging information for our viewers. Our next presenter is Larry Anderson with the FHWA Planning Office. Larry is the planning oversight and stewardship team leader who is responsible for providing program guidance for the statewide and MPO planning
processes. Like John, Larry has had a long career with FHWA, which gives him great insight into legislative and policy initiatives.

Larry, please help us understand how planning for bicycling and walking is supported by the SAFETEA-LU legislation.

Anderson: Thanks, Mary. What I want to do this afternoon is to cover a few of the particular provisions related to bicycle and pedestrian transportation within the transportation planning and programming processes at the statewide as well as at the metropolitan level. One thing to keep in mind is that I will, throughout my remarks, talk about statewide planning and metropolitan transportation planning. And when I talk about metropolitan and transportation planning I am really focusing on metropolitan areas of over 50,000 population. A lot of my remarks today on the transportation planning processes are going to focus on SAFETEA-LU Section 6001. That is the provision related to both statewide and metropolitan transportation planning that is associated with Title 23 of the U.S. Code, Sections 134 for metropolitan planning and 135 for statewide planning.

In SAFETEA-LU there are also transit provisions that are very closely related to the highway provision related to transportation planning, and those can be found in Sections 3005 and 3006, which correspond to Title 49 of U.S. Code 5303 and 5304 for transit. But those provisions are very similar and mirror what we administer at the Federal Highway Administration.

As John and Cindy mentioned, SAFETEA-LU builds upon TEA-21, which builds upon ISTEA. And as John also mentioned, the statewide and metropolitan transportation planning processes are the mechanisms and the venues for coordination of regional and local priorities and to try to balance those priorities with existing and projected revenue streams to make transportation investment decisions. And when we look at some of the language in SAFETEA-LU and some of the general requirements we will note that the transportation plans and programs shall provide for the development and integrated management and operation for transportation systems and facilities, including accessible pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities that will function as an intermodal transportation system. And this language in actuality is not new. This is essentially carried over from TEA-21 and really ties into the fact that pedestrian and bicycle transportation needs and facilities are an important part of the overall intermodal transportation system.

When I talk about transportation plans, and I will refer to those several times in my remarks, we are talking about those long-range planning documents that are
developed by state DOTs and by MPOs to cover at least a 20-year planning horizon. When I talked about transportation programs, I am talking about the transportation improvement programs that are developed and adopted by MPOs and the statewide transportation improvement programs that are developed by the state departments of transportation. And those are actual programming documents that cover at least four years now as established under SAFETEA-LU to be developed at least every four years, which was a bit of a change in the SAFETEA-LU. But that’s just to give you a little bit of a background when I talk about transportation plans and programs what I am referring to.

What I want to talk about next are what we call planning factors, and these are the overarching considerations that need to be factored into statewide transportation planning as well as metropolitan and transportation planning and programming. And these are guiding principles, if you will, that are to be considered in the development of these transportation plans and programs, which will ultimately lead to the identification of individual projects that are subsequently implemented.

With SAFETEA-LU we now have eight planning factors. With TEA-21 there were seven. And these planning factors are essentially the same except in the past the factor of—there was a factor that included both safety and security. And those two factors now have been separated into individual planning factors. And the words on the slide in the graphics that you see are basically excerpts from the actual legislative and statutory language. But I wanted to just highlight a few of those factors just to show you the connection to bicycle and pedestrian issues and considerations and planning. We look at the support of the economic vitality and global competitiveness, productivity and efficiency. The factor on safety is really based on the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users as well as the factor on security, which also addresses the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users.

There is also the factor that addresses increasing the accessibility and mobility of people and freight as well as protecting and enhancing the environment, which also includes, and I didn’t include this on all of my slides, promoting energy conservation, improving the quality of life, and promoting consistency between transportation improvements and state and local planned growth and economic development patterns. There is also enhancing the integration and connectivity of the transportation system. There again, talking about the whole intermodal connection among and between modes for people and for freight. Promoting the efficient systems management and operations as well as emphasizing the preservation of the existing transportation systems.
So that provides a little bit of a background in some of the fundamental considerations that are factored in transportation planning and program development.

SAFETEA-LU also builds upon ISTEA and TEA-21 by talking about something called interested parties. These are groups and parties that must be engaged and partnered with and are key stakeholders with whom states and MPOs shall coordinate with in the development of transportation plans and programs. And, in particular, there are two groups of interested parties that have been added by SAFETEA-LU, including representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities as well as representatives of the disabled. And again, these are groups with whom states and MPOs must coordinate and collaborate, involve, and engage in the development of transportation plans and programs.

Another key feature regarding interested parties that is new to SAFETEA-LU involves MPOs and the development of what is now known as a participation plan. This is a document and a process that is established by the MPOs that is developed in consultation with all of these interested parties that will basically guide and set the rule of engagement in terms of keeping these interested parties involved in transportation and planning program development.

Another aspect that was originally required in TEA-21 that is now continued and expanded by SAFETEA-LU is what is known as an annual listing of obligated projects. This is to be developed cooperatively by the MPO and the state and the public transportation operator and must include Federal funding obligations for bicycle and pedestrian facilities. And that is a new added feature of the annual listing, and this listing shall be consistent with a category in the transportation improvement program that is developed by the MPO. FHWA and FTA developed preliminary guidance and it was issued on February 24th and at the bottom of the screen is the web link that contains this preliminary guidance.

One other aspect that I wanted to talk about in closing: we talk about transportation planning, but there are also other kinds of planning that are out there, and SAFETEA-LU established the highway safety improvement program which requires the development of a strategic highway safety plan. And the next slide shows a little bit of the relationship between what is done in terms of metropolitan and statewide transportation planning and the strategic highway safety plan as well as other associated planning activities that occur either within a state or within a metropolitan planning area. And this graphic really is designed to show the relationship where there is a lot of
different planning that occurs, that there are opportunities and linkage areas and points that bring together these various planning and program development activities.

In closing, I just wanted to say that the metropolitan statewide transportation processes are the mechanisms for considering, balancing, and prioritizing transportation needs and investment decisions, and the stakeholder involvement and participation are key elements to those decision-making processes.

Meletiou: Thank you, Larry, for clarifying some of the planning provisions of this legislation. I’m sure most of us would never find our way through it without your guidance. From my own experience, it seems that one of the main features of ISTEA, TEA-21 and SAFETEA-LU is to focus more attention on the planning for bike and ped at the metropolitan levels and give them more latitude on the kinds of things that they are working with state departments of transportation to create and ways to improve the systems, and I think that is a good thing.

If I understand correctly, the regulations that are to implement this legislation, the planning of the legislation, are currently under development. Is that correct?

Anderson: Yes, Mary. That’s correct. The existing regulations that FHWA and FTA work from actually were last developed and promulgated in their entirely in 1993. And that was based initially on ISTEA. Time has elapsed, and ever since the enactment of SAFETEA-LU back in August, we have been working very visibly on analyzing the SAFETEA-LU requirements as well as examining the existing regulations, and we are in the process of working jointly to develop new planning regulations that speak to the intent and requirements of SAFETEA-LU. We are hoping to have a notice of proposed rule making developed and out for public review and comment some time later this spring or this summer. There is a provision in SAFETEA-LU that talks about the planning provisions needing to be satisfied in the development of transportation plans and programs on and after July 1st of 2007. So we kept that legislative date pretty much in the back of our minds as we are developing the notice of proposed rulemaking, and our overall objective is to have that rule finalized in time for states and MPOs to work with to meet that July 1st of 2007 timeframe.

Meletiou: And where would people be able to access this information?

Anderson: There will be an official docket established through the Federal Register, and we will try through our various means and mechanisms to alert individuals and organizations of when that notice of proposed rulemaking will be available.
Meletiou: Okay, very good. Well, we’ve gotten a few questions in from our audience, and I encourage any of you who have question, please to send them in to us. This is a question for you, John. A person would like to know how the four communities for the non-motorized pilot program were chosen and will there be more in the future?

Fegan: Mary, the four communities that were chosen were actually named in the legislation. And the idea of the program is that it is a pilot program. And so we want to try to implement the program in the four communities and look at the results, but it’s a pilot, so we hope that the next time that the Federal legislation is up for reauthorization that we will have the opportunity to implement the program in a lot more than four locations.

Meletiou: Okay, that sounds good. We also have a question from Massachusetts which I think, John, I’ll direct to you and, Larry, if you have any comments, please add them. He says in Massachusetts we are prohibited by our FHWA district office from using eminent domain even for friendly or temporary taking for bike/ped projects funded through the transportation enhancements program. Are you aware of any other states that have a similar prohibition and why Massachusetts?

Fegan: I’m not aware of any other states. There could be. As you said, we have a Federal Highway division office in each state that deals with projects within that state. Their role is to help implement the requirements found in the Federal legislation relating to all sorts of Federal aid. That is the best source of information for projects in a particular state is to deal directly with the Federal Highway division office. Usually they are located in the state capital of each state. But they are your best point of contact at the federal level. They will often contact us at headquarters if there is a policy or an interpretation-type call that needs to be made at a national level. But for individual projects in states your best course of action is dealing with the Federal Highway division office.

Meletiou: Okay.

Anderson: And I think one thing to add to that question also and I believe that some of the background behind this particular question may focus on, I believe it was in, the appropriations bill for FY-06, if I remember correctly, and I believe it was Section 726 that regarded the use of Federal-aid funding for eminent domain in the prohibition, and that was actually guidance that was developed by the office of real estate services as one of the five program offices within the office of planning, environment, and realty at FHWA. And again, as I mentioned, that was issued by our office of real estate services. So I believe that that may be a bit of background behind that particular question, and if
I’ve read between the lines correctly, then that would be something that applies nationwide.

Meletiou: We have another question from Massachusetts. This person says can you provide some examples of states or MPOs that have made a practice of spending their Federal highway funds on bike/ped projects using funds beyond those programs like CMAQ and enhancements that are specifically targeted towards bike/ped projects.

Fegan: So they are looking for states that have spent Federal funds that haven’t been from CMAQ or—

Meletiou: Or enhancements.

Fegan: I don’t have the list of which states have provided funding. On our website, on our office of environment and planning bike/ped website, under funding, we do have a list that shows state by state, which programs that have used the fund to bike/ped programs. And I would refer the person with the question or anyone else to the website to look at that.

Quite frankly, a lot of the funding for bike/ped projects has come from the transportation enhancements funding program, which is part of the service of transportation program. Another large part has come from the congestion mitigation air quality program, CMAQ program. The recreational trails funding program has been another source of funding. Scenic byways funds are often used in states for bike/ped projects. But all the major program funds, as I said, can be used, and there are states that are starting to do that. I don’t remember the exact numbers, but in looking at the trends over the years, the transportation is still by far the most popular. But the other ones are starting to creep up, if you will, in popularity as well for funding bike/ped projects.

Meletiou: Well, I know that the 402 funds are not FHWA funds. They are NHTSA funds, but there are a number of states that have been able to use those funds. I know when I was with the North Carolina DOT we made extensive use of those funds. We were fortunate enough to have a supportive governor’s highway safety program that provided funding to do a number of bicycle safety initiatives including some really large helmet promotions, the development of a basics of bicycling, a seven-lesson curriculum, and any one of a number of other programs that we were able to implement across the state. Also there were states, and I am sure you remember some of these, and North Carolina was one of them, that were spending some funds prior to the passage of ISTEA. A lot of work got done during that time, which I think is part of the continuum of these programs that existed before ISTEA and TEA-21 that showed the value of dedicating resources to these...
sorts of activities and helped convince the decision-makers of the importance of providing funds to do these kinds of programs and projects.

Anderson: And, Mary, I would like to mention that a lot of the states and localities are spending their own funds for bike/ped projects. I’m sure you probably had that experience in North Carolina as well. But we have been talking about Federal-aid funds that are available. But a lot of states and localities are spending significant parts of their own funds to fund bike/ped projects and programs across the country.

Meletiou: Seattle is a place that has dedicated a lot of money. We have a question from New York regarding the TIP listing of obligated projects, are these just stand-alone bike/ped projects, or does this also include highway reconstruction projects with bike/ped elements, such as lanes, crosswalks, sidewalks, etc.?

Anderson: Actually, it is all of the above. The format of the report is based generally on the structure and format and content of the transportation improvement program. So that is the starting point. However, the expectation is that all Federal-aid funds that are obligated during a program year are reflected in this annual listing of obligated projects. The preliminary guidance that we in Federal Transit Administration recently issued discusses and recognizes the fact that there may be some larger scale highway projects that do have embedded elements that address both bicycle and/or pedestrian issues and to the extent that that information can be gleaned and reported as part of that larger project, that is certainly our expectation, as that those kinds of projects are reported at least to the extent that they can be as part of a larger highway project. But anything that reflects bicycle and pedestrian obligations should be reflected in that annual listing.

Meletiou: Well, let’s hope the list just gets longer and longer as time goes on.

Fegan: And, Mary, I would like to just mention here that this listing of projects and being involved in the planning process is critical here. I mean, if a project is not included on that list or at least covered in terms of scope on that list, the project can’t be funded using Federal-aid funds. So getting involved in the planning process here is critical.

Meletiou: I think that’s an important point because I think a lot of people locally want things to be done, and they don’t realize that they really can play a very active role in creating better bicycle and pedestrian transportation systems in their own communities. So I think that’s an excellent point. We have a phone call from Iowa. Could we go to our caller? [PAUSE] I think we don’t have that link. Hopefully, we’ll get Iowa on the phone shortly.
Back to the opportunity for people to get involved in their own municipalities and the MPO process, do either of you have any words of encouragement to help people see that they really can make a difference?

Fegan: Well, I think at the state level and the local level of government, the transportation officials are really looking to citizens, to advocates, to tell them what projects are important. I used to think that all these decisions were made in a vacuum, and as Larry has mentioned there is a significant requirement, a commitment, to involving the public in making these decisions. We don’t want a transportation system that imposes projects on states, on localities. We want a transportation system that responds to the needs that citizens have indicated, and so I would just echo what you said, Mary; it’s very important to get involved in the process. Figure out how the process works. Figure out when the deadlines are for lists of projects to be done. Just figure out how the system works where you are, and, actually, if you have a particular project, you also need to know whose facility it is on because some states, some facilities, are owned by states; some roadways are run by states. Others are owned by counties or local units of government, and so you need to figure out whether the project that you are looking to bring online, who has responsibility for that particular facility. So you need to figure out whose facility is it, and what are their deadlines, and how does the process work to get involved in the process?

Meletiou: Well, it’s been my experience that the communities that have bicycle or pedestrian committees or a dedicated bicycle and pedestrian coordinator are the ones where the greatest number of improvements takes place and where connected systems evolve -- primarily because in these communities they are usually doing plans that look both on the short-term and a long-term horizon and see opportunities to partner the provision of facilities with the development of highway and bridge projects as well as the independent projects that are built with separate money. We have a question from Richmond. Can CMAQ funds be used to pay for a regional bicycle and pedestrian planning project program coordinator? Can CMAQ funds be used to pay for a coordinator?

Fegan: CMAQ funds are not supposed to be used for funding local coordinator positions. CMAQ funds are really intended for projects and programs that have air quality implications. Typically, our program funds are not used to fund staff positions. The state bike/ped coordinators, and as you will hear in the Safe Routes to Schools session in a little bit, we do use Federal-aid funds to fund those positions because those are specific requirements in the Federal legislation. But generally we don’t use Federal-aid funds to fund staffing positions.
Meletiou: That clarifies that. We have another question from Iowa about clarification. Can you clarify the requirements for participation and public involvement in plans? Are both required to be completed by MPOs or state DOTs? The requirements for participation and public involvement in the development of plans.

Anderson: Okay, essentially, and I will start with statewide transportation planning, the interested parties that I referred to that must be involved and engaged would be done as part of typically through long-range statewide transportation plan development and also the development and also the development of the statewide transportation improvement program. And there are statutory in the existing regulatory requirements that do speak to involvement processes and approaches used by the states in terms of engaging all these interested parties. At the metropolitan level, SAFETEA-LU does something a little different in recognizing that MPOs for at least the past 15 years have been developing public involvement plans or processes that engage and involve interested parties throughout the metropolitan transportation planning process.

SAFETEA-LU basically builds upon that, and it’s not something necessarily that is new or different when we talk about a participation plan, but this is more in terms of a documented process. And a key difference is, not only is that list of interested parties expanded to include the representatives of the users of bicycle and pedestrian facilities as well as representatives of the disabled, but it also talks about how this participation plan must be developed by the MPO in consultation with all of those interested parties as well. So it’s not just a matter of an MPO defining unilaterally what the opportunities are going to be for these interested parties to be involved, but to engage those interested parties in the development of that participation plan that will be used ultimately in the development of the long-range transportation plan. So what we have seen is that there are some MPOs that may have public involvement processes or plans from the past that nearly or do meet the spirit and intent now of SAFETEA-LU, and that’s fine. But really, the key features are does that past public involvement process, does it include all of the interested parties? And has that plan been developed in consultation with all of those interested parties? And so, it’s hard to give a straight answer in all cases just because it’s really going to be based on how that public involvement plan in the past was developed. And it may just be a matter of re-looking at how it was developed and with whom it was developed and reassessing and doing whatever it takes to get to that next step to make it a participation plan.
Meletiou: Well, I think part of what I’m hearing you say is that the government agencies themselves need to be more proactive in seeking out these groups for comment and not just announce some sort of public meeting, and if no one stands up, that’s that.

Fegan: Well, certainly there are some provisions of SAFETEA-LU that talk about accessible meeting times and locations, and that is certainly a key aspect of this. But as you mention, Mary, and you are absolutely correct, the fact is that it’s not just a unilateral development of a plan and then announcing it those interested parties. It’s engaging those interested parties in the development of that plan to begin with.

Meletiou: And I know from having been at a state DOT myself that it’s always challenging when you do engage people because they don’t all have the same opinions, and sometimes it’s a little hard to sort of sort through all the different ideas and needs. And that’s a real challenge for people who work for government agencies. I’m sure you all have discovered that in your own work.

We have a question from Winston-Salem, North Carolina, who asks, the person asks, how and who will have to bear the burden of proof for the need of bike/ped facilities on a project by project basis? John, I think—

Fegan: Well, that’s really—the answer to that is what is required by your particular state or locality. We have a national design guidance policy that says that bicyclists and pedestrians should be routinely accommodated. But that design guidance language has been adopted by a number of states, and they have implemented it in different ways. And so you really need to look at your particular state or locality and see what their measure of effectiveness is for doing that. Is it routinely included in the planning process? Are there design cross-sections of roadways that always show space and facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians? Is there—have there been modifications to the maintenance manual that talk about the particular needs of bicyclists and pedestrians? So you really need to see what your own locality has done and what measures of effectiveness they have put into those provisions that they have passed.

Meletiou: Well, those are all really good points. Is there any checklist that people could refer to of the kinds of things that, like what you just described, that would help people know what to look for and where to look for it?

Fegan: We haven’t developed a checklist. I think what would be good is to look at some of the states that have been recognized as leaders across the country. And I am just going to pick a few. Oregon, Florida, North Carolina have been doing this for a long time. And a number—Virginia has a new design guidance policy. A number of states are really
moving in this direction of routinely accommodating bicyclists and pedestrians. Other states are slower to adopt this. But I think everyone has moved up a notch with the new legislation. We would like every state to have a policy of routinely accommodating bicyclists and pedestrians. But I think the best thing right now is to look at those states, some of which I mentioned, and see how they’ve done it. Oregon has been doing it for a while. North Carolina has as well. So has Florida. So there is a track history out there—a track record, if you will, to see how this works in different places. I would just look for models from those states.

Meletiou: And those states all have really excellent websites that you can access and find a lot of information about what sorts of projects have been done, what sorts of guidelines exist, what sorts of interactions there are between the public and the DOT and so on. So I would encourage you to do this.

Fegan: And, Mary, our pedestrian and bicycling information center also has some great resources in terms of showing which state programs had different mainstream elements in them as well. So again, I would refer you back to the pedestrian/bicycle clearinghouse.

Meletiou: In fact, that PBIC website is excellent. I have visited it a number of times myself and have always found the things that I needed and have never had enough time to look through the whole website. There is so much there.

We have another question here. What can citizens do when local implementation is not happening or is very slow? For example, Memphis has no painted bike lanes. There is a 20-year long-range plan but no short-term implementation schedule. Larry, can you address that?

Anderson: Well, I think one of the key things is to be engaged and at every step of the way. The long-range transportation plan development process is certainly an avenue. But when it comes to the actual implementation of projects, as John mentioned earlier, unless they are programmed in a transportation improvement program at the metropolitan level or the statewide transportation improvement program at the state level, those projects will not advance. And when we talk about that program, it’s the projects of the project phases that have the actual funding sources and categories and costs associated with those phases or projects, and those do not get advanced. Those projects do not get advanced unless they are programmed. And, if I think through some of our experiences also, if you look at the metropolitan level, that many, many, and the number is increasing, MPOs have bicycle and/or pedestrian and/or bicycle/pedestrian committees of subcommittees or working groups that complement the technical committees or the citizen’s advisory committee
structures within those MPOs, and those are great forums and avenues as well for those issues and concerns to be raised. And ultimately to be factored into actual projects that are advanced and implemented.

Meletiou: So people need to roll up their sleeves and get busy and get involved locally. Well, this is the end of this hour. I’m sorry we couldn’t take all your questions. They will however, be posted to the broadcast forum and answered online by our panel members. We are going to take a short break and will be back at 2:10 for our discussion of Safe Routes to School.

***

Meletiou: Welcome back, everyone, to our broadcast on the SAFETEA-LU provisions for bicycling and walking. In this hour we’ll focus on the Safe Routes to School legislation and some programs and resources that will be helpful as you develop your state and local Safe Routes to School initiatives. Our panelists this hour are Tim Arnade, FHWA Safe Routes to School program manager; Dr. Sarah Martin, CDC health scientist in the Physical Activity and Health Branch; and Dr. Lee Kokinasis, director of the Active School Environment and Safe Routes to School programs for the Michigan Fitness Foundation.

Tim will be our first presenter, and we have a lot to cover in this session, so we will go ahead and get started with Tim’s presentation.

Arnade: Thank you, Mary. And let me just say at the outset, thank you very much for inviting me to this presentation, I always appreciate the opportunity to spread the good word about the new Safe Routes to School program. Let me just take our viewers, my role on this panel today is to give you, the viewers, an overview of the new Federal Safe Routes to School program.

As many of you know, the recently passed transportation bill contained a new Federal-aid program, the Federal Safe Routes to School program. It is funded at $612 million and by, that’s a lot of money. But when you look at it, and you spread that over five years and 51 DOTs, it kind of diminishes quite a bit. Still, in aggregate it is a lot of money. The law is actually Section 1404 of the law that created the program. The law really has three main requirements. And I list those on the slide that you are viewing now in priority order. The first priority is to implement the Safe Routes to School program nationwide. The second priority is to create a clearinghouse that will support the activities of the first priority, the nationwide program. And lastly, we are to establish a task force, and I will talk about those last two at the end of this presentation, but most of my
presentation will be on the first priority, the implementation of the Safe Routes to School nationwide.

The purpose of the program—let me say the language out of the law is to enable and encourage children to walk and bike to school, to make walking and biking to school safer and more appealing, and to facilitate projects and activities in the vicinity of the schools that will improve safety, reduce traffic, reduce air pollution, and reduce fuel consumption. Now let me mention something about this slide that you are looking at now, that language is straight out of statute. That’s law. So we consider this the framework of our program. When we have a question, is it eligible or not eligible, a lot of times we go back to the framework of the program and see if it fits within the intent and purpose—the express purpose as established by Congress.

I want to talk about program implementation and what we have been doing to roll out this program. The first action item that we had was we needed a--we issued a memo to the states asking them to hire their state coordinators, and I will talk about that in a minute. But more importantly, we had to issue program guidance. How did we interpret the law, and what was the guidance that we were going to give the state departments and transportation in how to run the program? And this is probably the most critical policy document we will ever put out on Safe Routes to School. And I moved into the job in October, we issued our guidance at the first week of January of 2006. If you haven’t seen that Pulitzer Prize write-up, it’s on our website which will be at the end of my presentation you will see the website.

Another part of the law is that every state must have a full-time coordinator. Every state department of transportation must have a full-time coordinator. So let me say, this has been a very challenging part of the program. A lot of states have ceilings or freezes on hiring, ceilings on FTE, a number of state departments of transportation actually have to go to their legislature to get approval to hire a new person. So this has been a challenge for a lot of state DOTs. I am pleased to report that as of today, out of the 51 departments of transportation, of the 50 states plus the District of Columbia, we now have 41 coordinators. Twenty-seven of those are permanent full-time, and 14 are acting interim basis while the state undertakes the hiring process or an appointment process.

The other part of the program is the law specifically established the program for schools, K-8. It is not for universities, it is not for high schools, it is by law, K-8. So that certainly puts the framework on how and where the money goes. Funding—how do we decide who gets how much money? Well, the law also contained a formula. It’s a very
basic formula and what we call apportionment formula, how much they get annually. It’s based on enrollments in elementary and middle schools versus the national total. So how much a state receives is a percentage of the national total. And so, as you would imagine, the big winners are going to be the big states—California, Texas, New York, Pennsylvania, Florida. And then the smaller states of course, don’t get as large a slice of the pie. But Congress did establish a minimum threshold. So every state will receive no less than $1 million per year.

Program implementation—now what Congress did is they took this money and they divided into two categories: some for infrastructure projects, some for non-infrastructure projects. We kind of call this the hard and the soft side of the program – the hard dollars being the infrastructure projects, the soft dollars being the non-infrastructure projects. And we’ll talk a little bit about that more in a minute. Now, what Congress also said in their legislation is they encourage state department of transportation to establish a competitive application process. Now, they didn’t put that language in law; that is not statutory language. That is language that is in the conference report, so it’s an intent and a suggestion of Congress. It is not statutory. So states—and in our guidance we certainly address this—we tell states, we encourage them, to adhere to the conference report language, but they don’t necessarily have to.

Eligible grant recipients. This, too, is straight out of the law. It says that eligible grant recipients are state, local, and regional agencies, and non-profit organizations. And frankly, the non-profit organizations are mostly going to come in at the soft side money, the dedication side of the program. Education and encouragement.

Here is how the funding breaks out. For infrastructure projects, infrastructure funding, they take 70-90% of their funding, it’s 70% is the floor, 90% is a ceiling. So, and then for infrastructure projects, they have to be within two miles of a school, of a K-8 school. That is in the law also. Infrastructure projects or planning or design and construction, many categories, there is an extensive list of eligible projects in our guidance. I think there are seven categories, like sidewalk improvements, traffic ____ and speed reduction improvements, pedestrian-bicycle crossings, on-street bike facilities, off-street bike/ped facilities, etc. Very broad in nature, and under each one of those categories many different things will fit.

The guidance also addresses ineligible uses of the funding, and I would encourage you to go online of you have questions about what is eligible and what is not
eligible and look at our guidance. I think most of the questions you probably have in the front of your mind should be addressed in our guidance.

Now on the soft side—Congress has established a floor, 10% of the funds annually shall be used for non-infrastructure, up to a ceiling of 30%. So if you remember the prior slide, it was 70-90 on the hard side. It’s 10-30 on the soft side. So that is an overlap of 20%. So a state has the flexibility in that 20% to go either way. They can put it all towards infrastructure and use 90%. They could put it all towards non-infrastructure and use 30%. But the non-infrastructure side is for education, encouragement and enforcement programs. And once again, our guidance has specifics on what categories fall under that. I think there are something like five of them: public awareness campaigns, outreach, the press, and community and leaders; traffic education and enforcement within two miles of the school; student sessions on pedestrian and bicycle safety, health and environment; and lastly, funding training volunteers and managers of Safe Routes to School programs. And that is an overview of the implementation of the nationwide Federal-aid program.

Let me last talk about—these next few slides, which are going to talk about the last two parts of the program. The clearinghouse – by law we are to make a grant to a national non-profit organization to operate a clearinghouse that really will be a center of excellence and will support our Safe Routes to School coordinators in every state. So support the interest groups, the stakeholders, the communities, all the folks that have questions and provide best practices, technical assistance, training, marketing materials, and I am pleased to report to most of you who haven’t heard yet that less than 48 hours ago Federal Highways did conclude its procurement process, and we did make an award to the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill to establish and operate the clearinghouse.

Lastly, the law on the Safe Routes to School task force – the law tells us that we need to have a task force and to come up with—develop a strategy frankly, to and to report to Congress for study and developing Safe Routes to School programs nationwide. Now, let me just take a moment and just pause here and let you know that this task force happened to trigger the Federal Advisory Committee Act. Congress tried to avoid it, they were unsuccessful, and so we will be going through a very public and open process on the task force. And now that we have made the award for the clearinghouse, the next item I will be tackling after we get the clearinghouse fully established is the task force.
Lastly, let me just encourage you that these two web addresses on this slide, the first one is the web address for the clearinghouse. Now they just got the contract less than 48 hours ago, so they are running hot and heavy and they have a website up I believe already and getting a lot of information up. And I would direct many of you to that website, and then on the Federal Highways website you can see the guidance I was talking about earlier in my presentation. And perhaps a couple other questions you may have. We have funding tables broken down by state by state.

So in short, that is an overview of the new legislation, the new Federal-aid Safe Routes to School and at this point I am going to turn it over to my colleagues here to talk to you about other aspects of Safe Routes to School.

Meletiou: Thanks for that great presentation. You’ve obviously accomplished a lot in a very short time. And anyone who has tried to create a new program will understand just how hard it was for you and how much work you had to put into getting to the point where you are today, and we appreciate all the hard work you’ve done because we are advocates and professionals all over the country who have been champing at the bit to get the Safe Routes to School program underway. Thank you.

The Safe Routes to School program is a program that has forged many non-traditional partnerships at the national, state and local levels. Our next two panelists are public health professionals who focus on Safe Routes to School and similar programs as one countermeasure to mitigate the decreased levels of physical activity among children. They have become vocal proponents of building active environments and have been wonderful partners for the transportation professionals. We’ll start with Dr. Sarah Martin who oversees the Centers for Disease Control Kids Walk to School program. Welcome, Sarah.

Martin: Well, thanks, Mary. I am really glad to be here and that you invited the CDC to participate in this because I really feel—I’m excited about the new legislation in Safe Routes to School, and I really see it as a prime opportunity for public health to partner with transportation. In fact, Tim just outlined the infrastructure and non-infrastructure components, and I hate to call it the soft part, but the non-infrastructure components, I think, are what public health specializes in, so I hope the transportation will turn to public health to create the best Safe Routes to School programs possible.

Meletiou: I know your program has been in existence for some time. When and why did CDC get involved with Safe Routes to School?
Martin: Okay, well, at the CDC we actually have a physical activity and health branch. These are individuals dedicated toward physical activity, and I should mention that in each state there is also an individual dedicated to physical activity. So anyhow, members of the physical activity and health branch started working on the issue in the late 1990s. It was a response actually to some of the department of transportation own pilot projects that showed some promise with Safe Routes to School. So actually, it was 1999 when members of our active community environments workgroup, that is, those of us interested in making communities more walkable and bikable, decided to get started in what we call CDC’s Kids Walk to School program, and we drafted a CDC Kids Walk to School guide in 1999. In 2000 we distributed that guide widely to the public health audience and have been working on it ever since. Now, the why we got involved, I think, is fairly obvious. If I could show the first slide, what we see and what we know is that over the past 30-40 years the rates of walking to school or biking to school have decreased dramatically. And during that same time period the rate of overweight among children has tripled. And the incidence of Type II diabetes has increased perhaps ten-fold or more. Those first two bullet points really point to the need to get our kids moving more often to really increase physical activity.

Now the second two bullet points, one is that the rate of asthma has increased among young children 160%. That is children under the age of four. For children five to 14 years it has increased 70%. Now if we could reduce ___ emissions, that would help to combat these rising rates of asthma, and lastly, pedestrian injury is an issue. In fact, it is the second leading cause of unintentional injury related to death among youngsters. And pedestrian injury—as you know Safe Routes to School provides for not only making our streets safer but for teaching about pedestrian safety and driver safety, and we also have a plug to helmet use. If you are going to be biking to school or rolling to school on a roller blade or a skateboard or any other way, it is important to wear a helmet. We know that those reduce the risk of injury or death. So definitely, pedestrian safety is an important component to Safe Routes to School. In fact, did you know that Safe Routes to School actually started way back in the 1970s in Denmark in response to very high pedestrian injury rates? Their Safe Routes to School program showed that they could reduce pedestrian injury rates by about 85% by implementing Safe Routes to School.

Meletiou: Well, I’m sure that many of our viewers are surprised to learn that the Safe Routes to School concept has been around since the 1970s. And as you point out, it is important for communities to focus not just on the safety issues but the health and transportation issues
related to walking and biking to school. Obviously, school transportation patterns have changed a lot in the last few decades actually. Why do you think fewer kids are walking and biking to school now than in the past?

Martin: Well, I think there are two answers. I think the __ environments have changed. I know I live in a subdivision with cul-de-sacs; you can’t really get to your school very easily. But also, I think some societal norms or perceptions have changed. For example, in 1969 about half of kids that lived two miles from school walked or biked. I think if you ask parents today if two miles is too far to walk or bike, many would say yes. So that is really a societal norm or perception that has changed. But if we show the next slide I can show you the reported barriers to walking and biking to school. You can see that distance is a real barrier today. We are seeing the disappearance of neighborhood schools and an increase in mega-schools on the outskirts of towns that make distance a real barrier for many children. I think traffic danger is another real issue that has grown over the years. Streets have been engineered for fast cars. We really need to make changes—narrow our streets and make them safe again for active travelers, and as Tim just mentioned, a lot of the money in Safe Routes to School is for those engineering changes.

Now you can see weather is a barrier. I don’t think that has changed over the past 30-40 years. If anything, it’s gone up a degree or two. And I would submit that kids can walk in all different weather conditions, so perhaps their norms around that have changed.

Now crime unfortunately is an issue in some neighborhoods. Although I don’t believe it is an issue for more than one in ten of our children, I think that perhaps media tends to heighten our fears. And it is surprising to find out that some schools actually have a policy to prohibit walking or biking to school. Those policies probably arose from traffic dangers, so we really need to fix the problem, not create policies that eliminate the opportunity to travel actively to school.

Meletiou: You make an important point here. I think that sometimes it is just easier to prohibit an activity than to fix the problems because the problems are often pretty complex, especially in schools where there are so many other issues that need to be considered. We’ve seen that happen in a number of places. Earlier you mentioned CDC’s Kids Walk to School program. What can you tell us about that program, and does CDC do anything else to promote active travel to school?

Martin: Thanks for asking about that. We do have a Kids Walk to School website. And it promotes these four goals, which are similar to the Safe Routes to School goals. We
encourage children to walk and bike to school. We increase the awareness about the importance of regular physical activity, and, in fact, for those that don’t know, children should accumulate at least 60 minutes of physical activity every day. And walking to and from school or biking to and from school provides some of those minutes. We also want to improve pedestrian safety, make communities more walkable, and mobilize communities to get together to create Safe Routes to School. In fact, have you seen our website?

Meletiou: I have. In fact, I visited your website a number of times, and I found a lot of great resources there both for people just starting their programs as well as those who have programs underway. I would encourage everyone to take the time to visit those websites.

Martin: Great. Thanks. My next slide shows the link to our website and some of the other things CDC does to promote walking and biking to school. We financially support the Safe Routes to School course through an interagency agreement with the department of transportation so that the Pedestrian and Biking Information Center has created that course, and we provide technical support for that. We are on the steering committee for the international Walk to School movement, which I will describe in just a second. And we fund some research projects that we call special interest projects. One is looking at where schools are sited—in other words, that neighborhood school issue. And another is finished, and it was to evaluate Walk to School efforts nationwide. And you should see the results of that study published in the next year or two. Lastly, about what we do being the CDC, a large public health agency, we have the opportunity to promote the international Walk to School Week—or it used to be a day and then was a week last year. In 2006 you will see for the first time it is an international Walk to School Month, the month of October. We promote that on the front page of the CDC website every year. And this past year we published a *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* promoting that Walk to School Week of 2005 and also some of our scientific work reporting the barriers.

So we definitely put our efforts into promoting it each year, and I would like to conclude by saying that Safe Routes to School is very important to public health. It not only increases physical activity, but also, if we make our street safer and teach about safety, we can decrease injury and if we can reduce the private auto trips to school, we will reduce traffic and have better air quality if we can lower emissions. So just one last plug for public health in Safe Routes to School partnering with transportation.
Meletiou: Thank you, Sarah. There is plenty of work for all of us to do to make the ideas that you have put forward a reality in addition to the work that has already been done by agencies like the Centers for Disease Control and various local and state initiatives.

Our next presenter is Dr. Lee Kokinakis. Lee oversaw the Michigan Safe Routes to School pilot projects initiated in 2003 and was involved in the development of the Michigan Safe Routes to School handbook. Lee will offer a brief case study of their program and focus on some keys to success. Lee, I’m glad you could be with us today. My first question is, I know that there are a number of well-established very good Safe Routes to School programs in the country. In Michigan it was the public health community that was a strong advocate for Safe Routes to School. How did this come about?

Kokinakis: Well, thanks first, Mary for mentioning the many programs that exist. We are all standing on the shoulders of pioneers here in this country and in other countries by advancing Safe Routes to School for some years. So that work has been very important. And the other thing before I begin my remarks is to mention that I will be talking about Michigan, but we feel like the principles, some of the principles that I will be talking about, have applications to other states, and we are just hopeful that it will be helpful.

The first slide I want to show you is the logo that was developed in Michigan and I am just asking that that come up so that I can recognize our Michigan Department of Transportation, the Governor’s Council of Physical Fitness, that is my organization. We have two names also known as the Michigan Fitness Foundation and the Michigan Department of Community Health. Of course, I am going to talk a bit about how community health has been a leader in our state.

First of all, our public health officials both at the Department of Community Health and at the Michigan Fitness Foundation have a strong commitment to physical activity for the reasons that Sarah has mentioned. We know that there is a tremendous need to increase physical activity. In addition, in Michigan we collected some data on the economic costs of physical inactivity, and we have learned that about $8 billion a year in direct and indirect costs are attributable to physical inactivity in our state. And lest any of us think it is just Michigan, nationally data from 2000 suggest that about $117 billion nationally are attributable to obesity. And the consequent are related at least to chronic health problems.

So our leadership understood the connection between Safe Routes to School and public health—the public health mission. They also fostered a culture of collaboration, a
very important component I believe, and by that developed a strong coalition with others that is a cross cutting notion of Safe Routes to School, which is so powerful that there are many interests served through Safe Routes to School programs. Obviously comprehensive transportation systems, public health services, and so on. So I want to mention one other piece, too, how public health has taken a lead in Michigan. We’ve developed some messages which we intended to be simple, clear, easy to remember. Communications to the general public that include the public health message. And in just a moment you are going to see a short video clip. The whole video was a movie that was produced of three of our 11 pilot schools as they underwent a number of activities to help us develop our Michigan program. And so these are real people, real students, real parents, real teachers, and while, of course, they are from Michigan at this time, I believe that these are the same voices that can be heard in many, many states. So, and also, these schools represent urban, rural, and suburban settings. So, if we could just take a look at that video clip, please.

[VIDEO CLIP PLAYS]

F: One of my big concerns for the kids walking to school is the crosswalks. Michigan has higher than the average number of adults and children who are overweight or obese.

M: It’s a nice opportunity for people to get to know each other.

M: As a society, we are becoming less and less fit. And we need to change that and stop it now.

F: You won’t get run over by a car.

F: It eases traffic jams, reduces pollution. It’s just good for our environment.

F: You might get shmooshed like a taxi.

F: Don’t worry about it. If ___ because maybe it can.

[VIDEO CLIP ENDS]

Kokinakis: That logo was developed with the input of middle school youths. We wanted a look that would appeal to that age group, and then eventually the attitudes and beliefs and behaviors of middle school students will influence whether or not they do walk and bike to school.

Meletiou: Well, I heard you say that building a coalition of advocates, including public health advocates who understand their stake in Safe Routes to School, has helped you build
capacity in Michigan. And, Lee, I’m assuming by capacity you mean the ability to implement and support programs. Is that correct?

Kokinakis: Yes, and in Michigan we think about capacity both at the state level and at the local level—building state networks of individuals and organizations to support Safe Routes to School, to bring that technical expertise you need. And at the local level, very similarly, you need those strong advocates, and perhaps even more importantly at the local level, you need the technical expertise to do the kinds of things you need to do in that case.

Meletiou: How else have you attempted to build capacity in Michigan?

Kokinakis: Our Michigan departments of Education, Community Health, as I have already mentioned, and Transportation, are working together to provide resources for Safe Routes to School in Michigan, and their support is very important, and just a quick __ on the educational objective there. Students who have physical activity before school are more likely to be ready to learn, and there is some research showing less behavior problems in the classroom as well. We used the strength and interest of our core team, our coalition core team to help us develop pilot project goals that would serve capacity building. A pilot project was funded by the Michigan Department of Transportation Enhancements Program, it was a two-year project. And the goals for that project were to build a strong state coalition, that was underway, to work with 11 pilot schools so that we could learn from and with them what they needed in order to be effective, to develop these communication strategies, materials, and the movie that you have seen part of, to collect and analyze parent and student information because we know that parents are a strong factor in whether or not students walk and bike to school. And then also to create user-friendly materials and procedures to help local school community teams.

Meletiou: Well, many of our viewers are just beginning a Safe Routes to School program. What you have described may sound a bit overwhelming to some of them. Do you have any suggestions for those who are just starting out?

Kokinakis: I think that is an important question. Again, Michigan’s example is hopefully helpful, but it’s really important for state and local communities to start where they are—to avoid comparisons with other states and other communities. Each state and each local community has a unique set of strengths and will have it’s own challenges. So starting where you are is very important. Next, a tip would be to get the attention of both local and state champions. Tell them why Safe Routes to School is important to their mission, and build a strong team that is going to be founded on collaboration and cooperation and recognizing the successes of all members of the team. In our case, again, you may want
to include in your state program the strengths and interests of key stakeholder groups and
build into your program what those stakeholders can bring to your program. Collecting
information and assessing the environment, important components of a state program and
that is who your leaders are and how they can help you and what your cultural
environment as well as the physical needs in your state may be or increasing safety. Plan
realistically. I want to emphasize that Safe Routes to School is a big project. When you
think about encouragement and education, enforcement, engineering, and evaluation
components—that can be a lot. So identify a small set of realistic objectives, and figure out
the steps you need to take to reach those objectives, and then stay focused on those steps.
And last, really celebrate keeping momentum going; it has really helped by celebrating
early wins.

Meletiou: Lee, that is a great roadmap for people to follow. And it takes a lot of partnerships and a
lot of hanging in there to make these things happen, as anybody who has worked on a
successful program can attest to. Well, obviously this is a really important element of our
program today. We’ve already received a number of questions which we will go to in a
moment. But we encourage those of you who are out there and have questions to please
send them to us. If you don’t get them during the few minutes that we have left in this
session, we will post them to the website, and they will be answered by our panel of
experts here.

The first question is from the Florida DOT. Please comment on the relationship
of school size and specialized programs in relation to our ability to encourage kids to
walk or bike to their schools. Tim, do you want to—?

Arnade: Well, I would just say that every school is going to have its unique attributes, but if you
are talking about mega-schools that are built out where there is really no neighborhood,
then they are going to have a challenge obviously of trying to get in this program, and
there probably won’t even e sidewalks there. But if you are talking about—so I think we
in our guidance have addressed a number of things about schools that are suburban,
urban, rural, and that we need to be able to reach all of these. Specifically, on siting I
would tell you also that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has done a lot of work
on this. They actually have a website regarding school siting. So they would be a
resource, too. We are very cognizant of it and at the sort of launched this program and are
in full-swing, we are struggling with how to deal with that also.

Kokinakis: May I offer a comment on that, too? In Michigan our Governor, Jennifer Granholm,
understands the connection between land use and physical activity, and part of the
solution may be the planning that Larry spoke about, getting some plans laid early on for maximizing opportunities to walk and bicycle to school, neighborhood schools affording that opportunity. Obviously large campuses in outlying farmlands are making that much more difficult.

**Meletiou:** Sarah, do you have anything you wish to add?

**Martin:** Well, from the public health perspective and the increasing physical activity perspective, all that I could add perhaps is the importance of physical activity for everyone so even in a remote location such as a mega-school there are programmatic parts of Safe Routes to School that could be implemented. For example, setting up off drop-off points within a mile or two of school and having children walk or bike to school in groups. That is just one strategy that could be used in a further away school situation.

**Meletiou:** We have a question here from Alabama. How can we utilize Safe Routes to School funds for bike/ped construction to and from existing schools? Tim? I think that would fall to you.

**Arnade:** Well, I think the legislation addresses that right up front, that it makes funding available for infrastructure projects for bicycle and pedestrian projects to access and get into school easier and safer. So frankly, what I would tell the viewers is that your go-to person is going to be your state Safe Routes to School coordinator. And I can tell you Alabama has already named the person, and so you can go to our website and their name and contact information is on our website. And recall that the states are encouraged to run a competitive application process. So once a state implements its program and puts out a call for applications and you build support in your community, you have a good application, then it will be up to the state DOT to make selections. But I would say to the caller who asked the question, that this program addresses that head-on.

**Meletiou:** We have a question here from a physical activity coordinator in Texas. Sarah, I think that you might be the appropriate person to answer this question. How can we as partners on this issue help not only change the environment but help change the culture and build a social norm for walking and biking? A tough one.

**Martin:** Wow. Thanks for that question. That is a tough one. Changing societal norms obviously takes years. And not something we can do overnight. But since World War II and the changes we made in the environment to create what we have got today is going to probably take that long again to uncreate what we created. So I would say hang in there and realize where your strengths complement those of the people in transportation. Don’t try to do it all. But work out those key partnerships and coalitions that can make it happen.
and know that maybe you need to get the media involved to help change the societal norms—and that they may have created some of the situations that make parents afraid to let their kids walk to school. So, hopefully, we can work with the media to work on starting to change perceptions.

Meletiou: Lee, do you have anything you want to add?

Kokinakis: Yes, just to build on the suggestion of including the media, walk to school day, International Walk to School Day is a wonderful time to invite the media and get their attention to the needs for more physical activity. Also other activities that are oftentimes parts of programs at the local level, such as the Walking Audit, called the Walk About Environmental Assessment—another great time to invite the press to build awareness and support for the importance of physical activity. And then third of all, don’t forget to include youth and what they have to say about why they do and don’t walk to school and what their parents have to say about why they do and don’t walk to school. And what we found with some survey data that we collected and then prepared in simple reports and fed back to school communities is that it really helps to get the word out and start that process, long-term process, of shifting those norms.

Meletiou: We have a question here from Richmond, Virginia, which I think you have already addressed, Tim. The question is, can Safe Routes to School funding be used to enhance accommodations along routes providing access to a new high school that will be opening?

Arnade: The answer is the legislation is very clear that Safe Routes to School funds is for K-8, so if you are a high school, obviously it is not K-8. It’s 9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th grades, so you would not be able to access that funding for a high school.

Meletiou: Sarah, you touched on this next question. Considering the environment in which we live today, how are local governments supposed to get parents to overcome the psychological fear of letting their children walk or ride their bikes to school safely without some kind of incident?

Martin: Okay, well, why am I getting all the tough questions? I think I had an answer. I have an answer, if I just recall it. The—can you ask me again?

Meletiou: Sure, Sure. Considering the environment in which we live today how are local governments supposed to get parents to overcome the psychological fear of letting their children walk or ride their bikes to school safely without some kind of incident?

Martin: Okay, okay. I think it is important for parents to know how low the risk of, how do you say, crimes against children do actually occur. I am not saying that it is not something to
worry about, but crimes against children usually happen from someone that knows that child or relatives. And usually don’t happen, rarely ever happen, within the vicinity of the school. So I think the frightened level is a little bit out of proportion with the risk level. So that is important to know, but that won’t fix everything. The other thing is that there are strategies in Safe Routes to School that can alleviate some of these fears. As I mentioned, the walking school bus with perhaps an adult driver and kids walking together or a bike train. Again, having adults and kids or even just kids together with older kids leading it. Having groups of kids rather than kids walking alone or biking alone may help alleviate some of those fears.

Meletiou: Lee, you had something to add.

Kokinakis: In addition to the walking school buses, another component of that question was asked, how our local governments are supposed to get parents to—and it’s really in that collaborative team development process, school parents, school personnel, student, local government, transportation, experts, road authority people, law enforcement, public health folks, everybody working together where that exchange of ideas and I think there is a real building of trust that happens at that local level as well. I see that as part of an in addition to what Sarah said in answer to that question. And I think also there are some maintenance things that can be done to diminish places where children might be fearful to walk past, or some difficulties that might exist not just in the infrastructure but in the environment on the walk from home to school. When parents are involved in the walking audit or the environment assessment, which they must be involved in when that is conducted, then they do help identify where those concerns are. And so such things, as we often talk about the loose dog, I mean, that is a real scary event, and it is a problem. Or a shrubbery that can be trimmed back, and there are some early easy wins and fixes that can happen. But I want to mention also something that comes to me from your remark, Mary, in areas of blight in some of our inner city areas where again that 8% of households that don’t have automobiles. Those children are walking regardless of what those conditions are, and I think that if we look at our Safe Routes to School programs we need to understand the background of settings and environment in which children may not walk because their parents are afraid and maybe they are not even needing to be afraid versus environments where kids walk and there are plenty of reasons to be concerned about their safety.

Meletiou: That’s a very good point. I’ve worked with some schools where the principals have talked about their concern for very young children who are walking alone who are not
susceptible to the kinds of things that people imagine are going to happen to the children, but just various dangers along the route to school. And they are pretty excited about the programs that encourage groups of children to walk to school together or children supervised by adults. Or perhaps additional law enforcement along the route in the form of school crossing guards and so on. So those are all good initiatives. We have a question from New York, and I think this would be for you, Tim. Are there established criteria for—oh, no. I guess it would be for Lee or for Sarah. Are there established criteria for evaluating Safe Routes to School initiatives. We know what a great job public health officials do in evaluating programs. So would either of you like to tackle that question?

Kokinakis: Well, in Michigan we collected parent s and student attitudes and beliefs and behavior data at our pilot schools, and we are going to use those tools as well as our statewide program is launched. So getting some baseline data on what people think and believe and are doing is important, we think, to know where we are starting from. And again, as Sarah mentioned, changes in norms take time, sometimes measuring a change and an attitude and belief is your best measure of outcome. Sarah, do you have other--?

Martin: Yes, I do have good news in response to that question. The PBIC national training course on Safe Routes to School is developing an online module, and the module that they are working on right now is on evaluation so there will be—there is not yet is—guidance on evaluating Safe Routes to School programs. Now of course there is some general guidance on evaluation and one of the key aspects is really engaging your stakeholders. What do the people in your stakeholder group want to know? Do they want to know if less cars are now driving their children to school? Do they want to know if more kids are walking to schools? Do they want to know different dangers have been eliminated? So it’s important to work with others to decide what do you need to evaluate and again, there is plenty of resources on general evaluation guidance. You can go to cdc.gov/eval for some guidance on evaluation. But I do encourage you to look forward to an evaluation module in the Safe Routes to School national training course that you find in the rest of the links provided again your handout.

Arnade: And, Mary, if I could add one thing also on evaluation is that with the new federal program evaluation is going to be a key component of what we do, and it’s going to be one of the tasks of the clearinghouse to come up with some evaluation methodology that we can put out there. We certainly want to know how this program has done coming in with $612 million federal program. You take ___ an intervention and you certainly want to know how things, the outcomes and measure those outcomes. So we plan to address
evaluation also, but I think the caller from New York, you just heard the three of us respond that there is a fair amount either—some stuff now but much more coming.

Meletiou: And that’s good news for all of us because not only Tim, will you need to have those good evaluations, but also the local and the state programs because despite how much funding there is available as you have pointed out, it is not going to be enough to go around for everything that needs to be done, and there will need to be some state and local funds partnered with that.

We have a question from North Carolina. Must infrastructure projects be primarily aimed at trips to school? Is a project eligible if it is part of a wider bike/ped mobility goal/plan. For example, providing safe routes to downtown but also helps with trips to a particular school? And, Tim, that—

Arnade: The way I would answer that to the caller, the person who asked the question is this. Go back, if you recall I said the purpose of the program that the framework we have, the number one purpose of the program is to enable and to encourage children to walk and bike to school. Now this is a program—that frankly, it is going to be oversubscribed. There are going to be more applications than resources available. And so I would say that they need to compare that. Sure, if there is a marginal benefit to kids walking or biking, but it really has to be the primary purpose. There are lots of other pots of money out there as you heard from the earlier panel for pedestrian and bicycle programs. The TE program, transportation enhancements program, the CMAQ, we heard about the 402 program. I would just say to you, let’s keep this money for the purposes in which it was established.

Kokinakis: May I add a bit? In Michigan the walking audit, which is to be participated in by multi-disciplinary stakeholder members, is one of the main ways of identifying the infrastructure improvement needed to improve safety along the route to school. And so we are really requiring that multi-disciplinary stakeholder team be involved in assessing the infrastructure needs along the route to school.

Meletiou: We have a similar question from California which I think has already been answered, but I will read it. How can we use current funding to promote safe routes to everywhere? For example, to the park, to friends’ houses, to the store? Does anybody have anything to add?

Arnade: Let me just address it in a broader way. There is obviously a dialogue underway about, you know, some people would say this is a metaphor for a larger movement, sort of returning neighborhoods and communities back to the days of more people walking and
biking and making them more livable. And so I think you have to crawl before you walk and walk before you run and this is certainly a first step—Safe Routes to School.

Meletiou: Tim, this one was sent in particularly for an answer from you. It’s from Ohio asking how will the MPOs be involved in the Safe Routes to School program?

Arnade: Well, I would say to MPOs you are going to need to work with your state DOTs. I have gotten a fair number of questions frankly from the state coordinators about working with the MPOs. So I know it is in the forefront of many of the state coordinators minds about working with the MPOs. You know, when we put out a call for applications, not we, the state DOTs put out their calls for applications, communities are going to need to build support for their applications. I know states are trying to come up with the best forum for and what criteria should be requested of applicants. And so I would say your community would really need to build support and demonstrate need and a lot of other suggested items. But I would think that you folks will have a role, and like I said, I know a number of state DOT coordinators that have already been discussing how they are going to involve the MPOs in the process.

Meletiou: Tim, we got another question for you. This is from Pennsylvania. What is the amount of funding available to each state per year for Safe Routes to School, and you have already answered that to some extent. And what is the maximum, minimal allowable per project?

Arnade: Well, what I would say to our caller form Pennsylvania is one, you can go to our website, and we have a breakdown state by state, year by year of funding, so we have two years of actual is now on the table and then three years still to come. Minimum and maximum amounts, that is up to each individual state if they want to set a minimum and maximum for how much their grant award. Some states may do that, some may not. But an overall picture of funding to the state, it is established by formula. Those numbers are out there. On the grant side it is up to the state department of transportation whether they establish maximum and minimum amounts, and if they do, what those are.

Meletiou: I am going to skip the next question because Tim just answered it. I’m going to go to a question from Cary, North Carolina. Do any of the panelists have any recommendations for how to work with school communities that are opposed to allowing students to walk or bike to school due to concerns about safety?

Kokinakis: I have some comments on that. First of all, I think you respect where they are at. You start where you are in every case. And then try and engage them in a dialogue around what is that concern, and perhaps they are not as aware of the physical activity needs of the kids and how their kids can benefit from lifestyles that include physical activity.
Martin: And lastly I think more eyes on the street actually helps reduce fear and reduce crime. So if we can get more people out there walking and biking, more parents involved, we will have more eyes on the streets, and things will be safer.

Meletiou: Well, we still have some more questions, and unfortunately we are not going to be able to answer them all, but please know that we will post these to the broadcast forum, and they will be answered by our panel members. We have some specific questions here for several of you. From Hawaii, which I am thrilled to see that we have participants from that far away. So we will be back at 3:10 to talk about planning.

***

Meletiou: Welcome back to the third hour of our broadcast. Earlier in this broadcast Larry Anderson presented information on the SAFETEA-LU provisions for bicycling and walking. Our next two panelists, Charlie Zegeer and Tom Norman have been working in the bicycle/pedestrian arena for many years. Between then they have over 50 years of experience in a broad range of bicycle and pedestrian research planning and engineering. Today they will focus on two planning initiatives created to improve the safety and mobility of bicyclists and pedestrians. After their presentations John Fegan with FHWA will highlight the findings of the 10-year status report on the National Bicycling and Walking Study and offer some wrap-up comments. Charlie, we’ll start with you. Charlie is the associate director of the UNC Highway Safety Research Center and director of the Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center. He has been involved in many of the research projects funded by FHWA. Let’s talk about FHWA’s new initiative to reduce pedestrian injuries and fatalities in high crash areas through the development of pedestrian safety action plans, Charlie.

Zegeer: Well, this is actually a project that we are doing for the Office of Highway Safety and Federal Highway Administration, and there really are components to the program. One is to develop the pedestrian safety action plan guide which you can see there on your screen. And this is really sort of step-by-step guide that leads state and local agency officials through identifying problem locations, selecting countermeasures, funding counter measures, implementing and evaluating the counter measures. And then some of the elements of how you go about finding funding. What about some of the stakeholders that need to be brought into the program at the state and local level?
I will go to the next slide, but basically it gives some of the reasoning for Federal Highways to initially come up with this project. As many of you know, about 4,600 pedestrians die every year on our nation’s highways. In addition about 70,000 pedestrians are seriously injured from motor-vehicle collisions. This represents about 12% of the nationwide traffic fatalities. And in some urban areas pedestrian fatalities make up between about 25-40% of the total deaths. So the next slide gets into some of the background or the foundation for what we bring into the guide, for example, much of what we include in the guide is based on national guidelines from groups like the American Association of State Highway and Transportation officials, like from the Institute of Transportation Engineers, from the guidelines in Federal Highway Administration documents. Also we have brought in some best practices that we found in states and cities around the country. John Fegan had mentioned some of those states that are doing many good things for pedestrians in terms of their criteria, their guidelines. And so we really tried to bring in a lot of good case studies that other agencies can use to model.

The next slide, we mentioned some of the stakeholders that are important at the local or state level—folks to be dealt with as a pedestrian safety action plan is developed. You need to get citizens, you need to get business groups, neighborhoods, as well as engineers, planners, educators, police, and a broad constituency to help make this happen most effectively.

The next slide gets into some of the data collection steps that if a local or state agency really needs to get started they need to collect the right kind of data, pedestrian and crash data are a good starting point. This slide illustrates the fact that starting with the crash data and also other information like from citizen complaints, from police officer input on where problems occur. Where are pedestrians having trouble crossing streets for example? Or were there no paths or walkways to walk along roadways? We try to focus on the three basic location types. That is park locations, corridors, and then neighborhoods and targeted areas. And there is also a discussion of how agency-wide data can be used—in other words, looking at trends across the city or a state, for example, if young children are over-involved in crashes. How Safe Routes to School programs can help that. Or seniors are being struck? Some of the education and encouragement and enforcement programs that can help address those problems.

The next slide shows how it is important to really target locations where crashes are occurring. This, in fact, is an example from Miami/ Dade County where you can see
on the left that there are individual points where each pedestrian crash has occurred. When you look at this kind of GIS mapping on the right side you can see sort of the high concentration areas of pedestrian crashes. Next slide.

We get into funding issues, but there are many different sources of funding that are available. From the federal, the state level, also from developers and local agencies. Things like getting routine maintenance funding can also really assist. Next slide.

As we get into engineering treatments we talk about some of the treatments that are really most effective in reducing pedestrian crashes. Things like raised medians. Curb extensions. Trying to treat intersections with some of the latest signal timing technology like countdown signals and different phasing to split up the movement between pedestrians and turning vehicles. We talk about rural areas where we mention improved lighting. And having shoulders along roadways to help pedestrians get from one place to another safely at night. And of course, sort of overall programs that can be specific to certain kinds of locations. Next slide.

In terms of education, certainly educating young children is important but also educating drivers to drive safely and drive within the speed limit to yield to pedestrians. One example we are showing here is an education program that was implemented in Miami/Dade County where they have different kinds of messages on posters that they put on all the buses within the county. Basically to give the different kinds of messages crossing safely at night, how to cross safely at intersections and watch for turning vehicles, walking on the left side of the road, things like that are basic messages that not everyone really understands. And also messages aimed at motorists. Next slide.

Another important one is enforcement activities. As part of the example given here, this was done in Miami/Dade County where they actually had police trained to cross at crosswalks and give citations or warnings to motorists to yield to pedestrians in crosswalks.

And sort of the last step in the training or workshop that we did is we take the class out in the field, we look at one or two high crash locations, and we apply some of the concepts of the different __ to the given locations. So the class comes back in the classroom, they sit down in workshop settings, and then they come up with countermeasures to deal with those particular sites. And that can also include things like changing policies throughout the state or local jurisdiction, increasing education, enforcement, and things like that.
Meletiou: Sounds like there are a lot of good tools that can be applied to the development of a pedestrian safety plan.

Zegeer: Okay, the last thing I guess I wanted to mention is that the current program has involved 13 what we call focus states, and these are states that have already been identified by Federal Highways as having abnormally high pedestrian fatality rates. There are also five cities that you can see on the next slide, and these cities are also target agencies where the training can take place. But I would add in addition to these states and cities, we are trying to encourage other agencies to let us know if there is some interest in them hosting some of the training because our hope in working with Federal Highways and with our prime contractor, DHB, is that this training will be made available to states and cities throughout the U.S. And the manual itself is available on our website. In fact, if you go to www.walkinginfo.org you can see the document and then print that out right from the website. Copies of that are being printed also by Federal Highways and will be available to be distributed.

Meletiou: Well, Charlie, I know you have been doing a lot of traveling to these states to help them develop their pedestrian safety plans, and it sounds as if several of those states are still on their way to developing a plan. When do you anticipate the first ones being completed?

Zegeer: Well, we have completed training in about half of the 13 states. We have other workshops scheduled for May and June, and then again we are scheduling workshops for the fall. But with some potential increase in Federal funding for the project it is likely that we will be able to offer more training to those states in particular.

Meletiou: Well, that sounds good. I know that North Carolina will be pleased to have the opportunity of being one of the states. And I am sure you will be hearing from many of our viewers who want to get involved in their own areas, who may not be in states or cities that have been identified for the first round of these, development of these, pedestrian safety plans.

Next we will hear from Tom Norman who is the director of the North Carolina Department of Transportation Division for Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation. This agency started in 1974 as a bicycle program and it is the oldest comprehensive program in the U.S. There are a couple of other programs that existed prior to this, but don’t take on as many different elements. The division undertakes a full-range of bicycle and pedestrian projects from planning and design to mapping to safety education and awareness programs. Tom joined the program in 1986 and became the director in 2003. Tom, there are many aspects of your program that we could discuss today but let’s focus
on the NCDOT planning grant initiative. I understand that the first call for proposals went out in 2003, and thus far NCDOT has provided about $1.2 million in matching grant funds to 50 towns and cities across North Carolina. I have a few questions for you. First, what led to the creation of this program?

Norman: Well, first of all let me say thank you for offering us the opportunity to be here today. It’s a pleasure to have the opportunity to say something about the importance of planning for bicycling and walking. If we can go to our first slide. One of the things that we began to realize is that tens of millions of dollars were being made available through ISTEA and TEA-21 and that livable, walkable communities need to be developed by plans. They don’t just happen. It’s something that you don’t really begin to think about until you get money to spend and communities are asking for projects. But the projects are not always contributing to a connected transportation system. Being involved in the state department of transportation, one of the things that you quickly begin to realize is that the plans are needed to shape what will be done for quite a long time into the future, and if you have a 5-year, 10-year, 15-year, 20-year planning horizon and projects need to be prioritized, which projects are most critical? Which projects perhaps are less critical, and which projects would be nice to have but are not really the priority that you want to focus on? We need to see how planning is really the headwaters of creating livable, walkable, bikable communities and making a real difference in North Carolina. You could go to the next slide.

Something that really is important to see is that these projects don’t happen in a few months. They take years, years of gaining acceptance in the community, years to put the funding together through the state DOT, through local bond issue funds or other sources. Sometimes developers are able to contribute funds to projects. But overall the plan holds to some level of consistency. And the goal here is not to have a few communities in the state that you want to show as being models, you want to create an opportunity to get lots of communities involved in biking and walking, and the planning is the first part of that effort.

Meletiou: And of course in order to create plans you have to have funding.

Norman: Exactly. And one of the things that is most difficult in the current environment is finding new sources of funds to do things that are non-traditional. Since 1991 with the passage of ISTEA there has been quite a bit of funds for construction, but we could not use those ISTEA funds or subsequently the TEA-21 funds for doing the planning that is necessary to guide the projects. We decided that the place to begin for a source of funds would be
through our General Assembly. They had, by coincidence, in the year 2000, created a comprehensive planning, transportation planning, legislation in which communities were being encouraged not just to plan for streets and highways, but also to look at non-motorized transportation as well as public transit. The General Assembly had made this a requirement for all communities, but had not crated a source of funds to support bicycle and pedestrian planning.

So we were able to go back a few years later and submit a request for an expansion budget request suggesting that because this mandate had been put on communities to do comprehensive transportation planning that that be supported by funds in order to do the bike and ped elements of that. We were successful in getting our General Assembly to support that planning effort. We were also successful in being able to get some statewide planning funds that have been set aside by Federal Highways for planning. It created an annual allocation amount of $400,000 which we are able to distribute throughout the state.

Meletiou: So you could see the need and you secured some funds, but then you had to create the program. How did you get this new program underway and get the word out to the interested communities?

Norman: In the beginning you think that there is a struggle to be able to get funds for something, but then you find out that the real work has to begin once you have the money and you have to create a brand new program that doesn’t have any template. One thing that we were able to do, effectively I think, was to involve local planners. We got feedback from them. I think we tried to do our best to see what it was that the people wanted. We also realized that one of the most crucial aspects of the new program was the website. And for that we understood that you had to have facts, you had to have something that guided the planning effort, which was a detailed, comprehensive planning template. And also you needed to have an online application form. And that has been one of the most crucial aspects to the success of this program in that people can gain all the information that they are looking for through our website.

Meletiou: I’ve noticed that there is a lot of good information on that website, including links to other websites that provide good resources and support information.

Norman: Thank you for pointing that out. One of the keys to a successful program in our view is to make it as user-friendly as possible. One of the goals of the website is to make it sort of one-stop shopping. If NCDOT isn’t providing the information, then we have links to other websites where we think the others have developed good materials for people to
use. That, again, has made it easier for some communities which are new to bicycle and pedestrian issues to go for one website and really find the resources that they need to carry forward with sending a good plan to us or a good application for a plan to us.

Meletiou: And, of course, that website does access the Pedestrian Bicycle Information Center and FHWA and all the good resources that are there. Well, setting up a totally new program, obviously, can be very challenging. But supporting a new program so that it will be successful is equally as challenging. How did you go about that?

Norman: You ask a major question when you say that. First of all, in delivering the program, you’ve got to spread the money across the state. We are a statewide program. There are some communities in North Carolina that have decades of experience with planning for or providing projects for bicycling and walking. But there are many communities that are growing now. North Carolina is a fast-growing state, and many of our communities don’t have any track record with doing this.

So what we’ve been trying to do is find a way to equitably distribute the funds among the communities in the state that have a background in bike and ped efforts, and also the new communities. We do have a concern for the smaller communities that have less sophisticated planning staffs and maybe need more support. So what we’re trying to do is spread the money around both with our larger MPOs and also with our smaller planning areas.

Meletiou: Well, to wrap things up, what are some of the outcomes of the planning grant program?

Norman: Well, I think time will tell to give me an opportunity to say how important this has been. The planning grants have served as a catalyst. In many respects the communities are having more of a dialogue locally. One of the requirements of the planning grants application or process is that the communities form a citizens taskforce. And we include health professionals because we understand the linkages that are a part of the health community, the DOT and the localities working together to create these comprehensive plans.

We’ve talked a lot about Safe Routes to School, and we understand that creating bicycle and pedestrian comprehensive plans also involves those that are interested in improving access to our schools. This is a way to blend all of these programs and bring them in together.

I would also say that we’ve been able to impact a fairly large amount of people—almost two million people so far—with our planning grants, with a relatively small amount of money. A single project to build a mile of greenway can cost $400,000. But
we’ve been able to reach a large portion of our state with $400,000 per year, even providing the comprehensive plans that will guide the development of biking and walking in their communities for 15 or 20 years.

Meletiou: I understand these plans identify a lot of opportunities for communities—what they can do for themselves and how they can put forward projects for funding from DOT and other sources. It sounds as though there are some issues that have struck a chord within the communities across the state and with planning and engineering professionals?

Norman: It certainly has. One of the things that we had not anticipated, but which we had seen and been glad to see is that the creation of the planning opportunity is getting more people interested in bike and ped training. And whenever we offer workshops, the workshops are filled. Many of them are with the grant recipients, so we’re getting a multiplying effect.

Meletiou: I’m sure other places are going to be interested in finding out more about how this program works. As you’ve pointed out, there is a lot of information on the website. We have just a few minutes to field questions on these two planning programs, and then we’ll hear from John Fegan. We’ll start with a question from Massachusetts. I think either Tom or Charlie could answer this. Have any other states implemented the PBCAT software to the extent that North Carolina has? I say Tom or Charlie because it is in Tom’s program, but Charlie’s agency created the website for Tom. Also, did implementing PBCAT in North Carolina require extensive changes in how crashes are reported by police for hospitals? Charlie do you want to…?

Zegeer: Good question. People that I work with back at the Ped/Bike Information Center, David Harkey, Bill Hunter, Libby Thomas, and others, were involved with developing some of the new ped/bike crash analysis tools software. The new version is just out. In terms of agencies that have implemented it, we’ve gotten requests ourselves from state and local agencies around the country. I can’t go down and give you a listing, but there have been a number of agencies that have put the software to good use—Louisville, Kentucky, for example.

Of course North Carolina and the State of North Carolina have used it extensively. The metropolitan area in Orlando, the MPO there I know, has made extensive use of the software. Several state and local agencies around the country have used PBCAT.

In terms of whether it has required any changes in reporting, the answer is no. In fact, our folks back at the highway data and research center have had a contract with the Governor’s Highway Safety Office to really do a lot of that typing for bicycle and
pedestrian crashes for several years. Basically, it involves looking at all the different
crash reports, reading the officer’s description, and then coding that crash as to one of the
crash sites. It has really been a useful tool for identifying what problems occur and then
trying to use that information to come up with countermeasures.

Meletiou: I’m going to skip the next question. Here is a question for John sort of left over from the
first hour that asks, can you clarify the difference between the authorized SAFETEA-LU
funding and the obligated funding levels, which seem to be much lower?

Fegan: The authorized amount of funding is the level of funding that is provided in the
authorizing legislation—the safety legislation if you will. Each year Congress
appropriates the money for that particular fiscal year. And as part of the appropriation
process, they put a limit—we call it an obligation limit on the amount of funds that can be
spent in that particular year.

Even though the authorized legislation may say that you have $100 in your
checking account, when the money for that year is appropriated and they say, “Yes, you
have $100 in your checking account, but you can only spend $90 of the $100.” You don’t
lose the $10. It is carried over into future years. So the obligation on the patient actually
determines how much money you can spend in any given year.

Meletiou: I wanted to focus on that question because it impacts both how Tom does business and
how Charlie can address issues in the state that he is working in. I would like to skip the
next question as well, and take a question from Hawaii since we were not able to do that
in our last session. This is again, for John. When funds are used for bicycle and
pedestrian facilities by a state or an MPO does it subtract from funds available for
highways? I think that is a question that a lot of people have.

Fegan: All the funding is set up in the different funding programs. When you spend money for a
bicycle/pedestrian project, that activity is eligible to be funded from any of those pots of
money. Except for the 750 high priority or earmarked projects, except for the four
communities in the non-motorized transportation pilot program, there is no set-aside or
special money for bike/ped projects. It is all generally available Federal highway funds
that can be used.

Meletiou: Well, since we still have a little bit of time I’m going to go back to question number two
from California. Besides looking to crash/injury sites is it appropriate to look to
locations/routes that peds and bicyclists do not use? It may be that a location shows no
crash incidents because although it could be a good route, it is not used due to apparent
danger. Charlie, I think this is in response to you.
Zegeer: That is a really good question. Certainly crash data are among the primary data sources that are important to look at, but there are others. There is one recent study that the ped/bike information center is just finishing up for Federal Highways office of research. That is a technique to really be able to rate intersections for walking and bicycles in terms of—we call it the intersection safety index. We actually are just finishing up a guide on this. It allows state and local agencies to take this manual/this guide and with a little technique to go and rate hundreds of intersections, literally, in terms of a six-point scale where a 1 means it is very safe for crossing and a 6 means that it is not and something that really needs to be looked at to be improved for walking and bicycling. That is because as the person I was referring to—just because an intersection doesn’t have crashes doesn’t mean it is a safe location. It may just mean that it is so dangerous that no one would want to cross there. So there is this new tool that allows agencies to rate intersections. The ones that do rate badly or highly on that scale can then be reviewed to consider these improvements.

Meletiou: We have a question from Taunton, Massachusetts, again, for John. Could you explain the highway safety plan under the HSIP? Is this required to be done by the MPO or the state or both?

Fegan: Mary, I’m not an expert on the HSIP. What we can do is look at that question. I’d like to just talk to our folks in our Office of Safety about that, and I think we can post the answer to that on the--

Meletiou: On the web.

Fegan: As soon as we get back we’ll address that question and post it.

Meletiou: We’ll check into that. Well, Tom, do you have any advice for other states that might be looking to increase the level of bicycle and pedestrian planning that is taking place?

Norman: Well, there is nothing like money to get people interested. And certainly if you either have some funds available or can find the source of funds either through a foundation or your general assembly to create a planning opportunity, we can say—we can offer testimony that that will, indeed, generate a great deal more interest in biking and walking in the towns and cities of your state.

Meletiou: So the first step is get some money?

Norman: Well, you have to create a program in order to be able to offer people something. A financial incentives is really something that does get people’s attention.

Meletiou: I think we have a caller on the line from Memphis, Tennessee. No? But the question—we have the question. If a city has no pedestrian safety program, can and should the funding
come from road building money, or does it have to come from enhancement funds? It seems that safety monitoring, safety improvements and maintenance need to be included with construction, so there is no set-aside. John, you look like you might want to answer that.

Fegan: There is no set-aside, but under the SAFETEA-LU legislation, there is a new highway safety improvement program, with funding provided for safety activities. That includes safety of bicyclists and pedestrians. And as we’ve heard before, sometimes locations that don’t have large numbers of crashes involving pedestrians or bicyclists need to be addressed because they are just simply so hazardous that people don’t go there. So the highway safety improvement program is a pot of money that can be used for that. The transportation enhancements funding program—one of the eligible activities out of the 12 categories is the provision of safety and educational activities for pedestrians and bicyclists. So the TE funding can be used as well. Those are a couple of pots of money that can specifically be used for safety activities. Mary, I think you had mentioned before the Section 402 funds also.

Meletiou: Right. We have time for one more question. This comes from Massachusetts. Can you provide some examples of states or MPOs that have made a practice of spending their Federal highway funds on bike/ped projects using funds beyond those programs like CMAQ and enhancements that are specifically targeted towards bike/ped projects? We answered something similar in an earlier session. Tom, I think you’ve had some experience with some of your municipalities that have utilized other funds.

Norman: Correct. The Durham, Chapel Hill, Carrboro MPO here in North Carolina has been using for some time its direct allocation funds, which is something that is made available as a federal source of funds to MPOs with over 200,000. And they have been using those funds for bike and ped projects.

Meletiou: This is something that everyone can do, but not many people make that choice. Now we’re going to move on to John’s report on the National Bicycle and Walking Study, the 10-year status report, and some wrap-up comments from FHWA.

Fegan: Thank you Mary. The National Bicycle and Walking Study was a study that was requested of the U.S. Department of Transportation in 1991, and the U.S. Congress asked us to develop an action plan to increase the safety and use of bicycling and walking. And we delivered the action plan to the U.S. Congress on Earth Day in 1994—April 22, 1994. Now, if you are real good at math, you’ll notice that that was actually 12 years ago, so I’ll
give you a 12-year status report instead of a 10-year status report on where we are in implementing the National Bicycling and Walking Study.

And they asked us when we did the study, Congress asked us to come up with an action plan at the federal level. We also came up with suggested action plans for state and local level activities as well. The first visual talks about the goals of the National Bicycling and Walking study. The first of these was to double the percentage of trips made by bicycling and walking. At the time we released the study, 7.9% of trips were made by biking and walking in the United States, based on the nationwide personal transportation survey done in 1990. So that was 7.9% of trips. We wanted to get that up to 15.8% of trips in this country made by bicycling and walking, and at the same time, we wanted to reduce by 10% the number of injuries and fatalities occurring to bicyclists and pedestrians. Next visual, please.

Some of the numbers on this might be a little small to read, but what this is, is really what happened in terms of changes in trips made by bicycling and walking from 1990 to 2001. Remember the goal was to raise trips from 7.9 to 15.8%. What actually happened was the percent of trips made by biking and walking started at 7.9%, but in 2001, it was up to 9.5%. That is not a dramatic increase in the percent of trips; however, it is a near doubling in the number of trips. What we didn’t realize was going to happen when we released the National Bicycling and Walking Study and set this goal of doubling the percent, was that the number of motor vehicle trips during the same period was going to increase dramatically. The number of motor vehicle trips went from 249 billion up to 407 billion trips.

So we’re trying to increase the percent of trips—the percent of bike and ped trips over the denominator of the percent of motor vehicle trips. The denominator kept getting bigger and bigger on us, so it was harder to increase the percent, although we did come very close to doubling the number of bicycle and pedestrian trips.

The next visual talks about effects on safety. We had a goal of reducing injuries and fatalities by 10%. We did, in fact, achieve an 18% reduction in fatalities occurring to bicyclists and pedestrians. These are fatalities that occur as a result of motor vehicle crashes. With regard to injuries, injuries went down 27% for pedestrians and 35% for bicyclists. So we certainly exceeded the goal on the safety side. But we need to work harder on the use goal, I think.

I mentioned that we had a federal action plan as part of the National Bicycling and Walking, so I want to talk about some of the elements of that plan. The first was
developments of policy statements. And we mentioned earlier that the Federal Highway Administration has what we call our design guidance language and that we expect each transportation agency to customarily include accommodations for bicyclists and pedestrians when they are making transportation decisions. So we have very supportive policy language at the federal level. That was the first group of activities.

The second was research, and Charlie alluded to some of the research activities a few minutes ago that have been conducted by the Federal Highway Administration, by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, by the Federal Transit Administration, by the Federal Railroad Administration over the years to look at the ways that we can increase the safety of bicycling and walking. We’ve looked at the safety of marked and unmarked crosswalks. We’ve looked at the safety of signalization for pedestrians. We’ve come up with products—PBCAT, the computer software procedure that was discussed a few minutes ago for categorizing the different types of pedestrian and bicycle crashes.

So there has been a lot of research that has been conducted, and resulting from that research is the third category of activities under the federal action plan or publications. We have large numbers of publications available on the safety of bicycling and walking and also on promoting the use of bicycling and walking. You can find those at the Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center websites that we talked about earlier.

A fourth activity at the federal level is the increasing use of partnerships. We have increased our partnerships with non-profit organizations. We’ve increased our partnerships with the health community, for example. That is a relatively new partner for some of us. I know a number of you all have been dealing with the health community for awhile, but the health community is very interested in getting people to be more physically active, and they’ve recognized the role that transportation can play in encouraging people to be more physically active by bicycling and walking.

We were in a meeting the other day with the Centers for Disease Control, and we were using the terminology that people need facilities to bike and walk if they are going to do it. The provision of facilities doesn’t guarantee that people will, in fact, bike and walk more, but it does guarantee that without facilities you can’t bike and walk. So we called them necessary, but not sufficient conditions to get more people biking and walking.

And then we’ve mentioned several times the increase in Federal funding that is being used for bicycle and pedestrian projects across the country. And again, this is
money that could have been used for other highway and transportation projects in this country. I will say once again that I have never seen a locality that has too much transportation money. These decisions to spend limited funds on bicycle and pedestrian projects are very significant. They are very tough decisions that are being made at state and local levels. As part of the action plan at the state and local levels, we’ve encouraged state level development to organize pedestrian and bicycle safety programs. A number of them have done that. A lot of programs start with a bicycle program and move into the pedestrian side as well. We’ve worked with to provide technical assistance on building facilities for bicycling and walking or promotional programs, educational programs, and some enforcement efforts that you’ve heard about.

That is kind of what was in the action plans at the federal, state and local levels as a result of the National Bicycling and Walking Study. But what we need to talk about now is where do we go from here? What do we need to do better? What do we need to change to really get bicycling and walking to be a real part of our nation’s transportation system?

The first thing is we need to get better at counting the number of people bicycling and walking. We have the trip data from the nationwide personal transportation survey, and some localities are starting to collect data on bicycling and walking, but many places are just not counting the number of people out there.

We need to also improve internal agency support for bicycling and walking: really get commitments from the head of agencies, and carry through on these commitments that bicycling and walking are part of the missions of the organization.

And also I think we really need to increase external awareness of bicycling and walking—not position bicycling and walking as a kind of special interest, but really position them as helping us solve some broader societal problems. We’ve mentioned the increasing costs of gasoline these days, and bicycling and walking can help address that. We’ve talked about changes in air quality, and bicycling and walking can help with that or other energy conservation measures.

The Interstate highway program was developed in the 1950s. As a matter of fact, it is 50 years old this year. It has taken us a long time to build the highway system we have now. We’ve been working for the past 10 or 15 years to modify that system—to make it more accommodating to bicycling and pedestrians. We’ve come a long way, but we still have a ways to go.
In the National Bicycling and Walking Study, the beginning of the document enumerated a vision of a transportation system where there were facilities and programs for all users, including bicyclists and pedestrians. We really need to keep that vision in mind.

On the previous hour of this session, a question came in about changing societal norms. I think that is really where this vision is headed. We need to change the way our country thinks about bicycling and walking. If you look at European nations, people bicycle and walk, and it is not an unusual thing to do. Everyone does it. They don’t have to wear special clothes or think of it as an unusual activity. It is just part of day-to-day living. That is how some people get around. I think we need to work, in the United States, on changing societal norms so that accommodating and taking care of the needs of bicycling and walking are just part of the normal way of conducting our activities so that we can get a more balanced transportation system that meets the needs of everyone.

Meletiou: Thank you, John. We appreciate the encouraging news that we are moving in the right direction and that there are opportunities to continue moving in the right direction with increasing levels of funding at the federal, state and local levels, a greater awareness on the part of decision makers, as you’ve indicated, and proven countermeasures as solutions to problems, there should be an even better report card over the next 10 or 12 years—whatever it might be. This concludes our presentation. I want to thank all of our panelists from each session for their informative presentations. I think it has been a really good discussion, and I’m pleased that these discussions will continue on the broadcast forum. I encourage you all to send in your questions.

And thanks to all of you who tuned in. I hope that the programs and resources that were discussed today will assist you as you work to make your communities more bicycle and pedestrian friendly. The SAFETEA-LU legislation and funding opportunities provide support for a broad range of initiatives that can ultimately lead to the creation of a truly multi-modal transportation system. Now I’ll turn the program back over to Katie McDermott of CTE for some final remarks.

McDermott: Thank you Mary, and on behalf of CTE, thanks again to all of our panelists as well. And thank you especially for participating in our program. I’d also like to acknowledge the many downlink sites across the country, including EPA’s air pollution distance learning network, which tuned in to today’s broadcast. And I must also recognize the efforts of the North Carolina Agency for Public Telecommunications, Microspace Communications and
East Bay Media, all of whom made possible today’s satellite broadcast and Internet simulcast.

Just a few reminders before we leave you. You can continue today’s discussion on bicycle and pedestrian planning strategies as Mary mentioned in CTE’s after-the-program web-based discussion forum. The web forum where you can post additional questions and comments to our panel will remain active for two weeks beginning at 4:00 eastern time today before being archived. DVDs or written transcripts of today’s broadcast can also be ordered from CTE’s website, and you can review this broadcast in its entirety from CTE’s webcast archive. Online versions of the handout and panelist slide presentations will remain available for download as well from this site.

And also, please remember to complete the evaluation form in your handout and return it to the site coordinator before you leave. If you are participating via the web, please submit the electronic evaluation form located on CTE’s website. We invite you to regularly visit our website for more information on the national broadcast that CTE is developing throughout the year. Later this summer we will feature another program in our series on SAFTEA-LU, and this one will focus on the planning provisions of that new legislation. You’ll also want to watch for our upcoming program on the results of the Federal Highway Administration’s recent scan tour on successful wetland mitigation programs.

And finally, on this day, May 4, a national day of prayer, we hope you’ll remember the needs of our nation’s leaders and civil servants who are striving each and every day in the work that they do to advance the public good. Well, that is the program for today. It has been a pleasure being with you. Until next time, thank you and good day from Raleigh, North Carolina.

[THEME MUSIC]
[END OF RECORDING]